

**UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ**

**CLASS IN SELECTED NOVELS OF D. H. LAWRENCE**

**A Pro Gradu Thesis**

**By**

**Kariina Laitinen-Ahonen**

**Department of English  
2001**

## THE ABSTRACT

HUMANISTINEN TIEDEKUNTA  
ENGLANNIN KIELEN LAITOS

Kariina Laitinen-Ahonen  
CLASS IN SELECTED NOVELS OF D. H. LAWRENCE

Pro gradu -työ  
Englantilainen filologia  
Syyskuu 2001

118 sivua

Tarkastelin tutkielmassani yhteiskuntaluokkia D. H. Lawrencen romaaneissa. Hän itse oli englantilaisen työväenluokan kasvatti. Tarkoitukseni oli selvittää, kuuluvatko hänen romaaniensa henkilöt eri yhteiskuntaluokkiin sen perusteella, ovatko he ”vaistoihmisiä” (blood-conscious) vai ”järki-ihmisiä” (mind-conscious). Lawrencen filosofiassa vaistoihminen on fyysinen ja toimii usein viettiensä ja vaistojensa ohjaamana, kun taas järki-ihmisen käyttäytyminen on tietoista, hän arvostaa henkisyttä ja pyrkii ilmaisemaan itseään kielellisesti.

Tutkielmani materiaalina käytin Lawrencen kolmea tunnetuinta teosta: *Sons and Lovers* (1913), *Women in Love* (1921) ja *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928). Analysoin erikseen työväenluokan, keskiluokan ja yläluokan henkilöitä. Lisäksi jokaisen yhteiskuntaluokan kohdalla tarkastelin erikseen miespuolisia ja naispuolisia henkilöitä, samoin kuin teoksen sankareita ja sankarittaria. Tarkastelin yhteiskunnan eri ryhmiä ja yksittäisiä henkilöitä juuri vaisto-järki vastakkainasettelun kautta.

Romaanien lisäksi käytin materiaalinani Lawrencen elämää, ajatusmaailmaa ja teoksia käsitteleviä kriittisiä ja elämäkerrallisia teoksia. Hyödynsin myös Englannin kirjallisuuden historiaa ja yhteiskuntahistoriaa koskevaa kirjallisuutta.

Lawrence yhdistää romaanissaan *Sons and Lovers* vaistomaisen käyttäytymisen ja fyysisyyden työväenluokkaan ja henkisyyden keskiluokkaan. Tarkoitukseni oli osoittaa, että Lawrencen myöhemmissä teoksissa tällaista selkeää jaoteltua ei enää ole. Myöhemmissä teoksissaan Lawrence ei enää yhdistä tiettyjä psykologisia piirteitä tiettyihin yhteiskuntaluokkiin vaan yksittäisiin henkilöihin, jotka voivat olla lähtöisin yhteiskunnan eri kerroksista. Myöhempien teosten sankarit, jotka edustavat vaistoihmisiä, ovat kuitenkin arvomaailmaltaan ja ulkoisesti erilaisia kuin teoksen *Sons and Lovers* työväenluokan edustajat, sillä heissä on esimerkiksi myös ns. järki-ihmisen piirteitä. Lawrencen näkemys vaistoihmisistä on siis muuttunut. Lawrencen perimmäinen tarkoitus olikin luoda sellaisia henkilöitä joiden järki ja vaistot ovat tasapainossa keskenään ja joiden luokkatausta on epäolennainen.

*Sons and Lovers* romaanissaan Lawrence kuvaa keskiluokkaisia materialistisia elämänarvoja ja pitää niitä tuhoisina. Lisäksi Lawrence kaikissa teoksissaan pitää naisia, etenkin työväenluokan naisia, henkisempinä, materialistisempina ja laskelmoivampina (eli ns. järki-ihmisinä) kuin miehiä yleensä. Myöhemmissä teoksissaan hän on pessimistinen koko yhteiskunnan suhteen, sillä materialismi ja eräänlainen kylmä laskelmoiva ilmapiiri on levinnyt kaikkiin yhteiskuntaluokkiin ja tappanut ihmisistä vaistot, seksuaalisuuden ja inhimillisyyden. Hän ei enää usko työväenluokan elinvoimaisuuteen niin kuin *Sons and Lovers* teoksessa. Lawrence on pessimistinen varsinkin kuvatessaan ihmisiä ryhminä, sillä yksittäisissä henkilöissä, olipa he sitten työväenluokan, keskiluokan tai yläluokan jäseniä, ilmenee usein vaistoihmisen piirteitä. On ilmeistä, että Lawrencen vaihtelevaan ja usein ristiriitaiseen suhtautumiseen eri yhteiskuntaluokkiin vaikutti hänen henkilökohtaiset ja sosiaaliset kokemuksensa ja teollistuneen ja materiaaliseen yhteiskunnan ongelmat.

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2 BIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3 THE BRITISH CLASS SOCIETY AND THE EDWARDIANS</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>3.1 THE WORKING CLASS AND CLASS RELATIONS</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>3.2 THE MIDDLE CLASS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.3 THE ARISTOCRACY</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.4 THE EDWARDIANS</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4 LAWRENCE AS A SOCIAL THINKER</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>5 INTRODUCTION TO THE NOVELS</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5.1 REALISM AND MODERNISM IN LAWRENCE</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>5.2 THE SELECTED NOVELS</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>6 THE WORKING CLASS</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>6.1 THE WORKING-CLASS MEN</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>6.1.1 THE BLOOD</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>6.1.2 THE MIND</b>	<b>55</b>
<b>6.2 THE WORKING-CLASS WOMEN</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>6.2.1 THE BLOOD</b>	<b>61</b>
<b>6.2.2 THE MIND</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>6.3 THE WORKING-CLASS HEROES</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>7 THE MIDDLE CLASS</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>7.1 THE MIDDLE-CLASS MEN AND VALUES OF THE BLOOD</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>7.2 THE MIDDLE-CLASS WOMEN AND VALUES OF THE MIND</b>	<b>79</b>
<b>7.3 THE MIDDLE-CLASS HERO AND HEROINE</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>8 THE UPPER CLASS</b>	<b>90</b>
<b>8.1 THE UPPER-CLASS MEN</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>8.1.1 THE BLOOD</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>8.1.2 THE MIND</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>8.2 THE UPPER-CLASS WOMEN</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>8.2.1 THE BLOOD</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>8.2.2 THE MIND</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>8.3 THE UPPER-CLASS HEROINE</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>9 CONCLUSION</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>BIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>116</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Some ideas were common to the Edwardian writers, philosophers and intellectuals, but were by no means shared by the whole population, for these ideas had often nothing to do with the social reality (Rose 1986). These were: 1. The belief that ideal personal relationships were the means to overcome class barriers, 2. The belief in vitalism as a new “life religion” and 3. The belief in the harmony between the body and the intellect in a human being (Rose 1986). In his writing D. H. Lawrence (1885-1930) manifested all of these three thought patterns. What made him so unique was his belief that the failure of human beings to live according to these philosophical patterns was the reason for the social problems of his day, such as the inflamed class relations.

In this thesis I shall examine three novels of D. H. Lawrence from sociological and ideological point of view. The aim of this thesis is the study of class in relation to an ideology that is basic in Lawrentian thought, as well as being an ideology that belongs to the thought streams of the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is the ideology of the blood versus the mind. According to Lawrence, a blood-conscious human being appreciates more human values like instincts and sexuality, whereas a mind-conscious person is more materialistic and appreciates more the intellect. What Lawrence basically does is to connect blood-consciousness with working class and mind-consciousness with upper classes. In the analysis section I shall use the terms blood values / life values and mind values (or qualities) or where more appropriate, blood-consciousness and mind-consciousness.

One of the first critics who paid attention to the theme of class in Lawrence's work was F. R. Leavis. In *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist* (1955:73-95) Leavis examines Lawrence's view on class through two short stories from Lawrence's early writing period. Leavis wants to prove that although Lawrence was very class-conscious he didn't show any class feeling in the form of sentimentality or idealisation of working-class way of life, or that he didn't treat his middle-class characters cruelly. On the contrary, Lawrence treated class as the villain and the theme was the triumph of life over class-distinctions (Leavis 1955:73). Leavis (1955:75) points out that “the pride of class superiority” is “the enemy of life” in Lawrence's works in general. This leads to the opposition that I

wish to make in my study, namely between mind and blood, class-superiority being a mind value and the ability to live life at full a blood value. Leavis, however, doesn't go any further so as to deal with the idea of life in connection with the working class, as I intend to do. He mainly wants to attack the charge of snobbery made against Lawrence (by e.g. T.S. Eliot) and stress the theme of life.

Graham Martin (in Widdowson 1982) agrees with Leavis that the class-differences that are overcome by life is a recurrent theme in Lawrence's work, but he thinks that this victory is possible on a personal level only. In *Sons and Lovers* (1913), and in *Women in Love* (1921) the individual characters are able to disengage from class on a personal level, whereas, in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* this process is seen as more difficult (Martin in Widdowson 1982:47). Martin has acknowledged the "binary opposition (middle-class = ideas / working-class = warmth ) that, he thinks, persists throughout his [Lawrence's] work" (Martin in Widdowson 1982:38) and he says that this opposition is made especially clear in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (Martin in Widdowson 1982:44).

According to Peter Scheckner (1985:13), Scott Sanders' (1973) work is the first full-length study of social and class conflicts in Lawrence. In addition, Sanders examined the connection between mind versus body and class in Lawrence's work. Sanders (1973:13-14) claimed that in Lawrence's work the most fundamental opposition was between nature and culture. Nature includes: unconscious, body, instincts, natural self, dark races, pagan, primitive, silence and working-class (miners); whereas culture includes: conscious, mind, ideas, social self, white races, Christian, modern, language and ruling class (managers) (Sanders 1973:13-14). Sanders (1973:13) thus claims that the "psychological divisions mirrored the social divisions which Lawrence had observed as a child in the industrial Midlands." He says that Lawrence had the habit of changing social problems ( class conflict, war etc.) into philosophical theories about man's nature (Sanders 1973:14).

Peter Scheckner (1985) gives credit to Sanders' study (1973), but claims that Lawrence's novels deal with class and society in a more complex way than Sanders suggests. In addition, Scheckner (1982:13) points out that critics have usually ignored the fact that Lawrence's views were constantly changing in rhythm with the social, political and other changes in society. However, Sanders

(1973) does make a connection between historical events, Lawrence's life and his work.

Both Martin (1982) and Sanders (1973) argue that the division into the working class with blood values and the upper classes with mind values is consistent in Lawrence's writing. In my thesis I shall show that no such consistency exists in Lawrence's novels. Scheckner (1985), unlike Martin and Sanders, acknowledges the contradictions in Lawrence's treatment of class. I agree with him that Lawrence's attitude on class was a complex one and constantly changing. However, Scheckner, although he deals with values and class, doesn't make any systematic analysis of the blood values and the mind values of the different classes, but deals with class in Lawrence's novels from several perspectives.

Consequently, in my study I shall concentrate on the different social classes in three selected novels of Lawrence as seen through the opposites of blood and mind. I want to show that in Lawrence the class-division, into the working class and the upper classes, does not always correspond to the psychological division into the blood (working class) and the mind (upper classes). Furthermore, I shall also show that those values that are considered as blood values in one novel may belong to the mind values in the other one, or vice versa. This is especially true when it comes to the heroes and heroines and their sets of values. Sanders' and Scheckner's views have been most useful to me in my own analysis of the novels, but neither of them concentrates on the theme of class primarily from the point of view of blood and mind values, as I intend to do here.

The hero of the autobiographical *Sons and Lovers*, an early novel of Lawrence, states: "...the difference between people isn't in their class, but in themselves. **Only from the middle classes one gets ideas, and from the common people- life itself, warmth**" (1913:315; emphasis added). This is the basic starting point to my study of Lawrence's novels. My task is to examine the characters of each class and see if they fit to this statement in *Sons and Lovers*. I also want to compare this phenomenon chronologically choosing a novel from each period of Lawrence's writing career to see if his view of the characteristics of the different classes changes through the years. The blood values and the mind values in this study conform broadly to the classification made by Sanders (1973),

but I have extended the list, using my own judgement as to what to include to each category.

The novels I shall analyse are *Sons and Lovers* (1913. Hereafter SL followed by page number), *Women in Love* (1921. Hereafter WL followed by page number), and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928. Hereafter LC followed by page number). I have left out novels, such as the travel books, that do not attempt to describe the social reality of Britain, but are situated elsewhere (on the Continent, Australia and Mexico). After all, the idea of this thesis is to examine class situation in Northern England as seen through Lawrence's work. The theme of class and the opposition of blood versus mind are essential also in *The White Peacock* (1911), *The Rainbow* (1915), *Aaron's Rod* (1922), *The Lost Girl* (1981), *Mr Noon* (1984) and in a novella called *The Virgin and the Gipsy* (1930). Because of lack of space I was forced to leave out the analysis of these novels, although, for example *The Rainbow* is undoubtedly one of Lawrence's major works besides the three that I have chosen. The setting of the selected novels is similar, an industrial bourgeois society that is familiar to Lawrence from his own life. In Lawrence's native village, Eastwood, there were present the same kind of pressures on individuals and contradictions between classes (Holderness 1982:4) that are present in all of these three novels that will be dealt with in this study. Lawrence's interpretation of the society of his time cannot entirely be taken as a true image of that society, as Lawrence offers several versions of that same society (Holderness 1982:25). Graham Holderness suggests that the image of the society varies depending, for example, on the social status of the character who is making the judgements.

In the background section of my study I shall give an account of Lawrence's life and social ideas and relate them to a broader historical context. In the historical part I shall describe the development of the social classes of Britain and the nature of Edwardian and partly Georgian societies in general. Class conflict in Lawrence is partly a conflict between the mind and the body, and it is also part of the individual as a social being. I shall try to outline the ideology of the body and the mind and all the other ideas that are connected with it. For example, the concepts of individual and community must be accounted for, as there is a distinction between the bourgeois ideology of individuality and the feeling of togetherness inside a working-class community (Holderness 1982:66-

67). Furthermore, there is a connection between the conflict of individualism and community and the literary technique of Lawrence. According to Holderness (1982:19) the realist technique is related to the idea of community, social nature of human beings, whereas, the modernist technique (aestheticism, symbolism) is related to individualistic tendencies. Therefore, I shall give an overall analysis of the realist and modernist features in Lawrence's writing in these three works as well as a more detailed description of each novel.

In the actual analysis section I shall examine the blood values and the mind values class by class and make a distinction between female and male characters. Lawrence had a totally different attitude to working-class women as compared to the upper-class women, as well as to men and women in general. In the analysis part I shall divide the classes into working class, middle class and upper class. To the upper classes I include the upper middle-class and the aristocracy, for they formed the new ruling class of Britain during this period. I shall also look more closely on the heroes and heroines and their values in each novel. The heroes and heroines are often very contradictory characters in Lawrence's novels. This is probably due to the fact that he often uses his fiction as a vehicle for his doctrines, which may have weakened the credibility of his characters. "Critics have long pointed to the tensions, inconclusiveness and changes of view in Lawrence's oeuvre, both over time and within individual works" (Widdowson 1992:20). This statement holds true also in the analysis of Lawrence's novels from the point of view of class.

## **2 BIOGRAPHY**

David Herbert Richards Lawrence was born in 1885 at Eastwood Nottinghamshire, a small mining village eight miles from Nottingham and one mile from the river Erewash which marks the border between Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire (in Nehls 1957:5). He was the fourth out of five children and the youngest of three sons (Moore 1974:25).

Lawrence's mother Lydia came from a bourgeois family from Nottingham and had been a schoolteacher before her marriage (Moore

1974:21,23). She was a very cultured woman who read a lot and had written poetry (in Nehls 1957:22). She was deeply religious and used to have long discussions with the local minister about religion and philosophy (in Nehls 1957:9). Lawrence wrote about his mother that she was “superior” because of her background and her correct King’s English (in Nehls 1957:7). She was a socially well-respected woman, whereas his father was less so (in Nehls 1957:7-8).

Arthur Lawrence was a collier from childhood to old age and was said to have been skilful at his work, although he was sometimes insolent towards his superiors, and careless at work, which made him prone to accidents (in Nehls 1957:21,31). What first attracted Lydia, was his handsome figure, good spirits and his full-hearted singing and dancing (Moore 1974:24). Lawrence’s sister remembers that his father was at his happiest when mending something in the house “singing at the top of his voice” (in Nehls 1957:11). Besides, this ability to enjoy manual work, the love of nature was also something that Lawrence inherited from his father (in Nehls 1957:14). Although, according to the autobiographical *Sons and Lovers*, it was with his mother that Lawrence often explored nature.

Arthur had taken “the non-drinking pledge”, but as he had little common with his wife, instead of going to the Chapel, he began stopping at the local public houses on the way from work (Moore 1974:24). This, of course, led to quarrels between husband and wife. Lawrence’s sister describes (in Nehls 1957:11) the nature of their fights as follows:

Mother would wait up for father at night, her rage seething, until on his arrival it boiled over in a torrent of biting truths which turned him from his slightly apologetic mood into a brutal and coarse beast.

Harry T. Moore (1974:20) writes that their fight was a “class warfare, bourgeoisie against proletariat”. I agree that their discrepancies were fundamentally class-based, although superficially the cause seemed to be the father’s drinking problem. There would not have been so many fights between the parents if the mother had made an effort to adapt to the working-class way of life, instead of trying to mould her family to middle-class ways. Lydia hated her husband and directed her love towards the children (Moore 1974:25) – the father was shut out from the rest of the family (in Nehls 1957:11). The mother was determined to give her children a good education and she was prepared to make

sacrifices for them (Moore 1974:24-25). The family did make a tiny rise in society every time they moved to a better house (in Nehls 1957:30). The children felt as superior as their mother, for a friend of Lawrence's childhood remembers (in Nehls 1957:30) that Lawrence used to boast about their new home to her.

The relationship between Bert, as D. H. was called in his childhood, and his mother was extremely close and became even closer after the death of the eldest son. Ernest, who was at the beginning of a fine career in London and was the pride of the family (in Nehls 1957:12-13), died of pneumonia when he was only twenty-three years old (Moore 1974:62). After this Bert got very ill and nearly died of pneumonia like his brother (Moore 1974:62). Again when Lawrence's mother died in 1911, after a long illness, the world collapsed for him and he became very ill (Moore 1974:169).

Lawrence's mother had a great influence on his life as a whole (in Nehls 1957:23) and this influence was more or less harmful. It prevented Lawrence, while his mother was alive, from forming normal relationships with other women and made him later take a critical attitude towards "superior" working-class women and towards the middle and upper classes and their material values. For, later in life Lawrence realised how wrong his mother had been and how unjustly the rest of the family had treated the father. The children later thought (in Nehls 1957:10-11) that their mother should have been more tolerant towards her husband and that they should have taken more interest in the things that their father cared for. Lawrence thought later (in Moore 1974:25) that "his father had a relish for life and that his mother with her militant self-righteousness had damaged both father and children." However, Lawrence was never deeply attracted to following the traditional working class way of life of his fathers either, for he was attracted to the bourgeois world of culture and thus became writer (Holderness 1982:68).

It was also through his mother that Lawrence got a very religious upbringing, for his father seldom went to church. Although Lawrence gave up religion when still a young man, the biblical imagery and mystical, religious tone in his writing shows how familiar he was with the Bible (Moore 1974:38). There are plenty of examples of this in the three novels I shall discuss in my thesis.

Besides his mother, the other great influence in Lawrence's life was provided by the surroundings he lived in. The contrast between the agricultural

and the industrial England has been an inexhaustible source in Lawrence's writing. In his essay "Nottingham and the mining countryside" Lawrence has written (in Moore 1974:29) that "the great crime which the moneyed classes and promoters of industry committed in the palmy Victorian days was the condemning of the workers to ugliness".

In consequence, Lawrence enjoyed his walks through the forests and his visits to the Haggs Farm, where he had direct contact with nature (in Nehls 1957:48). Salgado writes (1982:68) that this contact of human beings to the surrounding nature and the whole universe has always been a great concern for Lawrence and, that it has its origins in these days he spent in the Haggs farm and the surrounding countryside. Indeed there are in *Sons and Lovers* plenty of nature scenes where the main character (Lawrence as a youth) is filled with enchantment when in contact with nature.

Jessie Chambers, the daughter of the family that run the farm, was Lawrence's closest friend during his youth (Moore 1974:55). His mother was jealous of her son and didn't approve of their relationship (in Nehls 1957:52). However, Jessie encouraged Lawrence in his writing (in Nehls 1957:46), whereas, his mother never really believed he could write anything important (Moore 1974:160). Lawrence wrote his first poems to Jessie (Moore 1974:101). Lawrence portrays his relationships with his mother and father, and with Jessie in *Sons and Lovers*.

Before going deeper into Lawrence's writing career, I shall briefly account for his school and teaching years. Lawrence started school at the age of seven. He was continually teased by the other collier boys, because he preferred the company of girls and thought himself superior (in Nehls 1957:25,32). At the age of twelve he won a scholarship to Nottingham High School (Moore 1974:46). The schooldays were long and he studied hard to become as brilliant a student as his brother Ernest had been, but it was hard for a delicate boy who had poor health (Moore 1974:42,47).

After High School Lawrence worked three months in a factory of surgical appliances in Nottingham, translating orders (Moore 1974:59-60). From the age of seventeen to twenty Lawrence worked as a pupil teacher and attended a course for pupil teachers at Ilkeston (Moore 1974:77). Also Jessie Chambers and Louise

Burrows, to whom Lawrence was engaged for a while, attended this course (Moore 1974:79,160).

At the age of twenty Lawrence won a scholarship to Nottingham University College where he studied for two years (Moore 1974:92-93). While at university Lawrence started writing his first novel *The White Peacock* that was to be published in 1911 (Moore 1974:158). Lawrence's first publication was, however, a short story called "A Prelude" that appeared in "Nottinghamshire Guardian" in 1907 (Moore 1974:114). The University years were a disappointment to Lawrence who said that they "had meant mere disillusion instead of the contact of living men" (in Moore 1974:114).

After studies Lawrence obtained a post at a school in Croydon in South London (Moore 1974:120). He hated the routine of teaching (Moore 1974:86), but on the other hand, he proved to be a very successful teacher (in Nehls 1957:150) and was especially keen on Art, English and Biology (in Nehls 1957:86). While in Croydon, his mother died and he became very ill with pneumonia. As a consequence, he decided to leave his schoolmaster's post in 1912 and become a full time writer (Moore 1974:181). His second novel, *The Trespasser*, was published the same year (Moore 1974:173). He also begun writing *Sons and Lovers* that was published in 1913 and established Lawrence as a prominent writer (Moore 1974:240).

Lawrence's launch into literary circles happened already in 1909 when he met Ford Maddox Ford who accepted some of his poems to be published in the "English Review" (Moore 1974:139-140). Ford introduced him to famous writers and rich promoters of art (Moore 1974:153-154), from whom some were members of the aristocracy, like Lady Ottoline Morrell and Lady Cynthia Asquith. Furthermore, when visiting Eastwood he participated in the social discussions in the home of his good friend William Hopkin (Moore 1974:153-154). So the wide social sphere was really opening up for Lawrence and he began to lead a rather bohemian life style (Holderness 1982:77). It is notable that most of Lawrence's friends at that time were socialists and some of his female friends were suffragettes (Moore 1974:154).

In 1912 Lawrence's life would take quite a new direction. He met Frieda Weekley (former von Richthofen), the wife of his former French professor at the College and the mother of three children (Moore 1974:181). They fell in love and

only after knowing each other for six weeks, they travelled together to Germany (Moore 1974:193). Frieda had had extramarital love affairs before, but it was Lawrence who saved her from the deadening atmosphere of the bourgeois society (Moore 1974:189-190), as Frieda wrote later (In Moore 1974:190) that Lawrence “had touched a new tenderness in me”. Lawrence has dealt with their relationship in his novel *Mr Noon* (1984). With Frieda’s help Lawrence could eventually come in terms with his “crippling” past and together they fought through all the difficulties of their stormy relationship (Moore 1974:197). This fight is portrayed in Lawrence’s book of poetry, *Look! We have come through!* (1917). The relationship with Jessie had only satisfied Lawrence’s spiritual and artistic side, with Frieda he could also fulfil his physical and sexual side (Holderness 1982:91). It is also noteworthy that Lawrence was said to have been impressed by the fact that Frieda was the daughter of a German baron, whose family held high posts in the German Empire (Moore 1974:183).

Frieda recalls (in Nehls 1957:169) that while staying in Germany and Italy they were very poor. In fact, they were to suffer from poverty also during the war years and had to depend on the help of their friends for money and lodgings. However, this was a very creative period for Lawrence. He completed *Sons and Lovers* and started writing *The Sisters* that was to become two separate novels: *The Rainbow*, completed in 1915, and the *Women in Love*, completed in 1916 or 1917 (Moore 1974:207,210). Moore (1974:209) suspects that it was probably the sunny climate and the life style of the Italian peasants (“the dark sun-people) that eased his stress after the gloomy, industrial Midlands.

The Lawrences, now married, spent the war years from 1914 to 1918 in England, because they couldn’t obtain passports to travel abroad (Moore 1974:305). They had plans for moving abroad permanently and establish an ideal community, with some friends, that Lawrence called Ranim (Moore 1974:305). In this colony, according to Lawrence (in Moore 1974:273) “there shall be no money but a sort of communism” and it would be “established upon the assumption of goodness in the members”.

The war years and the war itself were a misery for Lawrence. He was often ill and short of money, because he couldn’t get his work published (Moore 1974:312,381). Holderness (1982) says that during the war Lawrence became alienated both from the reading public as well as from the society. *The Rainbow*

was suppressed for supposed immorality immediately after its publication in 1915, and also because it criticised English soldiers (Moore 1974:306,312). Furthermore, Lawrence had disagreements with the Bloomsbury group whose members dominated the artistic and intellectual life at the time, which further prevented him from getting his works published (Moore 1974:293). These people were a group of aesthetes and intellectuals whose opinions and sex lives were rather unconventional. Lawrence accused them of amorality and trivialmindedness, which in his opinion were made possible only by “the financial independence “ of the members “which enabled them to insulate themselves from the ... pressures” of work and routines of everyday life (Outhwaite 1993:46-47). Strangely enough, Lawrence himself condemned everyday routines and conventional life in *Women in Love*. Lawrence completed *Women in Love* and had difficulties in having it published, too. It was, however, published privately in 1920. During the war he also started writing *Aaron's Rod* (1922)(Moore 1974:362).

The Lawrences were expelled from Cornwall, because they were suspected of spying for the Germans (Moore 1974:355). After this they were under war office surveillance during the rest of the war (Moore 1974:367). Because of poor health, Lawrence could escape from war service (Moore 1974:334). Lawrence had to stand in front of the conscription committee several times, which he took as an insult to his individual freedom (Moore 1974).

Lawrence had planned to give a series of pacifistic lectures with the writer and philosopher Bertrand Russell, a peripheral Bloomsbury member, but their friendship, like many other of Lawrence's friendships, ended in philosophical disagreements (Moore 1974:277). Russell disliked Lawrence's philosophy of blood and later (Russell died 1970) accused him of Nazism because of his belief in the idea of a natural leader (in Nehls 1957:282-285). The writer Aldous Huxley has said that Lawrence was extraordinary and that he both liked and admired him, but that he was “difficult to get on with” (in Moore 1974:613). Lawrence had the habit of using his friends as characters in his works, and the portrayals were usually unfavourable for his soon-to-be old friends (Moore 1974:284). For example, Lady Ottoline Morrell, an aristocratic friend of his, was presented cruelly in *Women in Love* (Moore 1974:309) as Hermione Roddice and John Middleton Murry, literary editor, with whom Lawrence wanted a so called

“blood-brotherhood”, was portrayed as Gerald in the same novel (in Nehls 1957:375,377). Lawrence had indeed a very difficult character, for those who didn’t know him, or understand him deeply enough. This exuberant temperament and the occasional crossnesses he had inherited from his father (Aldington in Lawrence 1972:ix).

Because of his wartime experiences, Lawrence lost his faith in democracy and he also hated the English society more deeply (Moore 1974:303,387). In consequence, he left for Italy, right after the war was over, and would never live in England again (Moore 1974:388-389). He merely paid a few short visits to England in 1923, 1925, and 1926 (Moore 1974:387).

While in Italy from 1920 to 1922, Lawrence completed *Aaron’s Rod* (1922) and started to write *Mr Noon* that is partly autobiographical (Moore 1974:405,413). Now that the war was over Lawrence could get his works published again, and the years of poverty were finally over (Moore 1974:423). In 1920 Lawrence, for *The Lost Girl* (1920), was awarded the James Tait Black Prize of Edinburgh University, the only official recognition he ever got in his life (Moore 1974:424).

A short stay in Australia inspired Lawrence to write *Kangaroo* (1923) (Moore 1974:427), and *The Plumed Serpent* (1926), he wrote after a visit to Mexico (Moore 1974:467). In Mexico he got seriously ill and was diagnosed with tuberculosis (Moore 1974:508). Lawrence also lived about two years on a range in Taos, New Mexico, that was the nearest he ever got to the colony of Rananim.

In 1925 Lawrence came back to Europe (Moore 1974:515). His visit to the Midlands and Eastwood in 1926, during a general strike, gave him material for *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, that he began to write as soon as he was back in Italy (Moore 1974:530-531). On his visit to his native village Lawrence saw the misery of the miners caused by the long strike. There was unemployment, hunger and lack of coal. Lawrence wrote an essay about his visit called “Return to Bestwood” (in Lawrence 1968) where he expressed his sorrow about the bitterness between the classes. The strike had deepened the class barriers “on the one side the workers; on the other side the capitalists and the Government” (Sanders 1973:173). Although Lawrence had escaped from the working class, he again felt nostalgia and deep feeling for the common people (Sanders 1973:173-174).

Lawrence published *Lady Chatterley's Lover* privately in Florence in 1928, because he didn't want to have it expurgated (Moore 1974:533). He had also problems with other of his work. For example, the manuscripts of his *Pansies* poems and his paintings were seized by the British police (Moore 1974:581,595). Lawrence was constantly accused of obscenity which made him furious and bitter, and, what is more, his health had begun to deteriorate (Moore 1974:602). However, although Lawrence had "often found fault with the stupidity of mankind", he never ceased to love "life itself" (Moore 1974:625). Lawrence wrote in *Apocalypse*: "the magnificent here and now of life in the flesh is ours ... and ours only for a time. We ought to dance with rapture that we should be alive and in the flesh, and part of the living, incarnate cosmos" (Lawrence 1972:103).

*Apocalypse*, interpretation of the Book of Revelation, was to remain Lawrence's last work (Moore 1974:606). He died in Vence, France, in 1930 at the age of 44. Lawrence's literary production was huge, considering the number of years during which it was produced. In addition to novels, he wrote travel books, poems, plays, essays, literary criticism, history textbooks, short stories, novellas, translations and an enormous amount of letters.

I think it is obvious why class issues have such strong emphasis in Lawrence's works. First of all, his roots were deep in the mining country, but he found the working-class life too restricted (influence of mother) and decided to follow the supposedly more cultured life of the middle class. He felt, however, nostalgia for the working-class life and people for the rest of his life. Secondly, he grew up in the Midlands where he could experience the industrialisation of the countryside, the disputes between mine owners and miners and the strengthening of more materialistic values. Thirdly, he lived in an age when the British society was highly class-conscious and when all the classes wanted their share from the affluence brought by imperialism. In the next section I shall deal more deeply with society and class.

### 3 THE BRITISH CLASS SOCIETY AND THE EDWARDIANS

The terms 'working class' and 'middle class' both came to common use around 1800 (Briggs in Neale 1983:10-11). Of course, society had been hierarchical before, but in the earlier period the classes were called ranks and there was no such identity felt between the members of the same ranks as developed inside the different classes during the 19<sup>th</sup> century because of Industrial Revolution (Royle 1987). Max Weber explains that classes are economic interest groups and that also in class struggle there is always the question of economic interests or political power (Weber in Neale 1983:58,60). That is why the classes started to form their separate identities during the Industrial Revolution. Before the Industrial Revolution the middle classes existed as the middle orders "between the nobility and the common people" (Raynor 1969:3). What is shared by the middle classes is their "economic position as the driving and directing force in the new forms of business enterprise" (Raynor 1969:15-16) and a set of values that arise from this position.

Before the times of the French Revolution the word nobility referred to hereditary ranks, whereas the word aristocracy was associated with those individuals or families that belonged to a "hereditary ruling group" (Powis 1984:1-3). Thus one could say that all aristocrats were nobles but not all nobles were aristocrats. Afterwards aristocracy came to denote the whole social class (Powis 1984:6). It was considered natural and taken for granted that a person's rank was determined by birth (Powis 1984:14), especially among the aristocracy. This was still true in Lawrence's time, for no class has been so resistant to material and cultural changes as the aristocracy. Of course, anyone would resist if he was about to lose such privileges as freedom from taxes and monopoly on certain public offices (Powis 1984:12).

Today classes are defined mainly through occupational categories, but it is obvious that the boundaries of class are difficult to define (Stevenson 1984:340-341). Besides, there is stratification within the different classes as well and these divisions are often more significant than the divisions between classes (Briggs in Neale 1983:26). For example, the difference between the unskilled and the skilled labourer (Calhoun in Neale 1983:108). Women are usually ascribed to the social class of their husbands (Stevenson 1984:342).

For my purpose in this thesis it is not necessary to make any complicated structural analyses of the classes. In 1914 the middle and upper classes formed a quarter of the total population and the rest belonged to the working class (Stevenson 1984:37). In my thesis I shall use the following stratification based on the works of Edward Royle (1987), Ross Mc Kibbin (1990) and John Stevenson (1984): Working class, lower middle class, upper middle class and aristocracy. Upper middle class and aristocracy form the so called upper classes, the ruling classes.

### **3.1 THE WORKING CLASS AND CLASS RELATIONS**

During the 19<sup>th</sup> century, as Britain became more industrialised and urbanised, the British working classes became increasingly class-conscious. After all, they formed the majority of the total population (Royle 1987:89). Consequently, when the workforce joined together in various organisations to claim better living and working conditions, they could hardly be ignored by the ruling classes. For example, the Trade Unions developed during the first half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The Independent Labour Party (since 1906 the Labour Party) was formed in 1893 (Hopkins 1979:164). It must be noted that these organisations were by no means revolutionary in that they would have wanted to rule out the middle and upper classes and establish an order of their own. Instead the working class identity was gained and social reform was carried out more or less in peaceful terms in Britain. (Hopkins 1979).

Graig Calhoun (in Neale 1983:108) argues that the English working class was not revolutionary, unlike the proletariat in many other European countries, because they lacked a sense of community. This lack of community was caused by the inequality between the skilled and the unskilled labourer, the mobility of the workforce and exhaustion from work (Calhoun in Neale 1983:108-109). Masterman (in Mc Kibbin 1990:40) writes that the British working men are “much more allied in temperament and disposition to some of the occupants of the conservative back benches whose life, in its bodily exercises, enjoyment of eating and drinking, and excitement of ‘sport’, he would undoubtedly pursue with extreme relish if similar opportunities were offered him.” The non-political associational activities of the working class took often precedence over the more

political ones and, besides, the majority of the working class were unable to vote in parliamentary elections before 1918 (McKibbin 1990:9,15).

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century socialism gained ground among the middle classes as well as among the working classes, because the middle classes were feeling guilty of their prosperity while the majority of the working classes still lived in poverty (Hopkins 1979:157). The middle-class Fabian society that was founded in 1884 supported a bureaucratic and socialist state and the nationalisation of the industries because their objective was maximum efficiency and productivity (Rose 1986:122-123). However, they had no sympathy for working class revolution (Rose 1986:128). On the contrary, the social reforms should be realised by gradual, peaceful, constitutional and moral means (Hopkins 1979:158). Many of the Trade Union leaders were socialists after the 1880s but for them the Fabians were merely middle-class propagandists (Hopkins 1979:157,159).

The 20<sup>th</sup> century started with a more violent working-class protest. Syndicalism, the idea that workers should take over industries and run them for the benefit of the workers, favoured the use of strikes (Hopkins 1979:178). Also the suffragettes and other militant feminist movements were rather active, for women wanted more political influence through the vote (Sanders 1973:42). Although the Labour movement got stronger and more militant during the First World War, the nationalist feeling of patriotism was so strong among all classes that the government procedures that were made in the name of the "imperialist ideology of war" gained nation wide support (Holderness 1982:192-193). State took control of industry by, for example, nationalising the mines and the railways (Holderness 1982:191). The Unions, according to Sanders (1973:112), opposed this increased state control, whereas the governing classes took a more passive role. During the war, however, the working class identity grew as the support of the Labour Party and the Unions increased steadily (Hopkins 1979:211,221).

After the war unemployment rates were high in the staple industries (like coal, textile and iron industries), because of foreign competition and antiquated methods, especially among the unskilled workers, and this led to numerous and long-lasting strikes. The skilled workers in the new industries ( like motor manufacturing, chemical industry or food processing) were well-off. (Hopkins 1979). When Lawrence visited England for the last time in 1926, there was a

miners' strike which was a part of the General Strike. Despite the united effort (that lasted 8 months) of the miners to resist the wage cuts and longer working hours insisted by the employers, the miners lost. However, the Unions had been able to gain the support of millions of workers, which increased the working-class identity. Also it became clear that the improvements could be gained only through gradual reform and not by militant protest. (Hopkins 1979:198).

In the sphere of social reform there has been a tendency during the 19<sup>th</sup> century away from laissez faire politics and individualism towards a more collectivist approach and the acceptance of social reform as a normal feature of government politics (Hopkins 1979). Laissez faire meant that the state should not interfere with conditions of employment (Hopkins 1979:62). Individualism had stressed that people should be left to cope on their own, and many working-class members did find it degrading that they should be dependent upon relief money or they regarded the reform as "middle-class interference into their lives" (Hopkins 1979:195). The working class adapted the ideology of self-help and the better-off working class families adapted many other middle-class values, too. However, the Liberals, that consisted mostly of middle-class members, made many important social reforms between 1900 and the 1914 (Hopkins 1979:183). This wouldn't have happened without Trade Union pressure, the rise of collectivist thinking and the growth of central bureaucracy (Hopkins 1979:183). The Liberals saw the reform as a means of making it possible for the individual to practise self-help (Hopkins 1979:68).

The spirit of social reform and goodwill was lost during the war. Holderness suggests that this was because the forces of industrialism, imperialism and militarism were so powerful during this period (Holderness 1982:179). Women, however, could better their social position during the war. Former social reforms had improved the life of working-class women, for example by giving them broader educational possibilities, but participating in the war effort at home front brought further opportunities for them (Hopkins 1979). Husband and wife were now more equal and "boys no longer automatically took up their fathers' trades" (Hopkins 1979:205).

Between the wars Liberal party politics gave way to social reforms realised by the Labour party that had begun to take a more active role than before (Mc Kibbin 1990:82). The Act of 1918 that enfranchised almost the whole of the

adult population (Mc Kibbin 1990:76) was one of these reforms. What was also new was that the relations between working class and the rest of the society had become now a central political problem (Mc Kibbin 1990:259). There was mass employment due to the decline of the staple industries (coal, iron and textiles) (Mc Kibbin 1990:205) and wage disputes between the employers and the employees. Consequently, the middle classes felt threatened, which led to the Conservative Party's electoral victories in interwar Britain (Mc Kibbin 1990:259). The Conservative governments were by no means favourable to the working class, but favoured the middle classes (Mc Kibbin 1990:267).

Class-consciousness and class-pride were at their highest between the wars, and this led to the development of class stereotypes (Mc Kibbin 1990:271,275). For example, the middle class idea of a typical working-class member was that of a manual, not very competent, unionised, labourer in constant warfare with his employer, because he was being greedy (Mc Kibbin 1990:271,283). The middle class also blamed the working class for the unemployment by claiming that the British workforce had "priced itself out of jobs" (Mc Kibbin 1990:283). In fact, one of the main aims of the Conservative government was to weaken the unionised working class. The vast middle-class public resented also the new-rich, the plutocrats whom they considered wanton profiteers (Mc Kibbin 1990:272).

Till the 20<sup>th</sup> century industrialism had changed the life of the working classes both in negative and positive ways. The typical working man lived now in an urban environment and the nature of his work had changed (Hopkins 1979:2,12). "What was new was the unrelenting pressure of work throughout a 15- or 16-hour day, and the discipline imposed by overseer, factory bell and whistle" (Hopkins 1979:12). The old personal relationship between the owner and the workers had gone and this, of course, was one of the factors that increased working-class identity (Hopkins 1979:14). The employers simply used the workforce to gain large profits disregarding the sufferings of individual workers (Hopkins 1979:97). Most of the workers didn't benefit anything from the profits and suffered from poverty (Stevenson 1984:42). Lawrence and many other writers and social thinkers of his time took a negative attitude on industrialism. Urbanisation also increased the barriers between classes. Asa Briggs writes (in

Neale 1983:7) that “This estrangement of men from men, or class from class is one of the saddest features of a great city”.

Coal-mining had originally been regarded more as a form of agriculture than a separate industry, but in the 18th century the big land owners developed coal production to a market industry. Already in this period there were also collieries owned by new capitalists, like Barber-Walker & Co., the firm Lawrence’s father worked for. The miners became thus wage-labourers for a capitalist system and their position weakened. The industrial units within which the work was carried out became larger and, consequently, there was not such close contact between the men anymore. However, the mines had become more mechanised after 1850, which made the working conditions much better for the men. (Holderness 1982:48-55).

Industrialism can be seen in a more positive light and it can be argued that the improvement in the working and living conditions of the workers, as well as the extension of the franchise and the education reforms wouldn’t have been achieved without the Industrial Revolution and the role played in it by the British worker. Besides, the Victorian attitude ( middle-class morality) about the virtue of hard work had changed into a more pleasure-seeking life style of the masses in the Edwardian period (Hopkins 1979:256). ”As material circumstances change so the values of the poor narrow to fit those of the rest of society” (McKibbin 1990:195). The more pleasure-seeking way of life was also due to the boredom at work felt by the labourer, because of mechanisation of industry (McKibbin 1990:138). John Raynor (1969:3) also deals with the “embourgeoisement” of the working classes. Because of wider educational opportunities the working-class members could become, for example, teachers and thus members of the lower middle class. However, the term “embourgeoisement” refers here to the adaptation of middle-class values and life style of the members of the working class (Raynor 1969:40). Stevenson (1984:39) lists such virtues as decent behaviour and appearance, thrift, religious interests, temperance and self-improvement which became well established among the more well-off working-class families.

Although the working-class protest in Britain was more peaceful than in many other countries, it was successful as it was and reforms in the working-class living and working conditions were made step by step. Working class had gained

its own separate identity. However, the more affluent part of the working class had started to adapt middle-class values.

### **3.2 THE MIDDLE CLASS**

Like that of the working classes, the middle-class identity developed during the 19<sup>th</sup> century as a result of the Industrial Revolution that created new forms of business and also a set of new professions and occupations for the middle classes (Raynor 1969:3). The variety of middle-class occupations is diverse, but what distinguishes the middle classes from the other groups is not always the income rate but, as Stevenson points out (1984:35), “style of life, habits, tastes and attitudes”.

The middle-class belief in individualism and rationality (Raynor 1969: 86), instead of community and instincts, is the basis of middle-class values that Lawrence so despised. Individualism meant self-righteousness and indifference towards other people in the pursuit of property and success (Raynor 1969:88). It is contrasted with collectivism but associated with liberalism that stresses the individual freedom. Rationality, in turn, meant careful planning, maximising of security and controlled behaviour (Raynor 1969:86). Respectability was also something for which the middle classes wanted recognition. This meant keeping a distance between themselves and the lower classes, never to be obliged to anyone and possessing a set of values that are highly puritanical and moralistic (Raynor 1969:89). Work in charity organisations was considered respectable and, besides, it eased the conscience of the comfortably-off middle classes (Hopkins 1979:140). For them, Raynor writes (1969:3), “labour was ... a commodity, ... competitiveness ... part of the human order, property ... sacred, and thrift the supreme virtue”. In reality the life of the middle classes demonstrated itself also in vulgar extravagance (Raynor 1969:87), from which the middle classes often accused the working class in the times of prosperity.

The middle class is the least staple of the classes in Britain (Raynor 1969:3). The industrial plutocrats that emerged from the affluence brought by the development of industries were often granted aristocratic titles and seats in the House of Lords, and as a sign of their new status they often spent a part of their fortune on large country estates (Moynahan 1997:67). The lifestyle of the upper

middle classes and the aristocracy became similar and, furthermore, they shared common interests, like the need to secure their property in case the proletariat would become revolutionary (Raynor 1969:4,17,19). Martin Wiener (1981:14) argues that from the 1850s onwards the industrial spirit started to decline and give way to the need of stability. Accordingly, since 1860 the British society developed from dynamic to conservative. Wiener (1981:11) sees that the new upper middle-class bourgeoisie and the old landed gentry both took a passive role in economy, and that the elite as a whole shared common education and common values.

The new class of white collar workers (scientists, engineers, teachers, journalists, business managers etc.) demanded efficiency in work and everyday life and held themselves as the most productive members of society (Rose 1986:118,145). They didn't hold much respect for the supposedly idle and degenerate upper classes and therefore proposed, for example, that there shouldn't be such a thing as inherited wealth (Rose 1986:145). For, "salary, not wealth, was the measure of social efficiency" (Rose 1986:141). Neither did they think very highly of the working class ability to become anything more than labourers, because they lacked the intelligence (Rose 1986:127,141). The Fabian society was the most remarkable of the middle-class institutions that spoke for efficiency and productivity (Rose 1986:122). They wanted a highly bureaucratic and socialist state, nationalisation of industries and suppression of any possible working class revolution, for efficiency was more valuable than equality (Rose 1986:122-123,128). The Fabians believed that "The brain worker who had struggled up the ladder of professional success... was the highest product of human development" (Rose 1986:141). They favoured rationalism (=the supremacy of the human intellect) whereas Lawrence could never accept the idea that intelligence is superior to human instincts.

The late Victorian and Edwardian societies saw a rapid increase in non-manual occupations (Raynor 1969:21). This together with the affluence of the upper middle classes, a government policy that seemed to favour the middle classes (low level of taxation) and availability of relatively cheap labour (servants etc.)(Stevenson 1984:33-34,132) made the middle class the "backbone of the nation"(Raynor 1969:4) till the Second World War.

It was the middle-class values, rationality and individualism, that played an important role in the time period covered by in this thesis. It was the adaptation of these values (embourgeoisement) by the working class that Lawrence lamented about. He was also sorry that the old landed aristocracy went into business and industry together with the upper middle class.

### **3.3 THE ARISTOCRACY**

There are certain things traditionally implied by the term “aristocracy”. They are honour, spending, land and patronage. They characterise the aristocracy of the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century as well. Honour is related to rank and certain families or individuals were held more honourable than the others i.e. they had a “good name” (Powis 1984:3,9). Honour meant proper conduct, the violation of which led to dishonour (Powis 1984:9). There is a saying that a gentleman would rather die than lose his honour (Powis 1984:9). So, honour meant esteem or reputation and in practice this could mean a certain place at table or in church (Powis 1984:9-10).

The higher a person’s rank the more he was expected to spend (Powis 1984). The aristocracy was orientated to spending money whereas the middle classes were more interested in making it. Jonathan Powis (1984:34) sees this as the most fundamental difference between these two classes. The aristocrats were hospitable and put a lot of money on charity, for example, on founding schools (Powis 1984:25-26). And furthermore, “there were parks and houses to keep up and friends to entertain, and settlements to be made for daughters and younger sons” (Powis 1984:28), for the eldest son inherited the most of the fortune. In order to keep up this luxurious way of life many aristocrats were forced to ‘do business’ (like the middle class), to make a career in some public office or in the armed forces or make successful marriage arrangements (Powis 1984:30-31).

Traditionally the aristocracy got their income from land, namely by agriculture (Powis 1984:24). However, the impoverishment of the landed aristocracy had already begun during the agricultural depression of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and went on after the First World War because of higher taxation and death duties paid for losses suffered by the gentry during the war (Stevenson 1984:332-335). Consequently, many landowners were forced to sell their estates

in order to pay their debts (Stevenson 1984:132-133). Powis (1984:26) also thinks that there was an “unwillingness of the landowners to sacrifice the goodwill of their tenantry in pursuit of greater profits”, for many landlords saw it as their duty to help their dependants in time of need and they also wanted to respect the rights of their workers (Powis 1984:54). Lawrence felt sorry that this kind of paternalism was giving way to a more economic/materialistic way of thinking. Yet, Powis (1984:44) points out that all agricultural labourers were not treated so kindly by their masters.

The wealthiest families, especially those whose income came from other sources than land, did well during the Edwardian and Georgian periods (Stevenson 1984:133-134). Coalmining, engineering and textiles were still important fountains of wealth, but millionaires were also made by commerce, finance and the consumption industries (Stevenson 1984:336-337).

As the upper middle class business elite and professional elite (lawyers, diplomats, men from colonial service or from the armed forces) expanded, the aristocracy gradually lost its foothold on plutocracy – the rule of the rich (Royle 1987:110). Thus the governing class consisted now of aristocratic elements combined with the ‘self-made men’ of the upper middle classes (Royle 1987:115). Together they constituted the aristocracy of wealth that shared the same values (Royle 1987:15). These values were strengthened in the public schools whose purpose was to raise a political elite (Wiener 1981:21). In the curriculum of these schools there was no science or economy, for the elite classes didn’t want to have anything to do with the industrial reality (Wiener 1981:18). There was a tendency among the wealthy to move away from the industrial areas to more pleasant places “where they could spend their money without having to see how it was made” (Chatterley 163).

So, many (landed) aristocratic families were forced to find other means of obtaining wealth than land. Consequently, the countryside in places turned industrial and many of the old country houses were abandoned. This all meant the gradual decline of the aristocratic way of life. It was thus the industrial plutocrats from the aristocracy or from the upper middle class that Lawrence criticised in his novels, for he often romanticised the rural past.

### 3.4 THE EDWARDIANS

At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century Britain ruled a quarter of the world's population, mastered the seas and the coal and iron industries, and was admired for its stability (Moynahan 1997). The Edwardians of all classes could now enjoy the fruits of Industrial Revolution that had been carried out without greater political or social disturbances (Moynahan 1997:12). For cause the British felt proud of themselves and their country (Moynahan 1997:12). However, there was a darker side to the “pomp and glitter of the prosperous Edwardian period” (Moynahan 1997:69). According to Eric Hopkins (1979:170), it “rested upon insecure foundations”, for in world trade Britain was losing ground for Germany and the United States. Textile, iron and coal industries were unable to innovate and were beginning to decline because of foreign competition (Hopkins 1979:170). Besides, the British imperial regime was racist, ruthless and exploitative, which decreased its esteem in the eyes of other nations (Moynahan 1997:16). Furthermore, there were lots of poor who gained nothing from this prosperity, for example, among the unemployed and the unskilled labourers.

The British upper classes had the time and the money to amuse themselves, and King Edward VII lead the way, for he loved women, hunting and horse racing. The upper classes fought against idleness by giving house parties, by gambling and attending races and by playing games (Moynahan 1997). The enthusiasm for different kind of sports was shared by all classes (Moynahan 1997:62). The middle-classes moved away from the city centres and bought houses from the suburbs, where they could escape seeing the misery and squalor of the poor. In their suburbs they lived complacently and prosperously (Moynahan 1997:68).

Where the Victorian esteemed work and kept it separate from leisure, the Edwardians “made recreation a major mass industry” (Rose 1986:164-165). The Victorians thought that in order to keep the industry running efficiently the work force had to be kept “sober and disciplined” (Rose 1986:163). The Edwardians, however, believed that the workers' morality and loyalty increased if they were provided with amusements (Rose 1986:166). Thus the masses were offered such cheap services as parks, swimming baths, gymnasiums, theatres, libraries, museums etc. (Rose 1986:165-166). The Edwardian period started the time of

mass audiences for sports and theatres, as well as mass readerships for newspapers and other journals (Rose 1986:167). Those working class members in regular work had the money and the time, due to better standard of living and shorter working hours, to amuse themselves (Moynahan 1997:72). They could go to football matches, to the swimming baths or they could take their families to the seaside for the weekend (Moynahan 1997:72). When the war broke in 1914 the Edwardians thought that it was “the greatest game of all” (Rose 1986:193) and volunteered enthusiastically, but as the war went on the high spirits changed into pessimism.

Lawrence, whose family had also turned rather middle class, never paid much attention to the poverty of the working class. Instead, he was more concerned about the values of the working-class people and the rest of the society. In the next section I shall examine more deeply Lawrence’s view of life.

#### **4 LAWRENCE AS A SOCIAL THINKER**

I agree with Pinion (1978) and Salgado (1982) that Lawrence’s social ideas are a reflection of his own personal experiences. I have found that his view of the world in his novels and essays changes according to the different periods of his life and time. His life in the ugly industrial Midlands, his domineering and materialistic mother, the hostility of the bourgeois literary world towards his work, his wartime experiences, and the class unrest have affected his social thinking.

Lawrence pondered in his work the same problems that preoccupied English society in his time. They were the oppositions of individual versus society and of rationality (ideas) versus instinct (feelings). Lawrence’s main concerns as a social thinker were the social and personal experiences of human beings in the modern industrial society (Harrison 1966:164). He thought that it was necessary for an individual to be in contact with other people, the society and the whole universe, but he found that this contact couldn’t be satisfactory unless there would be a change in the values, both of individuals and of the society as a whole (Harrison 1966:163). In fact, he insisted that if there could be established a new kind of relationship between man and woman or between man and man, there

would also be a change in society, towards more human values (life values) (Harrison 1966:166). I shall explain the nature of this relationship later in this chapter.

Lawrence thought that human beings should be free to express their individuality free from any political or social organisations, for example from class (Pinion 1978:69). This “independence of spirit” came undoubtedly from his father. However, Lawrence should have realised, that this complete freedom of the individual to act instinctively without restraints is an impossible idea. Lawrence stressed the supremacy of the individual, but he also believed that individuals were incomplete if not in touch with the society (Scheckner 1985:54). And if members of community they couldn’t act fully instinctively.

Lawrence himself found difficulty in making contacts with other people and society, and, as I have already mentioned, he wanted to establish an ideal community somewhere far away from the industrial world. Harrison (1966:166,163) criticises Lawrence for his escapism and says that he should have remained inside the society that he wanted to change, and that his solutions to the social problems should have been more practical. In my opinion, too much practicality would have destroyed the imaginative quality of Lawrence’s work and would have left the reader nothing to wonder about.

Lawrence’s working class background and the class structure of English society, based on birth and property, have influenced the way Lawrence thought about class (Scheckner 1985:10). Accordingly, a word must be said about Lawrence’s attitude towards the class he originated from. He felt he had a blood-affinity with this class, but regretted the fact that he had lost contact with it, like he had lost contact with his father (Scheckner 1985:9,53). Neither did he want to belong to the middle- or upper classes, as can be seen from the following poem called “The Saddest Day” from his *Pansies* collection (in Scheckner 1985:9-10):

O I was born low and inferior / but shining up beyond / I saw the whole  
superior / world shine like the promised land.  
So up I started climbing / to join the folks on high, / but when at last I got  
there / I had to sit down and cry.  
For it wasn’t a bit superior, / it was only affected and mean; / though the  
house had a fine interior / and the people were never in...  
And so there came the saddest day / When I had to tell myself plain: / the  
upper classes are just a fraud, / you’d better get down again.

Lawrence wrote in *Sons and Lovers* that from the lower classes we get the “feelings” and from the middle classes we get the “ideas”. This division between

the blood and the mind troubled him almost in all his novels (Moore 1951:317). By blood-consciousness (=feelings) Lawrence meant the instinctive, intuitive, sensual, passionate bodily activities or feelings that cannot and must not be controlled by the mind (Moore 1951). These feelings and actions are unconscious, but Lawrence's concept of the unconscious differed from that of Freud in that for Freud the unconscious was still only a reflection of the mind (Salgado 1982:89). Mind-consciousness (=ideas), according to Lawrence, is the intellectual, mental side of human beings that should be kept apart from the blood-consciousness (Moore 1951). Lawrence has written (in Moore 1951: 316) that "My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds, but what our blood feels and believes and says, is always true." Lawrence's over-emphasising of the value of the feelings over the intellect made the intellectuals of his time to turn against him (Aldington in Lawrence 1972:xiii) and Bertrand Russell was the one who made the most hostile attacks on this matter. In contradiction to Lawrence, Russell was more inclined to think that there was nothing that the human intellect couldn't achieve (Aldington in Lawrence 1972:xiii). This was one of the reasons for the conflicts between Lawrence and the Bloomsbury group, which, like Lawrence, fought against the conventions of the Victorian period (Drabble 1998:110).

Most critics, for example, Harry T. Moore (1951:316-317) and Arnold Kettle (1953:115), argue that when Lawrence's work is examined as a whole, his aim seems to be to bring the mind-consciousness into balance with the blood-consciousness, rather than to give priority to the blood-consciousness. Indeed, he wrote in "A Propos of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*" (1968:492) that "Life is only bearable when the mind and the body are in harmony,..., and each has a natural respect for the other". At least in his last novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, however, he clearly wants to crush the intellect and make the blood the winner. "Better lack bread than lack life", he wrote in *Apocalypse* (1972:26), his last work. According to Moore (1974:372), however, this was inevitable because mind had been too long undermining the body and that this was the only way for Lawrence to bring the body back the value it had been deprived of.

Lawrence thought that in the more primitive societies, like those of the Indians, Mexicans or Italian peasants, the people had preserved their blood-consciousness, their close contact to the earth, the sun, the moon and the stars

(Lawrence 1968:504), which are the great symbols of the “blood-knowledge” in Lawrence’s work. He thought that the modern civilisation has made the body “the tool of the mind”, so that people don’t have any real feelings anymore, but instead, they are being merely sentimental (Lawrence 1968:492-493). These “affected” emotions, according to Lawrence (1968:493), are enforced by the modern amusements of the radio and the cinema. Lawrence attacked mostly the mechanising and dehumanising effects of industrialisation, science, social reform and education (Pinion 1978:67). Lawrence mistrusted social reform, because he saw in it nothing but greedy materialism (this will be dealt with later). What Lawrence wanted to do then, was to bring mankind back to contact with the more original levels of consciousness (Lawrence 1972:90).

Gamini Salgado claims (1982:80) that Lawrence had ceased believing in the idea of the primitive man before he started writing *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. Still there is a lot that can be called primitive in Mellors who is the main character, the gamekeeper with whom Lady Chatterley falls in love. However, it is true that Lawrence sounds bitter when he wrote in his essay “On Human Destiny” (1968:624) that “let man be as primitive as primitive can be, he still has a mind ... man can’t live by instinct, because he’s got a mind ... man is never spontaneous ... the way ahead lies through the chaos of modern life and society rather than in turning one’s back on it”, which Lawrence seems to have done himself.

Lawrence didn’t believe in the strikes, because he felt that, as I have noted earlier, the workers were in them because of the materialistic interests (Scheckner 1985:15). The joy of work had been taken away from the miners, for the value of work was only rated by the amount of money that it brought for the family (Lawrence 1968:586-587). Modern people, of all classes, have been taught to loathe physical labour, which fact was for Lawrence the source of more grief than the level of the wages (Lawrence 1968:586-591).

Before the war, however, Lawrence had been a keen advocate of nationalisation and social and political revolution in England (Scheckner 1985:12). In those days Lawrence saw the solution to the problem of the ownership of property in nationalisation, of the industries as well as of the land (Moore 1974:278). The final aim of this nationalisation, for Lawrence, would be to relieve the body from the money troubles and thus make possible the

development of the creativity and life spirit of every individual (Scheckner 1985:11).

However, the war years had made him distrustful of political militancy/class struggle (Scheckner 1985:12). In "Preface to Touch and Go" (1968:293) he wrote that "If it were a profound struggle that we were convinced would bring us to a new freedom, a new life, then it would be a creative activity". The revolution Lawrence wanted would be quite different in nature. It would be more like a sexual revolution. In his opinions about class-struggle, as in many other issues, Lawrence contradicts himself: He criticised capitalism and wanted to destroy it, but at the same time he hated the strikes, the democratic aspirations of the workers (Scheckner 1985:11).

Democracy, for Lawrence, meant mere "bullying" by those who wanted to prevent other people from doing better in life than themselves (Lawrence 1972:101). The democrat is "determined that no man shall shine like the sun in full strength, for he would certainly outshine us" (Lawrence 1972:23). Thus democrats make a "collection of weak men" (Lawrence 1972:19) who only find fulfilment in the possession of property (Lawrence in Williams 1963:208). The long war years made Lawrence mistrust democracy and the rule of the masses and reinforced in him the belief in oligarchy (Scheckner 1985:44). Consequently, Lawrence never in his novels gave any political power to the workers (Scheckner 1985:353), for he believed that no class is better than the other and that democracy would only lead to a dictatorship of the masses (Scheckner 1985:15-16). Thus the power would only shift from one class to another and the bullying would continue. Like democracy, social reform meant elevating the common (material) good above the individual achievement (Pinion 1978:67).

In "The Risen Lord" (1968:577) Lawrence expresses powerfully his hatred of the mammon and connects it with class-struggle:

Because only life is lovely, and you, Mammon, prevent life ... But that which is anti-life, Mammon, like you, and money, and machines, and prostitution, and all that tangled mass of self-importance and greediness and self-conscious conceit which adds up to Mammon, I hate it ... am going to push you off the face of the earth, Mammon, you great mob-thing, fatal to men.

Lawrence thought that the working class women were the most materialistic of all human beings, because they had lost contact with bodily work and had started to strive after a higher social status in life (Scheckner 1985:28-

29). The pattern in a worker's home was the same as the pattern in the factory between the worker and the factory owner and in both cases the former harmony had now been broken (Scheckner 1985:28-29). Lawrence said that the men were not so interested in money as the women were (Scheckner 1985:29). The women judged their husbands from the amount of money they brought home and disregarded them as human beings. Both husband and wife were discontented, for the passion had gone out of marriage (Scheckner 1985:28-29). Lawrence's critical attitude towards working-class women was due to the influence of his mother that had been harmful to the whole family. Peter Widdowson (1992:19) insists that Lawrence could also be very sympathetic and sensitive towards women. Lawrence had more female acquaintances than male ones and the women were usually middle-aged and belonged to the middle or upper class (Moore 1974).

Lawrence's belief in oligarchy means that he wanted a so called "natural aristocracy" (Lawrence 1968:475). He didn't want the aristocracy of money or the aristocracy of birth (1968:476). A "natural aristocrat" is a person who is "more alive" than the other men or women (Lawrence 1968:475), which means that he is more blood-conscious, more vital than the others. The "natural aristocrat" is the provider of life whose mission is to establish a new relationship between man and man, between man and woman, and between mankind and universe (Lawrence 1968:478). He is in direct contact with the sun (Lawrence 1968:482) which is the main symbol of blood-consciousness for Lawrence.

Lawrence introduces a society whose members are equal in that they are all unique individuals, but when in relation to other members of the society they are classified according to their degree of blood-consciousness (Lawrence 1968:475). Those who are most alive should be naturally regarded as leaders by the others who are less living. Lawrence put it this way (1968:484): "The children of the sun shall be lords of the earth." In *Apocalypse* (1972:10-11) Lawrence explains the difference between a democrat and a natural aristocrat: The democrat is tough and wants to destroy the strong so that the weak could rule, but the natural aristocrat is gentle and unselfish and manifests the innate strength of a human being. If people gave their respect to the authority of a "natural aristocrat", they would become heroic themselves (Lawrence 1972:15). People need no Christian god as long as they submitted "to the gods" in themselves and "to the gods in other men and women" (in Pinion 1978:90).

Lawrence has also made comments that have made some critics later accuse him of nazism. One of them was Bertrand Russell to whom Lawrence wrote: "We will be aristocrats, and as wise as the serpent in dealing with the mob. For the mob shall not crush us nor starve us nor cry us to death. We will deal cunningly with the mob, the greedy soul, we will gradually bring it to subjection (in Scheckner 1985:14). And this is by no means the worst of such opinions. Moore (1974:372) defends Lawrence by claiming that Lawrence didn't want to destroy the intellect, like Hitler did, but merely wanted to bring it back to balance with the body. What is more, he never realised this rule of the masses by a natural leader in his novels (Scheckner 1985:43).

Lawrence writes in "Autobiographical Sketch" (in Scheckner 1985:26) that the working class people

...are narrow, but still fairly deep and passionate, whereas the middle class is broad and shallow and passionless ... they substitute affection, which is the great middle-class positive emotion. But the working class is narrow in outlook, in prejudice, and ... in intelligence. This again makes a prison. One can belong absolutely to no class.

Like his heroes in the novels, Lawrence wanted to lead a classless life. This example also proves that Lawrence's ultimate intention was the balance within a human being of the "ideas" and the "feelings", whether or not it can be detected from his novels. And before his last writing period, i.e. the period after writing the leadership novels, he seems to have believed that the working classes still had some blood-consciousness in them and that they had potentiality in changing the society towards more human values, away from materialism. He thought that (Scheckner 1985:10) because of their direct contact with the nature and other men, the workers were more spontaneous and passionate. But later in life, when he wrote *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, he seemed to have lost his hope in the working classes (Lawrence 1968:496). However, when Lawrence was not in his bitterest moods, he still felt the life flow among the working classes, but said that he didn't want to idealise them or expect them to change the world (in Scheckner 1985:162-163).

Lawrence felt that the miners of his father's generation were more vital and down-to-earth than the younger generations, who had been mechanised and dehumanised by their school masters, their wives and their masters in factories. The schools had made them "good little boys", the wives had made them "good

husbands” and the masters had made them mere “instruments” (Lawrence 1968:580-581). In other words, they had been tamed, made decent, sober, conscientious (Lawrence in Scheckner 1985:139). When he visited Eastwood in 1926, Lawrence said that he felt both “nostalgia” and “repulsion” towards the working people of his native village (1968:258). Consequently, he wrote in a letter (in Holderness 1982:198) “These men, whom I love so much ... are still so living ... so passionate. I love them like brothers ... I hate them too ... I don’t intend to own them as masters”. Lawrence’s contradictory feelings towards his class of origin can be sensed from all the novels that will be dealt with in this study.

So, Lawrence was not sure from what class these natural aristocrats or world healers would come. He couldn’t make up his mind whether the workers might play any role in this change or not, but he definitely didn’t believe that there would be any such potential in the upper classes (Scheckner 1985:143). The working classes were perhaps already too materialistic or too tamed to be able to effectuate any change in society (Scheckner 1985:9). However, when Lawrence was in his more optimistic moods, he suggested that the change in the values of society needed the effort of all of us (in Scheckner 1985:15).

Lawrence believed that in the old times the classes were held together by “blood-connection” (1968:513). “The squires might be arrogant, violent, bullying and unjust, yet in some ways they were at one with the people “(Lawrence 1968:513) (Lawrence doesn’t explain in which ways). Lawrence explains that individualism, i.e. thinking that all the other members of society are against you and thus you have to keep a distance between them, leads to isolation and loss of community with the other members of society (1968:513). This has already happened to the more “cultured classes” (middle and upper classes), whereas, the working class is able to retain the feeling of community longer than the rest of society, but they will eventually lose it as well (Lawrence 1968:513). Class-hatred and class-consciousness are the result of this isolation and lack of blood-connection (Lawrence 1968:513). Lawrence held the Victorian period, especially industrialisation and the middle classes responsible for this breakage (Harrison 1966:169). The middle class, for Lawrence, is the class that was the first to be corrupted by mind values. Harrison contradicts Lawrence (1966:169) and claims that it was common interest that held the classes together, rather than blood-

connection and that the contemporary class-hatred was the result of the clash of interests between the classes. I'm prone to agree with Harrison on this matter, for Lawrence doesn't present any concrete examples of this supposed blood-connection.

In a utopian way Lawrence connected individual fulfilment with social reform (Pinion 1978:67). The source of the highest individual fulfilment is the relationship between the sexes (Pinion 1978:211). This relationship is based on touch and tenderness, which have a revitalising effect on human beings (Lawrence 1968:508). When the individuals find fulfilment in their marriage, also the bond between the classes will be restored and this will begin the renewal of the society as a whole (Pinion 1978:288). The society will adapt the new life values (Pinion 1978:211). This process will, in addition, regenerate the relationship between mankind and the cosmos (Lawrence 1968:510) from which mankind has been separated by the supremacy of the mind-consciousness (Pinion 1978:66). Lawrence wanted back the sort of contact with nature that he had experienced while visiting the Haggs farm as a youth. He wrote (1968:510) that "the human race is dying. It is like a great uprooted tree, with its roots in the air. We must plant ourselves again in the universe."

In this new relatedness between the classes there must be no inequality. Lawrence declared (in Williams 1963:208-209) that

...each man shall be spontaneously himself ... 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 ... woman ... Comparison enters only when one of us departs from his own integral being and enters the material mechanical world. Then equality and inequality starts at once.

This definition of equality contradicts Lawrence's former idea of the natural aristocrat and the more conscious classes.

Many critics have noted that some of Lawrence's views make no sense and couldn't become reality (Vivas 1960:ix, Pinion 1978:289). It is obvious that the purpose of Lawrence's art was didactic and moral (Salgado 1982:65), but it seems that he didn't so much want to change the social organisations, for example the class structure, as to change the morals and values of individual human beings. Lawrence has himself said that his mission was to explore and express the human feelings and not to bring about social change (in Salgado 1982:83). Lawrence's ideas also often contradict themselves (Salgado 1982:66), but he himself admits

that “there is nothing absolutely right. All things flow and change” (in Scheckner 1985:169). Consequently, Lawrence himself acknowledges here the contradictions the reader is about to find when examining his novels more closely.

## **5 INTRODUCTION TO THE NOVELS**

### **5.1 REALISM AND MODERNISM IN LAWRENCE**

Realism (as seen in contrast to modernism) in literature implies that the work of art appears to objectively “mirror” society (Outhwaite and Bottomore 1993:389). Objectivity means trying to avoid idealisation, sentimentality, class bias, exaggeration or any other personal view (Outhwaite and Bottomore 1993:389). Realistic style requires from the author sociological and material knowledge (Drabble 1998:808). The subjects are often taken from everyday life and especially from the working-class life (Drabble 1998:808). Often the more “gloomy” side of this life is described (Drabble 1998:808). A realistic work is comparable to a “historical document” (Outhwaite and Bottomore 1993:389), but Holderness (1982:12) points out that a novel cannot possibly reflect the “social totality” in all its aspects, and that those aspects that are unaccounted for are as significant as those that are included in the story. For example, in *Women in Love* the war is not mentioned, but its presence is felt; or in *Sons and Lovers* there are no middle-class characters, although the middle-class values play an important role.

Modernism as a literary movement in the West spanned from the 1890s to the Second World War (Drabble 1998:654). Modernist writers abandoned objective representation of life and society and turned to explore the inner states of mind/experiences of human beings, i.e. the “irrational and unconscious elements of personality”(Hewitt 1988:6-7).

The realist writers of the Edwardian period used traditional style and techniques (of the Victorian period), whereas, the modernists made experiments especially in the form of the novel (Drabble 1998:654). The modernist novel has often no plot, with beginning and end with a solution, but it is often non-

chronological, ambiguous and complex in form (Drabble 1998:654). The narrators are often “limited 3<sup>rd</sup> person or unreliable first person narrators (Drabble 1998:654). Also Lawrence’s novels have “little of what is conventionally called plot” (Sanders 1973:26-27).

The breakdown of traditional values and religion, scientific revelations and technical progress increased the feeling of disorder and discontinuity in the late Victorian and Edwardian societies. As a consequence, modernist works tend to have open endings, fragmentation and introversion (Hewitt 1988:6,130). The writers were exploring new forms to express the social and moral conflicts that they experienced (Stevenson 1984:413). As we shall see in Lawrence, the writers of this modernist period found it hard to come to terms with the society and its contradictions. It was because of this that the modernist novels often concentrated on the private/individual rather than on the public/social sphere. They responded to social phenomena by idealising the ancient past or by formulating new utopian societies. They tried to find the feeling of wholeness, unity and community [Edwardian virtues] from somewhere else than from the social reality. (Hewitt 1988:130-131).

The majority of modernist writers came from the upper classes (Hewitt 1988:86), which makes Lawrence an exception. He and other modernist writers considered themselves superior to the vast public and part of an intellectual elite (Hewitt 1988:134,172). The serious writer and his readers were apart from the masses who supposedly read only the “cheaper fiction” (Hewitt 1988:166).

D. H. Lawrence, as characterised by The Oxford Companion to English Literature (1998:654), was “a psychological novelist much influenced by Freud” and his narrative form was “traditional” [meaning realist], but his subject-matter was “daring” and his style was “poetic and emotional.” Critics (like Leavis 1955, Moore 1951 and Holderness 1982) claim that Lawrence’s work belonged to the realist tradition up to *Sons and Lovers* and that in *The Rainbow* realism has given place to modernist techniques, like symbolism and use of myths (Holderness 1982:4). In *Sons and Lovers* the historical aspect is clear (Holderness 1982:12). For example, in this novel Lawrence uses a more common everyday language normal to the community he describes (Holderness 1982:137). However, Lawrence continued to return to realist norms also in his later novels (Holderness 1982:6), like in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* where the plot is more unified and the

setting is described in the manner of the previous century (Sanders 1973:181). I share the opinion of Holderness (1982) that Lawrence applies the techniques of modernism using a realistic frame. Typical for Lawrence is “constant returning to society as a subject, and to realism as a style” (Holderness 1982:158). However, Lawrence used less verbal communication than was usual in realist works, even in *Sons and Lovers* (Sanders 1973:27).

In *Sons and Lovers* Lawrence ignored the social source of the conflicts between the characters. I.e. he didn't realise that they were indeed class conflicts, and thus translated them into conflicts between good and bad, conscious and unconscious, or body and mind (Sanders 1973:23-24). Sanders (1973:59) claims that in this novel Lawrence didn't acknowledge the impact of society on his characters, but gave psychological explanations for their actions, whereas, in *The Rainbow* and later in his work, he became conscious of the social world and regarded it as the enemy of individual life. This means that in *Sons and Lovers* he didn't straightforwardly criticise the industrial bourgeois society, as he did in his later novels.

In his later novels Lawrence's ideologies prevent the more realist description of the society, whereas in *Sons and Lovers* the working-class life (work in the pit, miner's home, children's life) is portrayed realistically with no disturbance of ideologies of any kind (Holderness 1982). On the other hand, the use of realistic techniques in these novels is a sign of Lawrence's “effort to come to terms” with the society, for realism presupposes interdependence between individual and community. The use of non-realistic techniques, on the other hand, implies that he wants to escape from the social reality. When Lawrence uses symbolism and myth or other non-realist techniques he often wants to stress the individuality and freedom of self-realisation of a character, but when he uses realist techniques he concedes that human beings are fundamentally social beings and cannot act fully according to their instincts. (Holderness 1982:19). In some parts of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Lawrence has gone back to the style he used in *Sons and Lovers*, which means probably that he wanted a bond between man and society more than to escape to individuality, away from humanity. In *Women in Love* the breach between society and individual is the strongest of the three novels.

*Sons and Lovers* is the most realist of the three novels, especially in the first part. *Women in Love* is the most psychological one, with the exception of a few minor more realist characters. *Lady Chatterley's Lover* lies somewhere in between, for it has the psychological theme of blood-consciousness, but it also has the more realistic theme of the blood values and the mind values of different classes and how these values affect the relationships between these classes.

## 5.2 THE SELECTED NOVELS

*Sons and Lovers* is the story of Paul Morel from the time of his birth till adolescence. It tells about the difficult relationship between Paul and his mother and between Paul and his lovers, Miriam and Clara. Paul's father is a simple, almost illiterate miner and his mother, a former teacher, comes from the middle class. The mother is dissatisfied with her life as a poor miner's wife and puts all her effort into her sons. They are to distinguish themselves and rise from the working class to the middle class. She has decided that they won't become the likes of their father. The mother and the children unite against the father, who declines morally and loses his life force. The father is kept isolated from the family affairs. In this first part of the novel everything is seen through the mother's eyes.

The first part concentrates on the married life of the Morels and the battle between husband and wife. It describes Paul's childhood, school years and finally his launching into life, which means his starting work in a surgical appliances factory in Nottingham. The story and death of William, Paul's brother, ends the first part of the novel, after which the novel concentrates mainly on Paul and his relationships with the other characters.

In the second part Paul becomes the apple of his mother's eye. He is doing well at the factory and is in the beginning of a successful artistic career. He's real desire is to become a painter one day. The relationship between Paul and his mother is almost like that between husband and wife. The mother is jealous of her son's lovers. Because of this Paul is unable to form a balanced relationship neither with Miriam, the farmer's daughter, or with Clara, the already married factory worker.

Paul spends pleasurable days on Willey Farm with Miriam and his family. With Miriam he makes long walks to the surrounding forests and fields and they have conversations about art and literature. With Miriam's brothers, instead, he does farmwork and spends jolly evenings singing and playing games. Paul cannot stand Miriam's abstract spirituality and turns to Clara, who is womanly and sensual, qualities that Paul had missed in Miriam. Clara and her husband work at the same factory as Paul does. Paul gets to know Clara's husband Baxter and they become friends. He realises that Clara and Baxter really belong together, and eventually they are indeed reunited. After his mother dies (of cancer) Paul has nothing to hold on to; alienated from his father and unable to come to terms with other women. He collapses, but at the end his will to live overcomes his will to die.

*Sons and Lovers* is a so called bildungsroman, where the main character, Paul, grows up to adolescence in a family where the mother is strong, whereas the father remains at the background. He goes through the normal stages of a youth's life with plans and doubts about the future, and with the first attempts to establish relationships with the other sex. Paul's mind is primarily occupied with thoughts about the kind of values he will want to adopt into his life. In fact, he knows from quite early on that he wants to become an artist and that he wants a life in which the mind and the body are in harmony. However, the people around him do not realise how important this balance is for him and try to pull him in different directions.

*Women in Love* tells about efforts to establish new kinds of relationships between men and women, and between men and men. It is also about young people who want to break the old established values of society – the bourgeois values of home, family, country, responsibility and routines of regular work and everyday life. It continues the story of the Brangwen sisters (already introduced in *The Rainbow*), Ursula and Gudrun. They come from a lower middle-class family. Ursula is a class mistress in Beldover Grammar School and Gudrun is an art mistress in that same school. Gudrun has recently come back home from London, where she has spent a rather bohemian life of an art student.

Ursula, who is very womanly and sensual, falls in love with Rupert Birkin who is also middle-class and a school-inspector. Lawrence doesn't give any account of Birkin's background. Ursula finds out that Birkin (addressed

always by his last name) is not an ordinary man, but a man who has a new kind of philosophy. Ursula is attracted by this philosophy and becomes his disciple and also his companion in marriage.

*Women in Love* has no conventional plot, but instead it is very psychological and philosophical. The main philosophies of this novel are all spoken through Birkin, Lawrence's alter ego. Birkin believes in blood-conscious love between a man and a woman. Birkin thinks that real passion, sensuality and instincts spring from the blood and thus cannot be consciously observed or deliberately produced by the human will (WL57), the conscious mind. He hates conventions and conventional people and materialistic view of life.

Ursula represents emotionality and sensuousness, whereas Hermione, Birkin's former lover, represents spirituality, which are both qualities mocked by Birkin. Hermione, who is present only in the first part of the novel, is a rich and influential upper-class lady who comes from an aristocratic family. She is well-known both in upper-class and bohemian circles, for she is interested in arts.

At the end Birkin and Ursula are able to meet on an unconscious level and reach blood-consciousness. In practice, Ursula and Birkin both leave their posts to be free and without responsibilities, and head towards "nowhere" (WL360), which means that they are going to travel around with no permanent home. At the end of the novel Birkin has been able to accomplish the kind of bond he wanted with Ursula, but he admits that he was unable to bind it with his upper-class friend Gerald. However, Birkin still believes that there is nothing false about intimacy, a blood-connection between man and man (WL542).

Gudrun is immediately attracted by Gerald Grich, the son of an industrial magnate. Gerald takes control of the mines after his father is taken seriously ill. He improves the coal production and increases the profits, disregarding his miners and their families as human beings. As he manages the mines his mind works purely mechanically, which he finds for a while fulfilling. After everything has been accomplished as regarding the mines, he feels immense emptiness and lack of meaning in his life. He wants Gudrun to fill this empty void inside of him, but she decides that the life Gerald could offer her would not satisfy her and she leaves him. In addition, she feels a spiritual connection with a German sculptor, whom she meets when the four of them (Ursula, Birkin, Gudrun and Gerald) are spending the Christmas in the German Alps. Gerald rushes to his death in the Alps

(in a way that can be interpreted as suicidal). After his death Gudrun travels around leading the life of a free artist.

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Sir Clifford Chatterley, a baronet, and his wife Lady Constance Chatterley settle down after the war (1920) to live on Clifford's family estate, Wragby. Clifford has been wounded in the war and he is paralysed from the hips down. Clifford is a mine owner who yearns to be a successful writer. He is, however, said to be a writer of trivialities. Connie, as she is called, devotes her life to taking care of her husband and helping him with his writing, thus leaving aside her own desires and aspirations. Connie and her sister Hilda are originally Scottish middle class, their father is a Royal Academician and their mother a cultivated Fabian (LC 6,248). So, they have grown up in an artistic and socialist atmosphere, and thus there are great differences between Clifford and Connie. Connie doesn't share Clifford's aristocratic manners and etiquette (LC80), and provincialism. Instead, she is very cosmopolitan and unconventional. She feels the mental life of the upper classes, her husband and his acquaintances, oppressive. She finds new meaning to her life when she falls in love with the estate's game keeper, Oliver Mellors. Mrs Bolton, the district nurse, is employed to take care of Clifford, leaving Connie more time to concentrate on her love affair with Mellors. Quite soon she becomes pregnant by him and the lovers start to plan a future together. When Clifford learns about his wife's plans he goes mad. He would have accepted an upper-class lover instead of Mellors. Furthermore, he feels that the order of his life is broken because he had been used to his wife being part of the household. In this situation his only consolation is Mrs Bolton, to whose motherly care he abandons himself like a child. At the end of the story Connie and Mellors are separated, Connie staying with her sister Hilda and Mellors working on a farm. After Mellors has got a divorce from his former wife, the lovers have planned to settle down on a small farm of their own.

Mellors is the son of a miner and had worked as a blacksmith in the colliery and as Clifford's father's game keeper before the war. Earlier he had also worked as a clerk. During the war he served in India as an officer's servant. He is married, but has been separated from his wife for years, because she turned out to be a drunkard and a bully. He has a little daughter who lives at his mother's. Now he lives in his game keeper's cottage in the middle of the forest, like a hermit.

Mellors, like Birkin, is not an ordinary man. He too has a philosophy of life similar to Birkin's. He hates mechanical work and the materialism of the industrialised world. Instead, he declares that people would be happier if they would learn to enjoy natural things like sex and manual work. Tenderness and touch are the main concepts of his philosophy. Tommy Dukes, an officer and a friend of the Chatterleys, has ideas similar to those of Mellors. He differs from the novel's hero in that he doesn't live according to these ideas, but seems to be a rather passionless character.

What connects these three novels is the setting, the mining towns of Bestwood, Beldover and Tevershall. Next I shall start my analysis on the values of the different classes that inhabit these rural industrial villages. There will be contradictions in Lawrence's views of these values, as well as in the views of the different characters. Also there may be contradictions between the historical reality and Lawrence's interpretation this reality.

## 6 THE WORKING CLASS

I shall begin the analysis of the novels by describing the different ways the working class is portrayed and by examining the class relations. Generally, Lawrence's description of working-class characters is very realistic in *Sons and Lovers*. As Hewitt has observed (1988:176) in this novel Lawrence wrote about the mining community as seen from inside, which is very rare in his later novels. There are plenty of scenes from the reality of a working-man's life in *Sons and Lover* and the working-class characters appear as active and lively members of their community. When Mr Morel walks home from work tired, wet and dirty, he "put up his umbrella, and took pleasure from the peppering of the drops there on" (SL68). Lawrence goes on: "All along the road to Bestwood the miners tramped wet and grey and dirty, but their mouths talking with animation" (SL68). In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* and in *Women in Love* where the miners are seen from the outside, from the point of view of another class, as gloomy gang of men. Only in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is Lawrence able to reach something from the realism of

*Sons and Lovers* when he writes with sympathy about Mellors' routines of a game keepers life.

In *Sons and Lovers*, in Scheckner's opinion (1985:27), the industrial town contrasted with the rural, agricultural countryside reflects the division to mind values and blood values. This pattern repeats in the other two novels as well, as I will show in the following two chapters, where Lawrence connects the working-class spirit with the ugliness of the industrial landscape. In *Sons and Lovers* Paul's life in Nottingham as a factory worker is contrasted with his visits to the Haggs farm, where he could be his natural self, passionate and instinctive.

Sanders (1973:110) writes that in *Women in Love* the workers are portrayed collectively, whereas in *Sons and Lovers* they were still seen as individuals. He continues that Lawrence's view of the war as masses of men fighting brutally against the enemy may have produced this collective portrayal of working men abundant with words of violence and ugliness (Sanders 1973:111). In *Women in Love* the colliery town of Beldover and the colliers are seen through the middle-class Brangwen sisters – from outside of the mining community. Gudrun considers the town ugly and she describes it as “defaced countryside”, “a country in an underworld” or “a dark, uncreated, hostile world” (WL 23-24). The colliers and their wives she describes as people from the “underworld” or as “ghouls” (WL24).

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the mining town and its people are seen through Connie's eyes in pretty much the same way as they were seen by the sisters in *Women in Love*. She represents the upper classes, the so called “leisured classes” (LC163), and feels regret that the old stately homes with their large parks are being replaced by the industries and industrial villages. Connie's thoughts are actually reflecting Lawrence's feelings about the changing of the old rural countryside to industrial towns. Connie describes the Tevershall village the way Lawrence had seen his own home town (Eastwood) when he visited it for the last time in 1926. It was the “utter negation of natural beauty ... of the gladness of life, the utter absence of the instinct for shapely beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of the human intuitive faculty” (LC158). Connie describes the village with such words as “ugliness”, “under-earth”, “doom” and the people as “haggard”, “shapeless”, “dreary” and “unfriendly” (LC14-15).

In *Women in Love* the home of the rich mine owner lies separate from the mines and the miners' dwellings. Lawrence writes that Shortlands, the Grichs' home, "looked across a sloping meadow", where "solitary trees that stood here and there ... at the wooded hill that successfully hid the colliery valley beyond, but did not quite hide the rising smoke" (WL37). The connection between the owners and the workers has been broken and both classes live in their own separate worlds. In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, like in *Women in Love*, the mining village and the home of the mine owner are isolated from each other and contrasted with each other. "Wragby [the home of the Chatterley's] ... stood on an eminence in a rather fine old park of oak trees, but alas, one could see in the near distance the chimney of Tevershall pit ... the raw straggle of Tevershall village, a village which began almost at the park gates" (LC14). The Chatterleys could always see and smell and hear the presence of the mines, but tried not to think about it (LC14).

In *Women in Love* when the main characters are in contact with working-class people they usually feel superior and separate to them. For example, when Birkin's servant announces to Ursula and Birkin that the tea is ready, "They both looked at her ... as the cats had looked at them, a little while before" (WL178). It is as if the masters and the servants were of different species.

In another example Ursula and Birkin discuss with a young working-class couple about a chair the former have bought from the market. Ursula and Birkin want to give the chair to this young couple. Already there is a tension and prejudice detectable in the conversation between two different classes that is also common in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* but non-existent in *Sons and Lovers*. The man replies to Ursula with "amiable, jeering warmth" and "in a tone of free intimacy" (WL408). This is the tone used by Mellors as well. The woman, instead, says "coolly": "Why don't you want it for yourselves, if you've just bought it? ... 'Taint good enough for you, now you've had a look at it. Frightened it's got something in it, eh?" (WL408).

In *Women in Love* the masters regard the workers as inhuman objects, "instruments" that can be used to gain profits. They are not seen as personalities. Neither do the miners take notice of their masters on personal level. So, here again the two classes are separate and there's hardly any contact between them, save the instrumental one. "As miners they had their being, he [Gerald] had his being as

director. He admired their qualities. But as men, personalities, they were just accidents, sporadic little unimportant *phenomena*. And tacitly, the men agreed to this. For Gerald agreed to it in himself” (WL267;emphasis added).

Like in *Women in Love*, also in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, the different classes don’t want to have anything to do with each other on personal level, but regard each other merely as non-human objects. Lawrence writes that Clifford saw the miners as “objects rather than men, parts of the pit rather than parts of life” (LC17). The village people, in turn, compare Connie to a “waxfigure” and they regard the clergyman as a “sort of automatic preaching and praying concern” (LC16).

In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* there is tension and prejudice between classes like in *Women in Love*. There was a “Gulf impassable, and a quiet sort of resentment on either side”, “no communication” and a “strange denial of the common pulse of humanity” (LC15). When Mellors had to communicate with the Chatterleys, he had an “impersonal look” in his eyes and he was “aloof, apart” (LC49-50), trying to make himself as “invisible” (LC49). In another example Mellors says to Connie’s sister: “Would anything that was said between you and me be quite natural, unless you said you wished me to hell ... and unless I said something almost as unpleasant back” (LC254).

## 6.1 THE WORKING-CLASS MEN

### 6.1.1 THE BLOOD

In *Sons and Lovers* the blood values of working-class men show from their looks and nature. Physically they are usually well built, handsome, masculine and healthy, and in nature they are careless, lively and impulsive. Mr Morel represents these blood qualities, for he has a “tender” voice, he is “well set up, erect ... smart”, he has a “wavy black hair ... vigorous black beard”, ruddy cheeks and “red moist mouth”, he laughed often heartily, he is “full of colour and animation” and “pleasant with everybody”, he is “soft, non-intellectual, warm”, he “danced well”, he is “sensuous”, he does “the right thing by instinct” and he is a “remarkably handy man” (SL41-46). In one example, Lawrence connects the word “body” with the people as being “common”. When Paul’s brother leaves home to become

a soldier, the mother cries out: “a common *soldier*! – nothing but a body that makes movements when it hears a shout!” (SL234;emphasis original). Scheckner (1985:29) claims that Lawrence connects Morel’s physical attractiveness and sexual appeal to his being working-class. He goes on to say (1985:35) that this novel “begins with this mind-body, middle-class – working-class dichotomy” in which Morel’s body is the “metaphor” of the working-class. Scheckner is right, as later when Morel is defeated by the mind values of his wife’s, Lawrence shows how his body is slowly ruined. In contrast, in the second part of the novel, Lawrence writes that his spirit was lifeless, whereas his body was still lively.

The working-class men in *Sons and Lovers* like Morel are usually interested in such activities as sports, dancing and going to pubs, rather than church going, reading or other spiritual things. Furthermore, Lawrence unites the masculine world with the working-class life. Women are not included in this world. Mrs Morel is not to interfere when his husband is reckoning his week’s wages and she is also not to know the exact amount of his earnings (SL249). So, work belongs to this masculine world and it is an important part of a working-man’s life. Scheckner (1985:29) also brings up the fact that in every husband-wife relationship in this novel, the women do the housework, whereas the work outside home is left for men. On the other hand, Scheckner points out (1985:29), “Having no class aspirations, Morel is shut out of his family” after Mrs Morel’s futile attempts to make him more moral and cultured, and therefore Morel escapes to work, which is the only thing that cannot be taken away from him. Morel is at his happiest when working:

The only times when he entered again into the life of his own people was when he worked, and was happy at work. Sometimes in the evening, he cobbled the boots or mended the kettle or his pit-bottle. 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 (SL102).

This is when Morel has already been alienated from the rest of the family and is not allowed to interfere in the family matters anymore.

Mr Morel is able to find the positive things in working-class life (the beauty of the pit, the quiet mornings, the little jobs at home, the meaning of good company etc.), whereas Mrs Morel can only see the “poverty and ugliness and meanness” (SL40). Mr Morel loved the simple routines of his miner’s life. He was happy in the mornings when he would make and have his breakfast or when his

wife had left some fruit for him to take to work (SL63-64). Working-class men in *Sons and Lovers*, in general, have the ability to enjoy simple things like food and comfort.

The miners also enjoy the communal activities, like going to pubs and wakes. In *Sons and Lovers* the life in the pub where Mr Morel goes is lively presented. Mr Morel feels more at home in a pub than in his own home, because Mrs Morel has turned it too middle class. "The men made a seat for him and took him in warmly. He was glad. In a minute or two they had thawed all responsibility out of him, all shame, all trouble, and he was clear as a bell for a jolly night" (SL80). For Mr Morel the company of other men and being the member of a community (mine, pub) is important and vital, because he has a lively character. The working class is connected with community, whereas the middle class is connected with individuality. Sanders (1973:29) writes that Morel's dialect identifies him with community, whereas Mrs Morel's standard English identifies her with individuality. It is obvious that because Mrs Morel doesn't speak the vernacular, she feels a stranger and remains a lonely figure inside this community. Therefore her individuality is stressed. Neither does she want to be identified with the working-class people, but feels superior. Language, according to Sanders (1973:30), is one of the factors that puts limits to Morel's rise on the social scale, which fact Mrs Morel doesn't realise. It would be easier for Mrs Morel to adjust to the working-class way of life than for Mr Morel to adopt his wife's middle-class values because they live in a working-class community.

The working-class members, women included, are generous and warm-hearted towards the other members of the community. Scheckner (1985:10) writes that "The typical worker in Lawrence's works is sociable, passionate, and uncomplicated" and that "He has a potential for humanness unmatched by the upper-classes". This is true at least in *Sons and Lovers*. When the Morel family encountered hardships, the other working-class families always helped them. Clara, when visiting Paul's home for the first time, is astonished by the "flood of hospitality from the old collier. He was so courteous, so gallant. She thought him most delightful" (SL386). Mr Morel often tries to be helpful and tender to his wife at home, but Mrs Morel is never satisfied with him. Scheckner (1985:10) has noticed that Morel's warmth and tenderness is a characteristic of miners also found in many other works of Lawrence's.

The miners of the older generation detested any kind of authority from the part of their pit managers. Although Morel was a skilful miner, he would often abuse his superiors. In consequence the pit-managers would give him “worse and worse stalls, where the coal was thin, and hard to get ...” (SL52). The work in these poor stalls would bring Morel less money. In this way the miners were being tamed by their masters. The older generation miners still had the guts to challenge their wives as well. Mr Morel would say “I don’t care who you are nor what you are, I *shall* have my own way” (SL62;emphasis original). Morel’s primitive rebelliousness against the norms of society is opposed to his wife’s moral values (Scheckner 1985:141).

The life values as seen through Mr Morel are plenty in the first part of the novel (physicality, masculinity, spontaneity, sociability, ability to enjoy simple life, warmth and detest of authority). In the second part of the novel Mrs Morel has won the battle between husband and wife i.e. between blood and mind i.e. between working-class and middle-class values. Mr Morel has become obedient and rarely goes to the pub anymore. Although Mr Morel has been tamed by his wife in the second part of the novel, Mrs Morel and Paul still can observe that “He had still a wonderfully young body, muscular without any fat. Paul looked at his father’s thick, brownish hands all scarred, with broken nails, rubbing the fine smoothness of his sides, and *the incongruity* struck him. It seemed strange they were the same flesh” (SL250;emphasis added). Paul sees the lifeless spirit of his father’s doesn’t fit with this still lively, sensuous body. Mr Morel has been forced to hide his blood-consciousness.

There are plenty of male characters who have life values in *Sons and Lovers*. Lawrence writes about another son of Mr Morel, that he “had a good chance of getting on. But he was wild and restless” (SL232). He is also “good-looking” and “irresponsible” like his father (SL235). For this, his mother doesn’t like him so much and acts coldly towards him, like she acts towards anybody who has the same kind of qualities as Walter Morel. Paul sees Clara’s husband Baxter as “a big, well-set man ... striking to look at, and handsome ... white skin ... hair was of soft brown, his moustache was golden ... his eyes dark brown and quick-shifting ... His mouth, too, was sensual ...” (SL238). Miriam’s brother “was good-looking with dark warm eyes ... he walked with considerable pride” and “The back of his neck was sun-red when he bent down, and his fingers that held

the brush were thick” (SL288-289). Indeed, in the second part of the novel the other characters are now seen through Paul and not anymore through his mother like in the first part. The reader can now see what qualities Paul finds attractive in the other characters. Although the heroes of Lawrence’s novels are often attracted to the bodies of working men, I don’t believe that Lawrence was a homosexual.

William, Mr Morel’s eldest son, has taken after his father in that he likes dancing and parties. This makes Mrs Morel very worried, because she is afraid that he will turn out like his father. Considering that William is well-read and has just started a fine career in London, she acts unfairly when she dooms his son for having some fun, too. William’s death later in the novel is symbolic of this suppression of his life force and his not being able to handle his swift rise to the bourgeois world, for he was spinning “giddily on the quick current of the new life” (SL132).

Especially in the first part of *Sons and Lovers*, where all is seen through Mrs Morel’s eyes, vulgarity ( a word many characters use in all three novels) is mostly the characteristic attached to working-class men. For example, Mr Morel is often violent and in furious temper, he lies, has coarse table manners and other disgusting habits (SL49,57-58,101,157). Vulgarity of manner is “an aspect of working-class life that Lawrence detested” and he never idealises it in his novels (Scheckner 1985:36). Mellors in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* criticised the working class for vulgar behaviour. Consequently, vulgarity is not one of the life values. Sanders (1973:23) claims that Lawrence misjudges Morel by making him such a vulgar brute in many scenes in *Sons and Lovers*, because Lawrence fails to see the social pressures on him. Sanders probably means here the continuous poverty of his family, his inability to meet the social and material aspirations of the rest of the family and the hard work in the mines. In my opinion, Morel’s vulgar behaviour is also the result of the suppression of the life qualities in him. The more Mrs Morel despises the masculine working-class being of her husband’s the more vulgar become his manners.

For Miriam the vulgar brutes are her brothers who work the farm with their father. Their crudeness is connected to their being farmers (working class) and has nothing to do with, for example, their sex (Sanders 1973:46). The boys often scold Miriam, because of her sensitivity. “She niver durst do anything except recite poitry ... Dursn’t jump off a gate, dursn’t tweedle, dursn’t go on a

slide, dursn't stop a girl hittin' her. She can do nowt but go about thinkin' herself somebody" (SL171). The difference between Mr Morel and Miriam's brothers is that the latter do read a lot and thus have the blood and the mind in a kind of balance. This is probably what attracts Paul to them. They are cultured to some extent, but because they belong to the working class, they feel threatened by Miriam's superior attitude and thus speak coarsely to her. Lawrence writes that their "rudeness was only superficial. They had all, when they could trust themselves, a strange gentleness and loveliness" (SL198). This applies also to Mr Morel, and to Clara's husband who is also described mostly as a vulgar brute, who was "ready to knock anybody down who disapproved of him .." (SL238).

So, the working-class men have strong, handsome and healthy bodies, are lively, impulsive and careless in manner, generous by nature and interested in physical activities. As we have seen, when under threat they can also act very brutally. Lawrence has written in an essay (in Scheckner 1985:24) that despite the vulgarity of colliers like Walter Morel, the miners of the older generation were never finally defeated. By "the older generation" Lawrence means the generation that had not been thoroughly tamed by the wives or the factory overseers, i.e. there is still blood-consciousness in them. In many of his essays Lawrence brings up the issue of the old and the new generation of miners. The new or the younger generation are the men or boys who have adopted the values of their domineering mothers, school masters or factory managers. They are the mob of dirty, ugly, gloomy men that start to emerge in Lawrence's novels after *Sons and Lovers*. In contrast, Lawrence still attaches life qualities to these men, especially when he describes them individually.

There are no major working-class characters in *Women in Love*. The working class is usually considered as a group as we have seen in the chapter about working class in general. Although the working men are mostly compared to machines or to underworld creatures by the main characters, they have still some blood qualities in them.

Gerald, when observing a working-class man servant, finds him as "good-looking and clean-limbed", "calm", "elegant" and "aristocratic", but also "half a savage" (WL91). Gudrun uses of them such adjectives as masculine, powerful, potent and vigorous (WL138). She notices their "physical well-being" (WL138) and finds that they have "certain beauty" and "a strange glamour" (WL139). In

addition, she feels that “their broad dialect was curiously caressing to the *blood*” (WL138; emphasis added). Besides all this, Gudrun also thinks that they are rather vulgar in their manners (WL137), which characteristic emerges in all the three novels.

The working-class man Ursula and Birkin meet at the market place arouses contradictory feelings in them. He was a

still, mindless creature, hardly a man at all, a creature that the towns have produced, strangely pure bred and fine in one sense, furtive, quick, subtle. His lashes were dark and long and fine over his eyes, that had no mind in them, only a dreadful kind of subject, inward consciousness ... his dark brows and all his lines were finely drawn. He would be a dreadful, but wonderful lover to a woman ... his legs would be marvellously subtle and alive ... he had some of the fineness and stillness and silkiness of a dark-eyed, silent rat (WL407).

Man’s legs are for Lawrence the sign of the amount of blood-consciousness in a person. Here the hidden blood-consciousness of the man feels threatening to Birkin and Ursula. The working-class man in this example is referred to as a mindless creature, an animal (here a rat) which can only act by instinct, i.e. he is totally blood-conscious with no mind at all. Ursula can see that this man’s woman has taken his manhood, but that he obviously didn’t care, for “he had a strange furtive pride and slinking singleness” (WL409). So, there is hidden blood-consciousness also in the younger members of the working class. In contrast, in *Women in Love*, as a group the miners appear in the eyes of the other classes as “half-visible shadows in their grey pit-dirt moving through the blue air” (WL427).

In contrast to the escapist individualism of the middle and upper classes, the working-class men in *Women in Love* still have an active communal life. They feel at home in the market place, in the pubs and in the streets of Beldover. “The doors of the public-houses were open and full of light, men passed in and out in a continual stream, everywhere men were calling out to one another, or crossing to meet one another, or standing in little gangs and circles discussing” (WL139).

Lawrence hoped that there would emerge a blood-conscious man ( a natural aristocrat) who would bring more human values (life values) to society. The revolution of life, as Lawrence called this idea, is handled differently in each novel and the potentiality of the working class is seen differently by different characters. In *Sons and Lovers* most of the working-class men are still vital enough to resist the mind values of the women. Lawrence doesn’t mention the possibility of a revolution of life in this novel.

In *Women in Love* the characters have varying opinions of who will be the one/the ones to bring new values to society. Although Gudrun thinks that the colliers are “mindless”, purely “physical”, “inhuman”, “half-automatized” and “machine-like”, she feels that they have a strange potency in them (WL138). That is why she often feels desire to be among them.

Gerald’s father, who had always looked after the welfare of the miners’ families, felt “inferior” to the working-class people (WL249). He believed that his workmen “held in their hands the means of salvation. To move nearer to God, he must move towards his miners” (WL249). He thinks these men are “closer to perfection” than other people and that they are “manly and noble in their labours” (WL259). Gerald, who doesn’t care for the sufferings of working-class people, treats his workers as “his instruments” that have no will of their own, but they are all “subjugate to his will” (WL257). Gerald doesn’t see the life qualities and potentiality of these men like his father does.

Birkin thinks the working-class men are too “meek” to start the revolution of life values (WL411). He doesn’t regard them as “Sons of God”, but “children of men” who shall “inherit the earth” and leave the other classes “the chinks” (“only little room”) (WL411). Birkin, like Lawrence, implies here that after class struggle the working-class people will be materially better off and become the leaders of the nation. However, when in a leading position, they shall act like their former masters and subordinate all the other classes under their will. In other words, they only want material values, not human values or equality of men. Birkin goes on that if “the English really begin to go off, *en masse*, it’ll be time to shut our ears and run” (WL448; emphasis original). So, Birkin clearly doesn’t put his hope in the masses for a better England. However, many of the blood qualities that Birkin seems to value can be found in the description of the working men, for example in the man Birkin and Ursula meet on the market. In fact, as Schneckner writes (1985:62), Lawrence has rather contradictory feelings towards this class in this novel.

The other characters either, apart from the older Grich, do not believe in the potentiality of the working class. On the contrary, the working class seems to enjoy being part of the mechanical order, the society that has lost the blood values. “Salvator Mundi” in this novel, according to Ursula, is Birkin (WL154).

In spite of this, Birkin, who is middle-class, has no intention to save the world, but rather escape from it, as I shall show later.

Mellors is the only working-class male character in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. He belongs to the younger generation, but he represents the blood values. But otherwise the life values are mostly attached to the older generation of miners in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. According to Scheckner (1985:29), Mellors seems to be the only representative of the old organic way of life in the novel, whereas the rest of the working class has already turned mechanical and materialistic. In Queen Victoria's time, according to an aristocrat, the miners were still "good working men" (LC164), whereas the new generation of miners has a different spirit. Work as such doesn't matter to them, for they are more interested in earning and spending money. Mrs Bolton and Mellors also make the difference between the older miners and the younger ones. The older men, compared to the women and "lads" are still "good and patient" (LC107) as seen by Mrs Bolton. Mellors refers to the money values of the "young ones" and the women (LC312). None of the characters in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* consider the working class men vital enough to start a revolution of life, even though they think that the older men still have the life values.

### 6.1.2 THE MIND

Sanders (1973:23-24) recognises that the battle between Mr and Mrs Morel is "grounded in class differences", which Lawrence then in moral and psychological terms interprets as struggle between bad and good, or between conscious and unconscious, or between mind and body. This "opposition between flesh and spirit" (Sanders 1973:48-49) appears, for example, in their differences of language. Mrs Morel is able to express more than just the immediate feelings, unlike Mr Morel. Sanders (1973:33) lists other differences between the Morels that are "primarily social rather than personal" - the differences in their "education, religion, social aspirations, aesthetic training, economic motivations, manners, moral views and political interests". Also Scheckner (1985:24) emphasises the social origin of this conflict that superficially appears as psychological or even sexual.

Lawrence has written about this battle that “There is a basic hostility in all of us between the physical and the mental, the blood and the spirit. The mind is ashamed of the blood. And the blood is destroyed by the mind” (in Sanders 1973:49). The taming of Mr Morel is symbolic of the suppression of the working-class men as a whole. The domineering Mrs Morel strives to make her husband good, and consequently,

There began a battle between the husband and wife – a fearful bloody battle that ended only with the death of one. She fought to make him undertake his own responsibilities, to make him fulfil his obligations. But he was too different from her. His nature was purely sensuous, and she strove to make him moral, religious. She tried to force him to face things. He could not endure it - it drove him out of his mind (SL49).

Mrs Morel had inherited her high moral sense from “generations of Puritans” and, consequently, “If he sinned, she tortured him. If he drank, and lied, was often a poltroon, sometimes a knave, she wielded the lash unmercifully” (SL51). But as we have seen that “in seeking to make him nobler than he could be, she destroyed him” (SL51). Mrs Morel compares her husband to another collier, who has already been tamed by his wife: “She saw the determined little collier buying in the week’s groceries and meat on the Friday nights, and she admired him. ‘Baker’s little, but he’s ten times the man you are,’ she said to her husband” (SL252).

Lawrence, especially in the first part of the novel, takes sides with Mrs Morel in this battle. One example is the scene where Morel cuts his son’s hair, which is presented as a very brutal act, because it is done against Mrs Morel’s will and causes her grievance. Although Lawrence often sides with Mrs Morel, Sanders (1973:51) writes that he fundamentally believed that mind destroys the body, which demonstrates itself in concrete ways in Mr Morel. He shrinks physically and loses his pride. The fights between the Morels begin usually after Walter returns home drunk from the pub and Mrs Morel nags at him. After another row between his wife, in Morel “there was a slight shrinking, a diminishing in his assurance. Physically even, he shrank, and his fine full presence waned ... his physique seemed to contract along with his pride and moral strength” (SL63).

Even in the relationship between Paul and Miriam there is a similar battle going on, where Paul acts like his father and Miriam represents the mind: “his blood began to boil with her. It was strange that no one else made him in such

fury. He flared against her. Once he threw the pencil in her face” (SL207). Paul clearly wants to gain a balance between the physical and the mental, whereas Miriam is all mental, spiritual, which Paul can’t accept.

Because Clara wants to be cultured and is a sort of a feminist, there is also a battle between her and Baxter, her husband. Baxter loves her, but bullies her, for she doesn’t respect him the way he is. Paul defends Baxter in this battle and says that “I think he (Baxter) might have been rather nice “, but Clara exclaims: “you think *I* made him what he is!” (SL412;emphasis original). I wonder why Paul never defends his father. At the end Clara admits that she has treated Baxter badly (SL452).

The embourgeoisement of the younger generation of working-class men is the mission of working-class women in *Sons and Lovers*. After Mrs Morel’s victory over her husband, she turns to her sons to make them accept her mind values that are middle-class values. William is the pride of his mother and succeeds in climbing into the middle class and getting a well paid post in London. His mother wants him to choose between the life values and the money values: “Dance, if you want to dance, my son; but don’t think you can work in the office, and then amuse yourself, and *then* study on top of all ... Do one thing or the other, but don’t try to do both”(SL93;emphasis original). Lawrence doesn’t want to give a positive picture of William’s rise in the social scale, for he becomes alienated from the society, gets depressed and dies of pneumonia and exhaustion. Scheckner (1985:31) claims that Lawrence’s experiences of the middle class were in this way conveyed through William. Along with his brother William, Paul starts to accept the middle-class values first through his mother and afterwards at school.

Besides the mothers, the school is also moulding the younger generation to accept the mind values. The collier lads are taught “algibbra an’ French” (SL111) instead of something practical or useful like simple counting, so that the boys could count their wages when they become colliers.

In *Sons and Lovers* there is not yet any class struggle going on between the workers and the managers, but the class warfare happens on the family level. However, Lawrence describes how the miners are gradually made part of the machine and ignored as human beings. Lawrence wants us to see the miners solely as the victims of the society that supports the mind values. In later novels,

the working class starts to struggle to get its share of the profits. For Lawrence the class struggle is a sign of the material ambitions of the working class. In *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the class warfare is fought between the owners and the workers, but not on family level like in *Sons and Lovers*.

The workers of *Women in Love* have become materialistic, for "money was spent with almost lavish freedom" (WL139). And as we shall see, they still grumble, for they want an even bigger share of the profits. Lawrence says that the new idea of equality of possessions was the driving force in this fight for "material fulfilment" (WL260). Gerald's father had worked the mines in a way that profited both the owners as well as the workers. He wanted to improve the living conditions and well-being of all the people. As a result, the miners and their families spend happy times and were grateful to the owners. But, Lawrence writes, "man is never satisfied, and so the miners, from gratitude to their owners, passed on to murmuring ... they wanted more" (WL259). From here on begins the class struggle, riots and strikes.

Lawrence expresses the victory of the mind values over the working men in *Women in Love*, which happens along with the mechanisation of the mines. First he tells about the changes Gerald made in the mines. The miners had no control over their work anymore, but were under the management of educated engineers that ran the work on accurate scientific methods. "The miners were reduced to mere mechanical instruments" (WL266). The mechanical principle became the new God for them that they could worship. Lawrence goes on saying that the men submitted to this all and even the "joy went out of their lives" and their "hearts died within them", they got satisfaction from the "destructiveness" of it all (WL266). "They were exalted by belonging to this great system which was beyond feeling or reason, something really godlike" (WL266).

The sisters, when observing the workers, think that they have become "half-automatized" and even their voices sounded like machines, "full of an intolerable deep resonance, like a machine's burring"(WL138-139). They had "unnatural stillness in their bearing" and " a look of abstraction and half-resignation in their pale, often gaunt faces" (WL139). In *Sons and Lovers* the faces of the working-men were still healthy and handsome.

It is contradictory in *Women in Love* that Lawrence first writes about the disputes between workers and owners, but then insists that the men enjoyed being

part of the machine. Both Scheckner (1985) and Sanders (1973) accuse Lawrence of disregarding historical facts when writing about the reactions of the workers to improving of the efficiency of the mines. Sanders (1973:210-211) writes that in reality there were strikes against the new machinery and the level of wages. Similarly Scheckner (1985:45) sees that in these disputes there was never the question of material aspirations of the working class. So, money and property were not main issues in these strikes, but the forcing through of social reforms, fighting against Capitalism in the name of the human rights of the workers (Scheckner 1985:45). After all, in reality the colliers were the only ones who didn't benefit from the industrial Capitalism (Scheckner 1985:62). As Scheckner claims (1985:64-65), Lawrence writes as if the workers were promoting the Capitalist way of life side by side with the owners, but in reality the situation was different.

In *Women in Love* the embourgeoisement continues, but now the men seem to be as eager as the women to rise in the world. Gudrun meets a working-class man who works as an engineer in Gerald's mines. He seems quite bourgeois already. He is "earnest", "clever", "gentleman", "well-to-do", always clean (changes into clean clothes every day and uses silk socks), "fastidious" and "exacting" (WL140). He "had the fineness of an elegant piece of machinery" and he was "too cold, too destructive to care really for women" (WL140). He was a great "egoist" and felt superior to the ordinary colliers (WL141). As a matter of fact, he has taken the same kind of attitude towards the colliers as Gerald Grich has. He detests them on a personal, individual level, but admires them as a piece of well-functioning machinery (WL141).

The vitality of the working class and their ability to start the revolution of life is strongly doubted in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. All the characters see the working class more or less doomed. The class struggle and bolshevism of the working class is the sign of the victory of money values. Lawrence declares, in the form of Tommy Dukes ( a minor character) who has a philosophy similar to Mellors', that "We're all of us Bolsheviks", factory workers and owners alike, for we all share the "industrial ideal" (LC41).

Mellors had believed in his own class at first, but he came soon to realise that they only cared about money like the rest of the society (LC147-148). Lawrence's visit to England and his native village in 1926 strengthened his dislike

of class struggle and social revolution because of the misery and class conflict that the General Strike had caused (Sanders 1973:172). Sanders (1973:189) writes that Lawrence started to cherish the thought of “private peace” instead. Mellors says that bolshevism and nationalisation are not going to help the state of the mining industry and the state of the men (LC311). He refers to the young miners who, in his opinion, care only about money and spending it (LC312), and now that the mining industry is declining, they are not able to earn so much money and have started to protest. Mellors thinks that this problem would be solved if the men learned “to *live* instead of earn and spend” (LC312;emphasis original). In this way they could come along with a lesser income. But Mellors finds the situation hopeless, for the miners are “a sad lot, a deadened lot of men: dead to their women, dead to life” (LC312), especially the young ones (LC312). Mellors says that “the Tommies are getting just as priggish, and half-balled and narrow-gutted” as the middle class (LC226). He regrets that the human feelings, the “intuition” and the instincts have died among the working class (LC227).

Both Connie and Mellors criticise the working class as well as the upper classes for materialism and greediness. Connie thinks that all classes are the same, for she says that “There was only one class nowadays: moneyboys” (LC109). She feels the masses have become “over-conscious in the money and social and political side, on the spontaneous, intuitive side dead” (LC159). Like Mellors, she accuses the ruling classes for the state the working class is in (LC159). She asks: “who has taken away from the people their natural life and manhood and given them this industrial horror?” (LC189). Mellors hates the “bossy impudence of the people who run this world ... the impudence of money, and ... the impudence of class” (LC287). So, he is not entirely unbiased in his opinions. Mellors’ sympathy is perhaps after all with the common people, like Paul’s at the end.

Mrs Bolton is critical about the way the younger men find pleasure in spending money on clothes, drinking, smoking, restaurants, motorbikes and cinema (LC107-109). She says they are “selfish” and “respect nothing” (LC108) and when they have no money to spend they join the working class protest and become interested in socialism (LC108).

Where in *Sons and Lovers* the miners and especially Mr Morel have been slain by their domineering wives, in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* the main factor are the industrial magnates, like Gerald and Clifford. I think

that in the latter novels, especially in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Lawrence still sees the miners as victims even he writes in *Women in Love* that they enjoyed the new order in the mines. The spirit of *Sons and Lovers* where Paul still feels that from the working people we get the feelings, the life values, has turned in the latter novels into a pessimistic attitude towards this class.

## 6.2 THE WORKING-CLASS WOMEN

### 6.2.1 THE BLOOD

In *Sons and Lovers* there are not many life values attached to working-class women, as there are to working-class men. Mrs Morel represents mind in *Sons and Lovers*, but at a closer look she is not thoroughly mental. Mrs Morel was at first fascinated by her husband's nature and good looks. When they meet for the first time at a party, she watches him fascinated. "He was so full of colour and animation" (SL43). Also Paul believes that his mother has got the life in her, for he believes that she "got *real* joy and satisfaction out of " her husband "at first" and that "she had a passion for him" (SL381;emphasis original). Soon, however, she begins to loath all he stands for. She becomes "cold and impassive" towards her husband, but for her children she is able to give "life-warmth" (SL208). Later Mrs Morel still finds some fascination in the farmer's life (after visiting Willey Farm), although she has so far been against her sons' entering into any manual occupation. She says she would love to be a farmer's wife and run the farm with him (SL173).

Material comfort means a lot to Mrs Morel, but once in the novel she admits: "But *I* had expensive furniture. It's not everything" (SL301;emphasis original). There are also middle-class values that Mrs Morel doesn't accept, for example, hypocrisy, triviality and extravagance, even if she has the propensity to some of these herself. In the middle-class life she appreciates a good education, gentlemanly behaviour, decency, respectability, good income and complacency (i.e. easy life without hardships).

Clara, who works in the factory, is treated more sympathetically than the other women in the novel (Scheckner 1985:32). She has many blood qualities in her. Clara is the opposite of Miriam, because she is "full of life" (SL319), she has

a skin “like white honey” and a “full mouth” (SL237). Paul finds her physically attractive in many ways, her breasts, her curves and her back (SL295). Paul even compares Clara to an “Amazon” (SL307), i.e. to something primitive. Another thing that attracts Paul in Clara is her antagonism to all authority (Scheckner 1985:32). In *Women in Love* there are no working-class women like Clara. Lawrence ignores them almost completely in this novel.

Mrs Bolton is the only major working-class character in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* besides Mellors. What unites them is the fact that they have both obtained some education. Mrs Bolton educated herself as a nurse after the death of her husband. He had died in an explosion in the pit. Mrs Bolton, as a widow, had got little compensation from the mining company, because they accused her husband of causing his own death. This is why Mrs Bolton would always feel “resentment against the ruling class” (LC84) and “was always for the men” (LC85) if there was a wage or other dispute going on in the mines. Mrs Bolton felt that Connie shared with her this “grudge against Sir Clifford and all he stood for” (LC146).

Mrs Bolton feels victorious when she finds out that Connie is expecting Mellors' child, for it would be “a slap back at the high-and-mighty Chatterleys” (LC151) and she goes on to say that “a Tevershall baby in the Wragby cradle” would not be a shame to the Chatterleys (LC154). She is fundamentally for the life values and thinks that a working-class child would bring new blood to the upper-class circles. She has experienced with her husband the same kind of love that exists between Connie and Mellors, the kind that goes into one's blood and is all to do with touch and tenderness. That is why she declares that “I'll abide by my own” (LC171) even she often feels superior to her own class and is somewhat fascinated by the upper-class way of life.

Mrs Bolton finds many similarities between the men of all classes and she is fundamentally very sympathetic and understanding, even towards Clifford, for she says at the end of the novel that “you're [Connie and Clifford] both right in your own ways” (LC310). Mrs Bolton feels sympathetic towards Connie, for she understands the kind of love Connie shares with Mellors. Mrs Bolton tells Clifford about the lives of the people in the village, but she does it “in a spirit of fine discriminative sympathy” (LC105). Also Sanders (1973:175) acknowledges

Mrs Bolton's blood values like generosity and sensuality, but he also remarks that she was very envious of his social superiors and loved gossip.

Although Mellors finds fault with women of all classes, he admits that there is in working-class women a "sensual bloom" (LC209). That is why he fell in love with his wife. However, he came to realise afterwards that these women could also have a viscous mind and a strong will.

### 6.2.2 THE MIND

Mrs Morel in *Sons and Lovers* is one of the many women with mind values. She is "small and delicate" in built with "straight", "honest", "searching" eyes and "beautiful hands" (SL44). She always dresses up like a lady and is proud of herself (SL44). Walter Morel is fascinated at first by her ladylike manner and by her southern pronunciation of pure standard English (SL44). When they meet Walter Morel is fascinated by her bourgeois qualities, while she is fascinated by his working-class qualities. However, when married, they are not able to fit these qualities together in practice.

Mrs Morel comes from "a good old burgher family" that had gone bankrupt (SL42). She is Congregationalist and has had a puritanical religious upbringing (SL45). Mrs Morel finds it disgusting to see young "lads and girls courting" (SL211), because she thinks that sex is impure. She has a "receptive mind", she "loved ideas" and is "very intellectual" (SL44). She enjoys discussing about religion, philosophy and politics (SL44). In addition to intellectual discussions, she likes "thinking", "reading" and "writing" (SL90). She has also a very strong will. In many scenes Mrs Morel is seen using her strong will against her husband and being "cold and impassive as stone" (SL77).

Now that Mr Morel is defeated, his wife starts living: ... "he went to bed and she settled down to enjoy herself alone, working, thinking, living" (SL85). She also started to take part in associational activities, like the Women's Guild (SL89). After her victory, Mrs Morel laughs at her husband and starts to regard him as merely a "circumstance" in her life (SL82-84). Mrs Morel now ignored him and turned entirely towards her children. The children side with their mother and Morel can only state to his wife that "they [the children] are like yourself; you've put 'em up to your own tricks and nasty ways – you've learned 'em in it,

you 'ave" (SL98). It is now Mrs Morel who decides about the future of the sons. She is determined that they are "*not* going in the pit" (SL 90;emphasis original).

Miriam is an example of a woman who is only spiritual and nothing else. Earthly matters such as money don't mean anything to her, while Mrs Morel is also a materialist. Thus, I think, Mrs Morel and Miriam represent different sides of mind-consciousness. Miriam is "mystical", religious and "romantic" (SL191) and that is why Paul is able to form merely a platonic relationship with her. Miriam feels superior to other people and her only aspiration in life is learning (SL192). Miriam is also highly emotional, which irritates Paul (SL203). Miriam, like Mrs Morel, is disgusted by such things as birth or begetting. It is said that her "companion, her lover, was Nature" (SL216), because it is the only pure thing. Where Mrs Morel is "cold and impassive" (SL77), Miriam too "was never alive, and giving off life"(SL355). In Scheckner's opinion (1985:32), Lawrence clearly identifies Miriam's spiritual qualities with the upper classes. Miriam is indeed similar to the mental upper-class women I shall deal with later. Sanders (1973:45) claims that Lawrence contradicts himself when he condemns Miriam's spirituality, hunger for knowledge, earnestness and restlessness, because these are the things that took Lawrence himself away from his class.

Mrs Morel feels an alien among the other working-class women: "she shrank a little from the first contact with the Bottoms women" (SL37). The small community was lively and idyllic, but Mrs Morel comes from the middle class and so she doesn't fit in. Inside Morel's family the mother and the children have become alienated from the father. After William dies the family members suffer alone, individually, for there is no community left in the family (SL183). "There was scarcely any bond between father and son" (SL481) and even the relationship between Paul and his mother becomes more remote at the end. The process of isolation works thus inside the community and inside the family and it is destructive. In the Leivers family Miriam represents individuality, whereas the men represent community. When Paul spent time with the Leivers' men working, singing or debating on current issues, Miriam often waited for Paul to come to her, so that she could communicate personally with him (SL207).

I agree with Sanders (1973:47) that all women in *Sons and Lovers* want to escape the social restrictions of their lives. Also Scheckner (1985:28) has noted "the conflict between the instinctual communal life of the men, and the more

material aspirations of the women” (Scheckner 1985:28). Where the men found satisfaction in work, the women turned to culture, religion and material possessions (Scheckner 1985:28). Lawrence writes that the women are not satisfied with their living circumstances or with their standard of living and want to better themselves and their families: “the women could look at their homes, at the conditions of their own lives, and find fault. So the colliers found their women had a new standard of their own, rather disconcerting” (SL90). Scheckner (1985:28) also claims that Lawrence regards the women’s attack on their husbands’ more traditional way of working-class life as a threat to the life values of the men, which I find quite true.

Mrs Morel always talks about money. Therefore, the children get the highest pleasure from being able to earn money and hand it to their mother. Every time William gets a rise in salary, Mrs Morel feels immeasurable pride (SL93). William says to her: “Think of me in London ... We shall be rolling in money” (SL94). Mrs Morel, in turn, feels relieved, for Morel had failed to provide the money for her (SL101). When Mr Morel has hurt himself in the mine and has to go to the hospital, Mrs Morel only thinks about the loss in wages that will result (SL125). Mrs Morel also enjoys going shopping, spending the money (SL113), for its a bourgeois pleasure. Paul knows his mother, for when he has painted a picture for his mother, he says “I did it for my mother, but I think she’d rather have the money” (SL256) and consequently he sells the painting. It seems that Mrs Morel doctrine of life is very materialistic, for she thinks the highest aim in life is “ease of soul and physical comfort” (SL316). She doesn’t care about Paul’s art, but only what he could achieve by it (money, respect etc.).

Holderness (1982:145) claims that Mrs Morel shows his social ambitions mainly by trying to make her children middle-class. Sanders (1973:38) suggests that in this way Mrs Morel “treats the individual as the unit of success or failure, without regard” to the prevailing social conditions of that individual (the same mistake she did with her husband). She wants her sons to have bourgeois occupations, marry bourgeois girls and become respectful and decent. She fights to remove all working-class influence from them, but doesn’t succeed. It is noteworthy that the only daughter doesn’t give any trouble to Mrs Morel, for she is to become a teacher (SL93).

Clara, like Mrs Morel, is not satisfied with her life as a factory worker, but thinks herself superior. She protests against the mechanical nature of her work, but “barks the wrong tree” by blaming the poor circumstances of her life and work on her husband. She cannot see that it is the materialism of the bourgeois society that has taken away her possibilities of a better life. Scheckner (1985:37) implies that Clara is a typical character of Lawrence’s whose dreams of a fuller life have been destroyed by mechanical industrial labour. Clara, like Miriam, tries to escape the limits of working-class life by educating herself (Sanders 1973:46). Later she does succeed in climbing to the middle class as she becomes a teacher in a farming college (SL487).

Women like Mrs Morel, Miriam and Clara are the snobs in *Sons and Lovers*. These women cannot adapt to and be satisfied with working-class life, but feel superior. Mrs Morel says “I’d starve before I’d sit down and seam twenty-four stockings for twopence ha’ penny” (SL66). She doesn’t want to condescend to the same level with the other working-class women. Clara “considered herself as a woman apart, and particularly apart, from her class” (SL323), for she had educated herself, learned a little French and belonged to the women’s movement (SL323). Miriam was conceited and felt confident that Paul would choose her, instead of Clara, for she felt that she could give him more than other women (SL336). Scheckner (1985:32) finds that the class snobbery of women like Mrs Morel and Miriam leads to their alienation from the members of their family. Mrs Morel is alienated from her husband and later also from Paul. Miriam, in turn, is alienated from her brothers and eventually also from Paul. Scheckner (1985:32) says “She is too much – for the men around her”, because she is too much “anti-working-class”. Consequently, it is the class differences in Lawrence’s novels that often form the basis of other conflicts between the characters.

In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* Mrs Bolton often feels superior to the people from her own class and finds the life of the upper classes fascinating. After the death of her husband, she had become the district nurse and had become quite middle-class in all respects. She spoke standard English, lived in a newish house and was respected as “one of the governing class in the village” (LC83). Her friends also belonged all to the middle class (LC155). “She felt almost upper class” (LC84) and now that she was among the Chatterleys, she was learning “all that made them upper class: apart from the money” (LC104). Mrs Bolton, the way

she lives now, is really a hypocrite, because she lives among the class she in reality despises.

Mellors is mostly very critical towards the working-class women, but extends his criticism to women of all classes. He says that most women “want a man but don’t want the sex” (LC211), meaning the kind of sex that is really tender and honest, according to Mellors’ philosophy. Although he had found his wife sexually appealing at first, he came soon to learn her brutality and meanness (LC147). He means the way she manipulated him by using sex as weapon. He says that she was really insolent, selfish and had a strong will that she used against him (LC210). Here again, as in his other novels, Lawrence talks about the fearful will of the women that take the life out of men. He says that the need to assert one’s own will is one of the signs of insanity in modern woman (LC101). In Mellors’ opinion, when it comes to greediness and materialistic values, the working-class women are worse than the men (LC312). Mrs Bolton is in the same way critical towards working-class women as Mellors is. She thinks that they are always “grumbling” about the lack of money and spending their money on clothes (LC107).

There is a short description of two working-class women in *Women in Love* that are by no means favourable towards them. One is “a stout, pale, sharp-nosed woman, sly, honied, with something shrewish and cat-like beneath” (SL245). The other one is similarly rather “stout” and “short” (SL406). This woman looks at her man “with a determined protective look, at once over-bearing and very gentle” (SL409). She has taken his manhood from him (SL409), i.e. she is like Mrs Morel in *Sons and Lovers*. And the young man feels already “dead” under the influence of this domineering woman (SL409-410).

Like the working-class women in the previous chapter, the main working-class female characters do not usually have womanly appearance. As a generalisation, however, it is the exterior qualities of working-class women that attracted Lawrence, but not their interior qualities. He admits that working-class women often have sensuous bodies, but criticises their mentality and other mind values. Despite of their sensuousness they are not able to become blood-conscious, like the womanly middle- and upper-class heroines of these novels.

### 6.3 THE WORKING-CLASS HEROES

First in this section I shall concentrate on Paul who is the hero in *Sons and Lovers*. After all, he survives the pressures of three difficult relationships. Scheckner (1985:33) claims that the sexual conflict between Paul and Miriam is a battle between “working-class physicality and sociability – and bourgeois individualism and social elitism”. Paul’s relationship with Miriam is purely spiritual and he soon finds out that he wants more than that. The mind is not enough for him, he also wants the body. In contrast, Paul has also sexual inhibitions like Miriam. “Sometimes, as they were walking together, she slipped her arm timidly into his. But he always resented it ...” (SL224). Paul’s mother sees Miriam as her rival and becomes jealous, which also affects Paul’s decision to leave the girl. So he goes to Clara, who has left her husband, because she felt superior to him. Although Paul finds sexual fulfilment with Clara, he cannot respect her for treating Baxter badly. Their relationship breaks up, too. Mrs Morel finds Clara a better alternative for her son than Miriam, even though Clara is working class like Miriam. Mrs Morel’s attitude in this matter is not so much the question of class, but of who has the control of her son’s mind. Paul’s physical attraction to Clara doesn’t matter to Mrs Morel, as long as Clara leaves the control of Paul’s mind to his mother. Mrs Morel doesn’t, however, see Clara as a suitable marriage candidate for her son, because Clara is not so respectable (married already to Baxter), by her standards.

Although Paul chooses life at the end of the novel, there are some characteristics in him that show his mother’s influence. Paul felt superior about his home, which his mother had managed to make rather bourgeois. “There was about it now, he [Paul] thought, a certain distinction” (SL244). Paul especially mentions the pictures and the books, for it was the cultural part of the bourgeois world that attracted him. The way to Paul’s heart goes through culture and when Clara buys him a book of verse for birthday, Lawrence writes “This move on the part of Clara brought them into closer intimacy” (SL333). Under the influence of his mother he starts to see the miners as “hateful and common” (SL112) when he is still a child, but later on he changes his mind about the common people.

When working in the surgical appliances factory in Nottingham, Paul also feels superior to the girls who work in there. He would like the girls to respect him and he often bosses them (SL326-327). He gets annoyed when Clara doesn’t

behave humbly towards him. In fact, Paul admits himself that “he doubted slightly that he was showing off” (SL326).

Despite of his mother’s influence, Paul has more blood qualities than mind qualities. In fact, Paul resembles his father in many ways. He is quick tempered, passionate and appreciates people who behave easy and naturally (SL207,230-231). He is skilful in manual work and quick in his movements (SL242). In the second part Lawrence even starts to refer to Paul as Morel, which is the way he addressed Paul’s father in the first part.

Outwardly Paul doesn’t share the healthy, athletic, masculine features of his father, but he is “built like his mother, slightly and rather small” with a “pale” complexion (SL96). Although Paul looks rather pale and bloodless from outside, he feels his blood alive inside of him (SL318) and he admires physical men. The happy working scenes, in the first part of the novel, where the Morel children attend their father’s work at home are, according to Sanders (1973:36), the only times when Paul sees the body of his father as positive. But Sanders’ claim proves not to be true, for later Paul is seen as admiring his father’s muscular body and “smoothness of his sides” (SL250). Paul admires Miriam’s brother, as Birkin admires Gerald in *Women in Love*: “He [Miriam’s brother] continued to work all the time. The back of his neck was sun-red when he bent down, and his fingers that held the brush were thick. Paul watched him sometimes” (SL289).

Paul thinks that the pit is “a wonderful place” (SL167). He likes “the feel of *men* on things, while they’re alive. There’s a feel of men about trucks, because they’ve been handled with men’s hands” (SL167). He is fascinated by the collieries and he even uses them as a subject in his paintings (SL185). He thinks that he is so used to them that he would miss them if he had to live elsewhere (SL384). Paul is also interested in the miners themselves. He saw that the miners had changed from his father’s generation: “Paul was interested in the street and in the colliers with their dogs. Here was a new race of miners” (SL218).

Paul represents individuality when in contact with his mother or Miriam, whereas he represents community when he is with Miriam’s brothers. Scheckner (1985:38) states rightfully that this split between community and individuality is a major theme in *Sons and Lovers* and that it is based on class divisions. Paul’s life values start to show when he comes to the Haggs Farm. It seems that only in the farm Paul could be his natural self (SL198). He enjoyed helping with little tasks in

the farm and joined the “charades and games at evening” (SL283). The farm brings out of him the life qualities he has inherited from his father – love for manual work and for the company of other men.

Paul’s philosophy is: “So long as life’s full, it doesn’t matter whether it’s happy or not. I’m afraid your [his mother’s] happiness would bore me” (SL316). Paul means the bourgeois orderly and easy way of life, which she offers him. Paul says to her: “say rather you want me *to live* (SL316; emphasis added). The rupture between Paul and his mother is obvious now that he has come to realise that the social status offered by his mother would eventually kill the blood values in him (Scheckner 1985:36). Scheckner (1985:36) claims that this notion became a general theme in Lawrence’s novels as a whole: “the tragedy of life is not in hard work, personal suffering, or the need for struggle; it is in the failure to have lived to one’s fullest potential”.

Paul says to his mother that he prefers to belong to the working class and that the difference between people is not in their class, education or in their manners, but in what they really are inside. He often yearns to be a simple, stupid working-man, like those that worked in his home valley in the collieries (SL131). And yet, as a contrast, Lawrence expresses even more frequently Paul’s wish to become an artist. Paul’s mother isn’t able to understand her son and insists on his marrying someone from the middle class, but Paul refuses “to love ... a girl ... just because she was his social superior” (SL315). Mrs Morel has tried to pull Paul away from the contact with working-class people and influence and succeeded in making him alienated from this class and even from his father. On the other hand, Paul is also able to resist his mother. Scheckner (1985:26) thinks this resistance reflects Lawrence’s recognition of the vitality, passion and other blood values connected to his father’s class. Consequently, in the second part, Paul is attracted by Baxter Dawes (a factory worker) and they become close friends. It is a tragedy of *Sons and Lovers* that Paul is never able to re-establish a bond with his father.

Paul’s sympathy flows between two social classes. Because the rest of the community doesn’t share his idea about the insignificance of class and the compatibility of body with mind, he has to live in two separate worlds. He may travel to the seaside with his more middle-class-minded friends (SL225) or he may spend enjoyable days on the Willey Farm with Miriam’s brothers (SL282)

who have resisted embourgeoisement. Sanders (1973:31) claims that Paul is a “declassed artist”, but Scheckner (1985:38) argues that none of the heroes in Lawrence’s novels leads a particularly “declassed life”. I’m prone to agree with Scheckner on this, because being declassed in a society like the British is impossible in practise. Besides, Paul chooses to stay with the working class at the end of the novel. Scheckner (1985:39) also claims that, unlike Paul, the heroes that come after him accept social isolation as the means to remain individuals and live according to their blood values. But can they really escape society? Moreover, are they really representatives of blood values if they live apart of the social community?

Paul is clearly searching for a balance between the mind and the body, and he has come to the conclusion that the life values (or feelings, as he says) come from the working class, whereas the mind values (the ideas) come from the middle class (SL314-315). He has contradictory feelings, because in both classes he finds both good and bad. He wants the warmth and passion of the common people, but often escapes physical labour, which he both hates and loves, to the world of bourgeois culture (Scheckner 1985:35). Therefore Paul reaches out towards the working class for the life values (companionship, feelings, masculinity, sexuality, sensuousness). However, Paul wants to become a painter. Consequently, what pursues him to become middle class is the cultural sophistication of this class (literature, music, arts). At the end of the novel he is seen as pondering his relationship with the working-class when sitting in an inn: “There was something between him and them. He could not get into touch. He did not want them; he did not want his drink. Turning abruptly, he went out ... There was nowhere to go ... turning blindly, he went in and drank” ... (SL484). This is, in my opinion, the point where Paul finally chooses life and community (working class) instead of mind values and individualism (middle class).

The life values are the winner in *Sons and Lovers*. Although Paul loves his mother deeply, he persists in going his own way, knowing all the time that his mother suffers from this. Scheckner (1985:39-40) brings up that Paul is, in fact, the only hero or heroine in Lawrence’s novels who chooses the struggle through “communal life” and “social responsibility” instead of isolation from the rest of the society. “But no, he would not give in. Turning sharply, he walked towards the city’s gold phosphorescence ... He would not take that direction, to the darkness,

to follow her [his mother]. He walked towards the faintly humming, glowing town, quickly” (SL492).

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Mellors is seen through Connie's eyes and her observations of him are similar to how Paul is featured in *Sons and Lovers* and Birkin in *Women in Love*. Namely, she thinks that he has “an inward, not an outward strength in” his “delicate fine body” (LC218). He has a “slim back”, “slender white arms” and “slender, sensitive loins” (LC69,92). He is “tall and lean”, “frail and quenched” and he “looked thin and ill” (LC49,51,118). Yet, he was also soldierly, “fearless”, “sure of himself”, “full of vitality”, “warm and kind”, “impatient and passionate”, “sane and wholesome” and manly in a delicate way (LC49-51,70,92,118,218). His manner was “easy and good” and his movements swift and soft (LC49,70). Connie can see how much more alive he is, compared to herself, for she notices the beauty and the vitality of his body and she says there is a “flame of ... life” in him (LC69).

Because Mellors always seems to be self-assured and in command of the situation, which cannot be said about Clifford, Clifford accuses him of being a snob. He believes it was difficult for Mellors after the war to “get back to his own level [class]” (LC95). Mellors treated Connie with “protective authority” (LC91) and he is able always to remain calm, even when he is insulted by Clifford or any other upper-class person. I think Mellors feels so self-assured because he already has gained a balance between body and mind. The other heroes, Paul and Birkin, are still looking for equilibrium and thus there is a certain instability in them. Sanders (1973:193) also argues that Lawrence has wanted to make Mellors a character in whom the body and the mind are already in balance.

Mellors has many characteristics that make him appear as a classless character, although he in practice belongs to the working class because he is a game keeper. For example, when we look at his background before he became a game keeper, he had already worked as a blacksmith, clerk and an officer's servant. In fact, Sanders (1973:180) suggests that Mellors' return to the working class is not a very plausible development in the plot of this novel.

Also Scheckner (1985:168) wonders about the compatibility of Mellors' blood-consciousness with his intellectualism. Although Mellors is a game keeper, Connie notices at once his gentlemanly conduct, the way he bows and speaks standard English (LC49-50). Once when she is visiting Mellors in his cottage she

finds a few books from his bedroom, which make her exclaim in her mind that “So! He was a reader after all” (LC221). On the other hand, as Sanders (1973:175) states, Connie is similarly a little apart from the upper class to which she belongs. In this way, Sanders (1973:181) argues, Lawrence eliminates the more striking class differences between the hero and the heroine and tries to make it more plausible that they fall in love. I’m not sure if Lawrence consciously aimed at this. Mellors is the natural aristocrat. Connie’s sister Hilda notices the way Mellors shifts from standard English to dialect and thinks that he is not a “simple working man” but “acting” as if he was one (LC254). Hilda “could not help realising that he was instinctively much more delicate and well-bred than herself” (LC255). Similarly, Connie thinks he has “a native breeding which was ... much nicer than the cut-to-pattern class thing” (LC285), i.e. Mellors’ behaviour is intrinsic, not shaped by society and its values or class standards. That is why Mellors behaves neither like a common man nor like an upper-class man, but he changes his behaviour according to the way he happens to feel at the moment. This proves ultimately that Lawrence’s aim was to bring blood and mind into balance (cultured gentleman who acts instinctively) and to disregard class distinctions (a character seen as classless).

Mellors suffers from class-consciousness like the characters from other classes in this novel. Typically, like many working-class characters in Lawrence’s novels, Mellors is always on his guard when he is among his superiors in wealth. Mellors is usually able to forget Connie’s class background and take her as a female, but when he feels threatened by her supposed class values, he becomes class-conscious and speaks mockingly to her and there is a “look of derision” in his eyes (LC71). In these scenes Mellors feels that Connie is using her superior class position to force him into her will. Mellors also becomes class-conscious when he starts to fear all the complications his affair with Connie might bring along. He primarily refers to the difficulties that their different class background might cause. He says to Connie “Think what if folks find out – Sir Clifford an’ a’ – an’ everybody talkin’ – “ (LC129). He goes on “You’ve got to remember your Ladyship is carrying on with a game keeper. It’s not as if I was a gentleman” (LC129-130).

Mellors disliked all the classes. He doesn’t want the upper classes to handle him “with their unpleasant cold minds” (LC233). In the working class he

had found “a pettiness and vulgarity of manner extremely distasteful” (LC147). In fact, Mellors wants to get away from “all human contact” (LC92), for he found people from all classes too mind-conscious. He finds other people make his life too complicated (LC123), because they won’t let him live as he likes. However, Mellors is a realist and knows that “the rest of the world “won’t disappear” (LC221). Sanders (1973:204) claims that Connie and Mellors resemble Ursula and Birkin, the heroine and hero of *Women in Love*, in that they wish to break all ties to the society. This is what they hope for, but in my opinion, however, they in practice separate only from their former spouses.

Mellors’ isolation is turned into a life value compared to the individualism that resulted in loneliness in *Sons and Lovers*. Community and life do not belong together like they did in *Sons and Lovers*. Connie saw the “impersonal look in his eyes (LC49), and that he was a “curious, quick, separate fellow” (LC50). He had at once the “look of suffering and detachment” (LC50). Connie thinks that “Perhaps only people who are capable of real togetherness have that look of being alone in the universe” (LC 282). On the other hand, she also thinks that Mellors’ isolation proves that even he may not be able to start the revolution of life, for there “was no fellowship left” in him (LC160). Scheckner (1985:143) brings up the fact that Mellors feels oppressed by both society and isolation. Scheckner (1985:165) also questions Mellors’ value as a hero, because, in his opinion, a hero cannot be isolated from “the masses they represent.”

Mellors hates machines and materialism. He cannot fix Clifford’s wheelchair and admits that “I know nothing at all about these mechanical things “ (LC195). Mellors thinks that money and class go hand in hand, which makes him hate class (LC287). He doesn’t want to live for money, so he suggests to Connie that they should “drop the whole industrial life an’ go back” (LC228). This probably means going back to nature and earn one’s living by some manual labour, like farming.

Mellors has respect for manual work. The reasons why he came back to his own class were perhaps the need to do manual work (but not factory work) and the expectation of finding life values among these people. Mellors doesn’t want to become a mere “hanger-on” (LC148) with Connie, the idleness of the upper classes doesn’t appeal to him. He finds the same kind of pleasure in work, as Morel does. When Connie and Mellors are pushing Clifford’s wheelchair

together they feel that “this bit of work together had brought them much closer” (LC200). Manual work along with sex and tenderness, according to Mellors, make human beings healthy and wholesome. These are missing from Clifford’s life and he does go insane at the end of the novel.

Mellors has a clear picture of how people should live if they wanted to feel really alive. They should dress up more merrily, for example wear “scarlet trousers” (LC312), they should “dance”, they should enjoy their nakedness and handsomeness and they should do manual work, for example “carve the stools .. and embroider their own emblems” (LC312). Men and women should amuse each other, instead of going out for example to the cinema or to the restaurants, which are artificial amusements. In this novel, like in *Women in Love*, men’s legs are the sign of blood-consciousness in them. He thinks men have spoilt their bodies with working mechanically for money. He says they move clumsily and their bodies are ugly (LC228). He says that “if men had red, fine legs ... they’d begin to be men again ... “ and “ the women ‘ud begin to be women” (LC229).

Mellors is supposed to represent silence, which is a blood value and Clifford is supposed to represent language and thought, according to Sanders’(1973) division of the different values. However, Sanders (1973:193) argues that Mellors, like Clifford, has the habit of translating “life” into speech. Indeed, Mellors sometimes seems to preach the life values more than put them in practice himself. Does he himself, for example, wear bright coloured clothes, which he suggests the working-class men should wear if they “learned to live in handsomeness”?

Mellors preaches about warm-heartedness, but he often appears to be rather unfeeling, insensitive himself. For example, he doesn’t seem to care much about his child or about the child he is going to have with Connie. Once when Connie is walking in the forest, she hears someone “ill-treating a child” (LC61). It was Mellors who shot a cat in front of his little daughter. The girl starts crying and he shouts at her “callously” : “Ah, shut it up, tha false little bitch!” (LC61). Mellors often acts cold-heartedly towards Connie as well. Once when they had had disagreement about something, Connie thought he became “distant in recoil as the cold pole” and concludes that “Men were all alike” (LC215), i.e. Mellors. seems as unfeeling as Clifford and the rest.

Mellors claims that “the only way to solve the industrial problem” is to train the people to “live in handsomeness, without needing to spend” (LC312). He implies among other things that sex and tenderness between men and women will save the world, rather than any other kind of revolution. For Mellors, the highest aim in life is to have the right kind of relationship with a woman and in Connie Mellors has, finally, found a woman “who’d ... come naturally with a man” (LC212). This is undeniably what Paul is after in *Sons and Lovers*. Thus Mellors would give Connie what Clifford wasn’t able to give her, which is something “invisible”, intrinsic (LC288). He means the courage to be naturally tender to each other and to be physically aware of each other, which will make a man manly and a woman womanly (LC288-289). This philosophy of the “democracy of touch” seems to be a more concrete matter than the relationship Birkin wanted with Ursula, or perhaps Lawrence just wants to put the idea of the blood-conscious lovemaking more plainly in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.

Sanders (1973:195) doubts if Lawrence really believed in the socially regenerative power of sex, because it is so utopian and, furthermore, as he didn’t really give any clues how this regeneration would happen in practice. Scheckner (1985:13) also thinks that blood-conscious sex is no answer to a political crisis, to the industrial problem. Furthermore, Scheckner (1985:165) points out that Mellors’ idea about sex that will bring back the bond between classes is hardly plausible after Lawrence has emphasised in his description the separation of Wragby and its upper-class occupants from the village and the common people. Scheckner (1985:161) argues that Lawrence didn’t want tenderness between all people, because Connie and Mellors shut themselves away from the rest of the society and regard other people as “intruders”. Holderness (1982:226-227), like Sanders (1973) and Scheckner (1985), claims that the relationship between Connie and Mellors is only a “symbolic reconciliation of real contradictions”. I agree with the critics that Lawrence fails to bring the classes closer together in this novel. However, he undoubtedly regarded class as the enemy of life values.

There is the same kind of awakening of blood-conscious love between Connie and Mellors as there was between Ursula and Birkin. The first time Mellors comes close to Connie, he feels a “compassion flamed in his bowels for her” (LC120). At this moment he feels his life begins anew for him after a long dead period. When they make love he feels her “penetrating beauty ... passing

into his blood" (LC180). Mellors is the Saviour, for he saves Connie from the upper classes, giving her "a sense of freedom and life" (LC276), like Birkin saves Ursula from the middle classes.

Mellors seems often more reserved and afraid of the world than spontaneous. However, when sex is concerned, Mellors is able to act without "shame" (LC258) or reserve. Lawrence wants to say that there is nothing to be ashamed of in nakedness, for sex is "a natural and vital thing" (LC276).

Through Paul and Mellors, Lawrence wanted to express his own philosophies of life. They are the representatives of Lawrence's idea of blood-conscious human beings. However, they are both cultured, which leads to the conclusion that an ideal human being, from Lawrence's point of view, would be declassed and one that has the blood and the mind in balance. However, they both decide to lead a working-class style of life and, furthermore, Lawrence doesn't always represent the blood-consciousness of these characters very convincingly. For example, Paul shows a lack of spontaneity and often feels superior to other working-class people, and Mellors is often insensitive and doesn't want community with other people, not even with the working-class people. So, both heroes have contradictory feelings towards the class they come from.

## 7 THE MIDDLE CLASS

There is no straightforward criticism of bourgeois society in *Sons and Lovers* and there are no middle-class major characters or no description of middle-class life. However, the middle-class values play an important role in this novel. I agree with the critics that the conflicts between characters are social even they appear at first to be psychological. Sanders (1985:53) claims that already in *Sons and Lovers* the basis was laid for later criticism of the bourgeoisie, although the bourgeoisie is not present as a class in this novel. Also, according to Holderness (vuosi:147), Lawrence's dismissal of this class in *Sons and Lovers* was deliberate and shows his negative attitude to this class, and Lawrence's attitude towards middle-class individualism is more disapproving in this novel than in the other two novels that I shall deal with here.

In *Women in Love* the sisters and Birkin, although themselves middle-class, criticise the bourgeois society. They want all to find an alternative way of living. They don't care for marriage, social status, permanent home, children, regular work and the routines of everyday life. Ursula and Gudrun do not respect their parents' way of life. Gudrun asks: "When I think of their lives ... their love, and their marriage, and all of us children, and our bringing-up – would you have such a life. Prune [Ursula]?" Ursula answers: "I wouldn't ... It all seems so *nothing* – their two lives – there's no meaning in it. Really, if they had *not* met, and *not* married, and not lived together – it wouldn't have mattered" (WL424; emphasis in the original).

There are practically no middle-class characters in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, but this class is criticised along with the rest of the society. According to Tommy Dukes, a preacher of Lawrence's ideas in this novel, being bourgeois means capitalism, individualism, feelings and emotions (LC40). Mellors, Lawrence's major alter ego, thinks that the middle-class people are "priggish and half-balled and narrow-gutted" and "ladylike" (LC226), but goes on to blame all the society, "intellectuals, artists, government, industrialists and workers" (LC227) for "killing off the last human feeling" and "intuition" (LC227). He finds in the middle and upper classes "a curious rubber-necked toughness and unlivingness" (LC147), but speaks as critically about his own class as well.

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Lawrence says especially about the middle class that its members dared to enjoy their lives as far as they didn't have to risk anything (LC269). Their lives were "solid", "substantial", but "boring" (LC269). They wanted to find their daughters wealthy husbands (LC269) and they admired the upper-class way of life (LC167). Connie says about the middle classes that they "treasure up every one of your [Clifford's] pictures in the illustrated papers, and probably pray for you every night" (LC167).

## 7.1 MIDDLE-CLASS MEN AND VALUES OF THE BLOOD

Although Lawrence has a critical attitude towards bourgeois society, he has not portrayed any middle-class male characters with mind values in these three novels. The only middle-class male character in *Women in Love* is Birkin, but he represents the blood values like the only noteworthy middle-class character in

*Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Connie's father. Connie often compares him to Clifford. Where Clifford lacked warmth, her father "could be warm to her" like a man "who did himself well ... but who still could comfort a woman with a bit of his masculine glow" (LC75). When she gets angry at Clifford she exclaims "Why, my father is ten times the human being you are" (LC201). In appearance he was "stout" and "handsome" and his thighs were of a "man who had taken his pleasure in life" (LC265). He was also a very sensual man (LC265).

## 7.2 MIDDLE-CLASS WOMEN AND VALUES OF THE MIND

As for women, the only middle-class female character with life values is Ursula, the heroine of *Women in Love*. All the other female characters, who are scarce, represent the mind values. In *Sons and Lovers* there is one minor middle-class female character, namely, William's girlfriend. The description of her is not favourable to the middle class. It is ironic that when Mrs Morel's son eventually fulfils his mother's wish and finds a middle-class wife candidate, this "lady" proves to be a total idiot. When visiting the Morels for the first time, the Morels find out that she is a snob whose only interests in life are parties and dressing up in fine clothes (SL159). She has "never read a book in her life" and "she could understand nothing but lovemaking and chatter" (SL175). William knows how shallow she really is and now that he has been in contact with the bourgeois people more, he realises that "they don't seem to have the same principles" as the working-class people have (SL162). She considers the working-class people as "clownish" creatures, the servant class (SL161). It is ironic that she seems to share a lot with Mr Morel because of her sociability and lack of cultural sophistication.

Gudrun, in *Women in Love*, doesn't know what she really wants, so she often contradicts herself. She doesn't know if she wants to climb in the social scale or if she wants to be free from the communal strains and if she wants a man to be masculine or intellectual. Her relationship with Gerald is full of contradictions. She is akin to Gerald, for "they were of the same kind" (WL145). She herself admits that she has a "sense of power and of inexpressible destructiveness, and of fatal half-heartedness" (WL141). She admires Gerald's "superhuman" instrumentality and she is tempted to use him as her tool (WL472). However, when Gerald once acts brutally towards his horse, Gudrun hates him for

using his mechanical will against a living creature (SL435,169). She believes that staying with Gerald would also for her mean total subordination and self-abandonment under his will. She decides not to submit herself to Gerald's power and to be the one to fill his emptiness, but to remain a free individual. She often compares Gerald's love to the love of the colliers, who have become mechanical like their masters, but she feels that his embrace was even stronger and more deathly than theirs (WL377).

Ultimately, Gudrun then chooses freedom instead of marriage with Gerald. She finds the life he represents to be monotonous and "meaningless", for having a home and a servant, owning things, belonging to a certain class and associating oneself with certain social circles seems deadly boring to her (WL523-524). Gudrun also criticises Gerald for his over-exaggerated masculinity, for his mechanical behaviour and lack of intelligence (WL522-523). Her decision to leave Gerald is easy after she meets a German sculptor, who is her spiritual mate. With this man Gudrun escapes to the inner world, away from the real world and Gerald, for she thinks that in Gerald she had known "the world and had done with it" (WL510). They have a "companionship in intelligence" (WL518). Their relationship seems to be purely platonic, like Paul's and Miriam's. It seems that she rushes from a mind-conscious relationship to another.

Gudrun at first says to Ursula that she doesn't want to escape from the world. And she comes to the conclusion that "the only thing to do with the world, is to see it through" and that it is "really an illusion to think you can get out of it" because "one is of the world if one lives in it" (WL494). Later she, however, turns her back on the world by choosing the German sculptor.

Gudrun has also contradictory feelings about class. She dislikes the idea of climbing the social ladder, for she "thought with repulsion of the wives and daughters of the pit managers [middle-class], their tennis parties, and their terrible struggles to be superior each to the other, in the social scale" (SL472). She also criticises the working classes for trying to imitate the middle-class way of life (SL472). Similarly, "the meaningless crowd of the Griches [upper-class]" doesn't receive any sympathy from her (SL472). Yet, Gudrun contradicts herself already in the next chapter when she admits that it is the "outside show" that matters, "for inwardly was a bad joke" (SL472-473). By this she means that the social status

and wealthy appearance are important, whereas the intrinsic qualities of human beings don't matter so much.

Gudrun resembles Hermione in that she is materialistic and feels superior to other people. If she ever decides to get married, she would marry a man with "sufficient means" (WL20). At the end of the novel she turns down possible marriage with Gerald, but before she is ready to follow the sculptor, she does so only after she has secured her life financially with him (WL516).

In the artistic circles of London Gudrun had been "a social success" (WL29). She is aware of her superiority over the provincial people of Beldover (WL29) whom she describes as "ghouls" or "aborigines" living in a "dark, uncreated, hostile world" (WL24). She feels an outsider in her home town, like Mrs Morel did in Bestwood, or Connie in Tevershall. Gudrun thinks that the poor people are filthy and would not "dream of approaching them, for foulness" (WL189). It is contradictory that she wants to separate herself from the common women, although she often finds herself walking the streets among them. Gudrun is at the same time fascinated and horrified by the miners and by Beldover. Scheckner (1985:62) says that Gudrun expresses here Lawrence's own attitude to the miners. Like Ursula's, Gudrun's attraction to these men is also sexual, for their "broad dialect was curiously caressing to the blood" (SL138). She enjoys the atmosphere "of physical men ... of labour and maleness" (SL138). Like Gerald, she feels their potency, which is "half-repulsive", because in their potency they are like "strange machines" with no mind at all (SL138).

She doesn't feel superior only to the common people, but, for example, to Birkin as well. Ursula is angry about the way Gudrun treats Birkin: "There he was, summed up, paid for, settled, done with, ... This finality of Gudrun's, this dispatching of people ... in a sentence .. Gudrun is really impudent, insolent making herself the measure of everything" (WL304). Gudrun admires Hermione, because she "makes the most of her privileges" (WL66). She says that if she was in Hermione's position, she would do the same (WL66,187). Gudrun also loathes the same group of people she herself belongs to, namely the bohemians, of whom she exclaims "What a foul crew they were!" (WL432). She is a hypocrite for still going around with them, if she earnestly feels this way.

The people of Beldover are "intimidated" by Gudrun's "perfect *sang-froid* and exclusive bareness of manner" (WL20;emphasis original). This French

term is used of somebody who acts cold-bloodedly and calmly (Bailey2000:98). At the end of the novel Lawrence expresses it explicitly that “Gudrun was cold, a cold woman” (WL535), for she is unfeeling about Gerald’s death. Gudrun ends up in bohemian circles after having a love affair with a working-class and with an upper-class man, but Lawrence makes it clear that she will lead a mental life.

There are only few remarks made especially about middle-class women in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*. In one scene Connie visits a lower middle-class acquaintance of hers who had been a teacher before marrying a farmer, but Connie doesn’t think very highly of her, for she thinks she was “rather a false little thing” (LC135). Connie’s mother had lived a life of suppressed feelings and desires (LC8). Mellors has had some experience of middle-class women, from which basis he considers them too spiritual, romantic, passionless and sexless (LC208-209), like Miriam in *Sons and Lovers*.

Connie’s sister Hilda has all the characteristics that Lawrence would classify as mind values. She is very class-conscious, for she “loathed any ‘lowering’ of oneself, or the family” (LC248). All she can think of Mellors is if he is “presentable” enough (LC251). She, in Clifford’s way, would have welcomed an upper-class lover for Connie, instead of Mellors. She is certain that Connie will come to her senses and says “We must rescue ourselves as best as we can” (LC297). She is very superior about her class and wishes that Mellors “might show that he realized he was being honoured” (LC254) when she and Connie are paying him a visit. She has also got that strong will, the “devil of a will” (LC254) that is typical for mind-conscious women in Lawrence’s novels. She is a cold woman for whom men are there only to be made use of, like entertainment (LC271). Belonging to the middle class, “solid Scotch middle class” (LC248), she valued respectability (LC251), stability (LC248) and “continuity” (LC255) in life, all of which fight against the ideal of spontaneity. She differs from Gudrun who found the middle-class conventional life too boring. Both Gudrun and Hilda are characters whose class-consciousness has killed their life values.

### 7.3 THE MIDDLE-CLASS HERO AND HEROINE

Birkin is the hero of *Women in Love* and the preacher of Lawrence’s philosophies or feelings during the war. He is often mockingly referred to as the Saviour of the

world by the other characters and seems to feel often that way himself, too (WL154,434). He is a middle-class school inspector, but nothing else is said about his background.

Birkin resembles the other heroes, Paul and Mellors. Outwardly Birkin is “pale and ill-looking” and his “figure was narrow but nicely made” (WL33). He has a frail body, but he admires Gerald who has a masculine body. A special feature in Birkin was that he “went with a slight trail of one foot” (WL33) and that he was often ill, which, I think, is a reflection of the fact that he suffered so much from not being able to lead the life he wanted to. Instead of good looks, Birkin has intrinsic strength (WL314). Although Ursula is often critical towards Birkin, she finds him attractive, for “It was in the curves of his brows and his chin, rich, fine, exquisite curves, the powerful beauty of life itself” (WL59) and the warmth that radiated from his eyes (WL186). Gerald can also observe the “warmth and vitality” in Birkin (WL75), his “animal-like spontaneity of detachment” (WL239). Both the sisters find that there is in Birkin “an extraordinary rich spring of life” and that he is genuinely able to “give himself to things” (WL303), which means acting spontaneously.

Lawrence wrote once “My great religion is a belief in the blood, the flesh, as being wiser than the intellect. We can go wrong in our minds. But what our blood feels and believes and says, is always true “ (in Scheckner 1985:42). Scheckner (1985:42) claims that this philosophy is presented more powerfully by Birkin than by any other hero in Lawrence’s novels. Birkin thinks that real passion, sensuality and instincts spring from the blood and thus cannot be consciously observed or deliberately produced by the human will (WL57), the conscious mind. He talks about the blood-knowledge that doesn’t come from the head, but is in the blood (WL57) or of the “phallic cult” that springs from the sun (WL293). He says that love on conscious level is like “pornography – looking yourself in mirrors .. so that you can have it all in your consciousness, make it all mental” (WL57). Birkin detests love and emotionality because they part of the conscious mind. Instead, Birkin wants to meet Ursula on an unconscious inhuman, impersonal level where there is no speech, no obligations, no standards and where they could be impulsive and irresponsible (WL172-173). He doesn’t want any subservience between themselves, but a “balance” where they could both act in singleness “like two poles of one force, like ... two demons” (WL232). This kind

of bond between man and woman or between man and man is ultimately that which will hold the humanity together (WL179), which idea appears also in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. First of all Birkin wants to establish this bond between himself and Ursula. He hopes secretly that this kind of bond could also be possible between him and Gerald, but as Gerald belongs to the ice and snow and not to the sun (WL293), this is not possible.

I said earlier that Birkin was attracted by Gerald's maleness, the degree of which can be seen from a man's legs. Birkin thinks about his friend's legs that they are "white-skinned, full, muscular", "handsome and decided" (WL116). Only on one occasion, when Birkin and Gerald have a friendly wrestling match at Gerald's home in Shortlands, is Birkin able to reach blood-consciousness with Gerald (WL312). He says to Gerald after the fight that being physically close to somebody "makes one sane" (WL313). These kind of scenes in Lawrence's novels are undoubtedly homoerotic, but Lawrence's sexual tendencies are not my concern in this thesis.

Birkin and Ursula, like Mellors and Connie, finally find the state of blood-consciousness together, which process is described with biblical images (WL355-359). Birkin is the "son of God" who gives life to Ursula "the daughter of men" (WL357). Lawrence describes how the passion floods from Birkin's "phallic source", from the thighs and loins, to Ursula and makes her "still and perfect" (WL359). Ursula is seen crouching before Birkin and seeing in him the inhuman "son of God" (WL 358). Birkin also worships Ursula, for she is his "resurrection and his life" (WL419-420).

Ursula represents emotionality and sensuousness, which are qualities often mocked by Birkin, whereas Hermione, Birkin's former lover is extremely mental. Hermione is compared by Birkin to a "perfect Idea" to which all men are supposed to submit, and Ursula to a "perfect Womb" to which all men should come (WL353). Birkin doesn't want to abandon himself to neither of these opposites (mind/body), but wants to remain a free individual (WL353). In their relationships to women Birkin and Paul both go through the fight between the blood and the mind. Birkin tries to balance between the mind and the body and feels himself torn apart between the two. He feels that "This violent and directionless reaction between animalism and spiritual truth would go on in him

till he tore himself in two" (WL340). Other people observe this incongruity in Birkin and say that he is a "chameleon" (WL112).

Birkin hates conventions and conventional people and collective behaviour. He rejects, like the sisters, the idea of conventional institutions like marriage, home and class. He'd rather people could act spontaneously as individuals, instead of acting collectively (WL47,238). He thinks that only superior people are able for this impulsive behaviour (WL47). Furthermore, Birkin thinks that human beings should not be compared, because they are "intrinsically" different and therefore they are unequal in spirit (WL125), because "individual may sometimes be capable of truth, and humanity is a tree of lies" (WL151).

For Birkin, humanity is a "dead tree" that should be replaced by the "real tree of life" (WL150-151). However, he wants himself to behave decently towards other people and show some human sympathy towards those who don't share his kind of knowledge of the blood-consciousness (like Hermione). Lawrence writes that "His nature was clever and separate, he did not fit at all in the conventional occasion. Yet he subordinated himself to the common idea, travestied himself" (WL33). However, Birkin seems to feel himself superior to the other characters in the novel. He believes that there must emerge a man (probably himself), who would "give new values to things" (WL70). Ursula often hates him for this superiority and thinks that he is "a prig of the stiffest type" (WL154). Sometimes Birkin is sceptical of his own ability, or the ability of anyone, to act according to this philosophy. This is why he sometimes wants that the whole of humanity would be destroyed and God would replace man with "a finer created being" (WL539).

One of the main themes of *Women in Love*, according to Scheckner (1985:58), is the rejection of the social world. Many critics (Scheckner 1985, Sanders 1973, Holderness 1982) claim that the escapism of the main characters in *Women in Love* has its origin in Lawrence's wartime experiences (conscription committee, suppression of works, deportation from Cornwall, being under surveillance). Consequently, he stresses the importance of individual freedom in this novel, because his own freedom was threatened during that time. Lawrence ultimately thought of war as the extreme manifestation of bourgeois society (Holderness 1982:209), but the war also awoke in him the "fear and hatred

of the masses” (Sanders 1973:109). The war made him pessimistic about class struggle and democracy (Scheckner 1985:58). On the other hand, Lawrence at first also welcomed war as the power that would destroy the old order of society (Sanders 1973:114-116), which would make it then possible for some natural aristocrat to plant blood values to society.

While Paul wanted to seek rescue from communal life, Birkin wants to say goodbye to the world and to the humanity. He often feels there is no real life left in the relationships between people and that the human being is perhaps able to find blood-consciousness only in nature. In reality this means that he and Ursula will leave their posts in the school and live like vagabonds without home or relatives (WL360), as free souls. He doesn't want to “inherit anything” (WL412), but be a new classless individual with no bond to his parents or to the social order. But the lovers are unable to find a satisfactory life in the isolated place in which they end up, the Austrian Alps (Scheckner 1985:68), because Birkin is still not completely happy about his relationship with Ursula, for he desires a similar bond with a man. Birkin wants some kind of community with other people besides Ursula, a kind of “further fellowship” (WL412) with a man or with “a few other people” (WL361). He probably means that this community would still live in isolation from the rest of the mankind, like Lawrence's Rananim. So, the bonds that Birkin would bind would still happen outside the rest of the society “in perfect isolated darkness, outside the world” (WL376). It is also strange that he wants to establish an intimate friendship with Gerald who represents mind values.

Scheckner (1985:68-69) claims that Lawrence has no other alternative to offer to his hero and heroine than endless flight, and that none of the main characters is able to give a better alternative of how to live than what the society already offers. In *Sons and Lovers*, as comparison, Paul goes back to the community with other people and so is saved from the deathly individualism. Birkin resembles Paul in that he thinks that people should not be obsessed by the idea of happiness, but going through hardships is what real life is all about (WL347). This belief conflicts with his urge to escape the social reality.

Birkin criticises the materialism of people in all classes. He says that people nowadays only work to gain material values like the collier's “pianoforte”, an “up-to-date house” with a servant or an evening on the Ritz (WL71). The

inconsistency is that Birkin himself has a secure income that exceeds many times the average income of a working man, but he still has the guts to denounce the working class possessions. Birkin claims that in the old times people were not materialistic (WL405), a claim he is unable to substantiate. He says that after people have gained everything materially, there is nothing left for them (WL72). This is what happens to Gerald after he has made the mines as profitable as possible. Birkin says that it would be good if the world's prosperity would be distributed evenly among the people, so that they would stop grumbling and start finally living according to the life values (WL125).

Scheckner is right to claim (1985:60) that Birkin is a sort of antihero of Lawrence in that he is a "cultured intellectual" from the middle class, but at the same time he criticises the class he comes from and its values ( culture, education, reason, science, intellectualism, materialism, self-consciousness etc). For after all, regarding his educational background and income of four hundred pounds a year, he can be said to belong to the well-to-do and better educated part of society. So, Birkin cannot be counted as a classless individual. Lawrence writes that the bohemians, i.e. "Painters, musicians, writers – hangers-on, models, advanced young people", are unconventional, classless and free (WL76). In contrast, Lawrence gives an unfavourable description of bohemian life in *Women in Love*, which comprises mostly drinking and talking a lot of nonsense (WL446,434). I wonder if Ursula and Birkin are part of this bohemia at the end of the novel, because they also desire to be unconventional and classless.

Birkin is a very contradictory character. Ursula often thinks so (WL336), although she in the end accepts his ideas. Feelings are one of the blood values in *Sons and Lovers*, but in *Women in Love* they have been graded down in the scale and included in the mind values, i.e. feelings and emotions come from the conscious mind. Ursula can't understand why Birkin hates feelings and emotions so much (WL337). Birkin's spontaneity is also debatable. He regrets his years with Hermione, but still wants to behave decently towards her, although he is really annoyed with her. Thus he doesn't act impulsively in his relationship with Hermione. She, however, shows much more spontaneity by hitting Birkin with a paper weight after she realises that he is going to leave her. Ursula can also see some falsity in Birkin's supposed spontaneity, for she thinks that Birkin is not able to literally let himself "go", but he seems to her more like a stiff "Sunday

school teacher” (WL290). At first Ursula includes Birkin with the same sort of people as Hermione, for she felt in them “ruthless mental pressure ... destructive mentality” (WL110-111). Ursula often feels like an outsider when she is with Birkin and Hermione and implies that there is still a bond between them and that they are both shallow (WL342). Birkin admits that Ursula is right about him, for “He knew he was perverse, so spiritual on the one hand, and in some strange way, degraded on the other” (WL352). It is also Birkin’s superior attitude (he is a snob) that casts doubts about his total devotion to life values as a whole.

Ursula, the heroine of *Women in Love*, is physical and emotional. “Ursula was more physical, more womanly” (WL102) than her sister. In Hermione’s opinion Ursula “could never be more than the usual jealous and unreasonable female, with ... powerful female emotion, female attraction .. but no mind” (WL340). Ursula is fascinated by the common people. She is attracted by the young working-class man whom she and Birkin meet at the market place, for he is sexually appealing to her. She thinks “He would be a dreadful, but wonderful lover ... His legs would be marvellously subtle and alive” (WL407). It is inconsistent that Ursula is fascinated by masculine working-class men, but still chooses Birkin who is the opposite.

Ursula can’t stand anymore the “routine and mechanical nullity” of her life (WL224-225). She feels cut off from reality, because she doesn’t feel alive. She thinks that death is the only way to new life, for the humanity could not interfere with death (WL224-225). Here she is already under Birkin’s influence and repeats his ideas.

Ursula becomes Birkin’s disciple, although she at first feels antagonistic towards him (WL348). Later in the novel Lawrence describes how, when they are making love, Ursula is figuratively born out of Birkin’s loins (WL359). Together Ursula and Birkin are able to reach blood-consciousness that “can never be transmuted into mind content” (WL365). Ursula agrees with Birkin that she doesn’t want “the old connection with the world – father and the rest ... and all that it means, England and the world of thought” (WL493). She was free, “she was herself ... she belonged only to the oneness with Birkin” (WL463). She considers herself as an individual without class ties, but as I have shown, hers and Birkin’s classlessness is not realistic.

Ursula is the heroine of this novel, for she is able to find blood-consciousness. However, she can only achieve it through a man like Birkin. She can be compared to Connie in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Both have the courage to start living their life at full leaving all their former obligations. In both cases, however, their abandonment happens rather ruthlessly. Their behaviour towards their parents or former husbands is rather insensitive and superior, which makes a flaw to their heroism. Scheckner (1985:59) also admits that Ursula is indisputably a heroine of *Women in Love*, "a social rebel", but because her rebelliousness leads to social isolation and extreme individualism, it leads nowhere.

Birkin is a similar hero to Paul and Mellors. He has problematic relationships with women, he is a rather lonely figure and he represents Lawrence's idea of a blood-conscious person, even though he comes from the middle class. Birkin is, however, often disappointed with himself, as he often finds himself acting mind-consciously. Accordingly, his blood-consciousness is not very convincing. Ursula is very womanly, whereas Birkin is not at all masculine in the way that was characteristic of men in *Sons and Lovers*. Ursula is the heroine, because she is womanly and hasn't got the strong will that is typical of mind-conscious women. But Lawrence makes it clear that she can become blood-conscious only through Birkin. The individualism of the hero and heroine in *Women in Love* is not something that Lawrence first considered as a life value in *Sons and Lovers*. Masculinity, community and the physical world altogether are not part of the blood values in *Women in Love*, for they belong to the conscious world. This novel puts more stress on what happens inside one's head. Even sex is something that should happen on an unconscious level. Consequently, Lawrence has a different idea of blood-consciousness in *Women in Love* compared to the former novel, and he has also chosen a middle-class hero and heroine to represent blood values.

## 8 THE UPPER CLASS

The aristocracy is not present in *Sons and Lovers*. Lawrence's himself was acquainted with the upper class more closely by the time he wrote *Women in Love* and that is why the aristocracy has yet no important role in his earlier work (Salgado 1982:73-74).

In *Women in Love* there are scenes where Lawrence describes the upper-class way of life. It is extravagant and luxurious and comfortable outwardly, but Lawrence criticises especially the cold mentality, hypocrisy and reserve of the upper classes. In Birkin's view they are like the figures in chess playing their mental game (WL119). The aristocracy has the appearance of the 18<sup>th</sup> century (WL110) and Lawrence wants to show how conservative they still are.

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the theme of isolation, as well as separating the classes, works inside the upper class as well. One of Connie's upper-class lovers had no "contact with his surroundings" (LC26) and he was "anti-social" (LC30). Connie's life in Wragby is a life without "contact" and "touch" (LC20). Clifford's aristocratic and other upper-class acquaintances and relatives lived in the world of "ideas" and "books" (LC21) and had no "warmth of feeling" (LC18). She despises the way Clifford and his acquaintances "take one in, with their manners and their mock wistfulness and gentleness" and concludes that they've "got about as much feeling as celluloid has" (LC202).

Lawrence writes that the aristocracy in general felt anxious about its position and alienated from the rest of the society, from the middle and lower classes (LC10). In those days the aristocracy was still highly privileged, the Conservative Party being in power, but it already felt the rise of the working class and the vast increase of the middle-class population as threats. Connie has also noticed how little the rule of the aristocracy was based on, for she thinks "their rule was really a farce" (LC75), although she herself belongs to the aristocracy now that she is married to Clifford.

On the other hand, contradictorily, Connie laments about the abandonment of many of the old aristocratic homes, as well as about the countryside turning to mining districts (LC162-163). This is how Lawrence felt, too. According to Moore (1974:412), Lawrence was seldom critical about the aristocracy, but he hated the bourgeoisie. However, Mellors' opinion of the upper

class is the same as of the middle class. He refers to their (upper class and middle class) “toughness and unlivingness” (LC147). He says the ruling classes are impudent, because they have money or an aristocratic breeding (LC287).

## **8.1 THE UPPER-CLASS MEN**

### **8.1.1 THE BLOOD**

In *Women in Love* Gerald's father, the mine owner, is dying of cancer. Earlier, when he was still well and in command of the mines, his leadership principles were quite different from his son's. He represents paternalism, which is a blood value and characteristic of the older generation of mine owners in Lawrence's novels. Lawrence clearly romanticised these men in his novels.

Most of all Lawrence stresses Mr Grich's great capacity for sympathy towards other people. Mr Grich felt respect for his working men and he saw it as his responsibility to look after the welfare of the men and their families (WL249). So he was kind to everybody who asked for his help and did a lot of charity. When the poor came to ask for his help he was very paternal towards them: “What's amiss then, Gittens [one of the miners] How is your Missis?”, he would ask them (WL251). The working-class people respected him and considered him as a “nice and kind” gentleman (WL245).

The war between the owners and the labourers “broke his heart” and put him into a contradictory position, for he had “wanted his industry to be run on love” (WL259). He felt chagrined, because the workers were against him, although all he wanted was to “be a father of loving kindness and sacrificial benevolence” (WL262). I think that, despite this, he could never have given up his position and wealth for the poor, which Lawrence seems to take for granted. In Lawrence's novels, to have blood values doesn't mean that you have to be poor and socially inferior to others.

Mr Grich lost his vitality over the years, in consequence of the mutually destructive relationship between himself and his wife (WL253). She represented the money values, whereas he represented the life values. In spite of the hardships in his life, he still believed, on his deathbed, in the life values (WL265), in love and charity (WL253), and in the “human relationships” (WL325), instead of

isolation and individualism. This all he could manifest through his love for his youngest daughter who seems to have the same kind of blood-consciousness as Birkin has. Birkin's philosophy of the blood-consciousness and Mr Grich's life values are a different matter. Birkin's blood-consciousness is a sexual/psychological experience that he shares with some one else. Mr Grich's life values, in turn, come up in the way he acts towards other people and in his passionate nature.

Gerald is the opposite of his father's as far as running the mines is concerned, but there are also some life qualities in him. He is often tender (WL253) and warm and able to show unconditional love (WL243), especially in his relationship with Birkin. Outwardly he is "handsome", energetic and physically strong (WL234). It seems that, unlike in *Sons and Lovers*, a healthy and handsome body is a sign of mind qualities in a person in *Women in Love*, for in order to work mechanically well one has to have a good health and a strong body. Birkin, who is blood-conscious, has a frail body and is often ill.

Another mine owner in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is similar to Mr Grich in *Women in Love*, but he is only briefly introduced. He is the paternal and generous "gentleman owner" (LC163-164) who cared about the miners' welfare. The new generation of miners, being more materialistic than their fathers, despised him for his position and wealth, which made him feel "a little in the wrong, for having all the advantages" (LC165). The only solution for him was to move elsewhere, away from the cold stares of the colliers.

### 8.1.2 THE MIND

Gerald Grich is the embodiment of mind values in *Women in Love*. Blood-consciousness is something intrinsic that cannot be observed from outside, so Birkin looks rather frail and pale. Gerald, in turn, is hollow inside, but his "externals" are enviable: "riches", "social standing" and "handsome physique" (WL509). He is fair-haired, "sun-tanned", tall, "well-made", masculine (WL27), "good-looking", "healthy", energetic, "erect and complete" (WL36), "manly", "soldierly" (WL75), "attractive" (WL77) and physically strong (WL234). He is compared to a wolf, because he has a "guarded look", "northern" purity and glisten about him, "stillness in his bearing" (WL27) and "cold light" in his eyes

(WL77). He is always well and rather formally and conventionally dressed (WL27,234). "Social standing" (WL242) is important to him and that is why he doesn't approve of Birkin's philosophy of "intrinsic personal superiority" (WL242).

Like Hermione, Gerald has a strong will, which he exercises over animals, over his workmen and over women. There are scenes where he is seen treating animals brutally, subjugating them under his will. For example, when he forces his horse to stand still by a passing train (WL133). In these scenes the mind literally crushes the body.

Gerald doesn't care about charity (WL253), equality and "love and self-sacrifice" (WL263). His only ambition is to maximize the profits that come from the mines. He does care about "position and authority" (WL262), for they give him the right to exercise his will over his inferiors and make it possible for him to effectuate reform in the mines. Reform means cutting down the expenditure by discharging many of the older workmen "as so much lumber" and replacing them with educated experts; by installing new machinery; and by using more scientific methods (WL264-266). Lawrence writes that "all the control was taken out of the hands of the miners" (WL266). Gerald could now subjugate the machines and the men to his power and become "the God of the machine" (WL257). There is, as Sanders (1973:49) points out, a functional division between body (miners) and mind (managers), which was for Lawrence the basic difference between the owners and the labour. Gerald doesn't care what his workmen think of him (WL257) or if they suffer or what they feel as individuals (WL257). Their "goodness" depends on how they do their work i.e. how they function as parts of the machine (WL257). To describe the new order Gerald created in the mines, Lawrence uses such expressions as "mind of man", "inhuman principle", "perfect machine", "pure order", "pure mechanical repetition" (WL263), "the substitution of the mechanical principle for the organic" (WL266).

Profit, for Gerald, is only important as a sign of victory of the mind (WL258). In Gerald's case the victory of the mind is complete. Now that the mines are functioning perfectly, there is nothing left for him to do. His life being meaningless he feels emptiness inside of him. Lawrence writes that "his centres of feeling were drying up", "the very middle of him were a vacuum" (WL268), he

was “emptily restless, utterly hollow” (WL306) and that he was forced to face “the ultimate experience of his own nothingness” (WL385).

Gerald needs Gudrun to fill the void inside of him, but as Gudrun also has a strong will, there begins a battle of wills between them. Gudrun feels that if she would accept marriage with Gerald, he would eventually suck all life out of her and she would be left dead inside. Every time they make love “she was passed away and gone in him, and he was perfected” (WL378). Gudrun’s and Gerald’s relationship is different from Ursula’s and Birkin’s, for Ursula and Birkin are able to give each other more life, instead of subjugating each other. At first Gudrun admired Gerald’s instrumentality and potentiality (WL471), but at the end she thinks that Gerald is like a “self-satisfied lamp-post” (WL523). Gudrun leaves Gerald, which leads to Gerald’s death, for now he has lost his only source of life, having none of it left inside of him.

Lawrence gives the impression that if Gerald had accepted the blood-conscious bond with Birkin, he would have probably been saved, but there was in Gerald “a numbness ... of atrophy” (WL402) and he turns Birkin’s offer of relationship down. When Birkin looks at Gerald’s dead body, he sees “this last terrible look of cold, mute Matter” (WL541). Lawrence makes the point that mind-consciousness leads to death, whereas blood-consciousness is a way to new life. William in *Sons and Lovers* and Clifford in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* are also destroyed by mind-consciousness.

Clifford, in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, looks “ruddy” and “healthy” with “broad and strong” shoulders (LC6). His eyes have a “cheerful”, “watchful” look with “the slight vacancy of a cripple” (LC6). In Gerald’s way he has blue eyes and always wears expensive clothes (LC6). Although he looks “smart and impressive” he is very “shy and self-conscious” (LC16). He can be “offensively supercilious” as well as “modest and self-effacing, almost tremulous” (LC16). Consequently, he is really very unsure of himself (the opposite of Mellors).

Clifford belongs to the aristocracy, for his father was a baronet and his mother was the daughter of a viscount (LC10). Clifford had inherited the baronetcy from his father and become the master of Wragby, his family estate. Lawrence sees Clifford as a typical representative of his class and writes about his feelings of anxiety and alienation like this (LC10):

He was at his ease in the narrow 'great world', that is, landed aristocracy society, but he was shy and nervous of all that other big world which consists of the vast hordes of the middle and lower classes, and foreigners. If the truth must be told, he was just a little bit frightened of middle- and lower-class humanity, and of foreigners not of his own class. He was, in some paralysing way, conscious of his own defencelessness, though he had all the defence of privilege. Which is curious, but a phenomenon of our day.

Clifford is a highly class-conscious character, but as I have shown, the other characters are not devoid of class-feeling either. Lawrence writes that Clifford was "rather supercilious and contemptuous of anyone not in his own class" (LC16).

In Lawrence's novels, mind-conscious people usually live quite isolated from the rest of the society or they feel themselves lonely. But the blood-conscious heroes and heroines of *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* also dreaded social contact, which I mentioned earlier. Only Paul in *Sons and Lovers* chose community instead of individualism and isolation.

The Chatterleys are both "cut off from those industrial Midlands" where they live and from "their own class" (LC12). Clifford has no contact with his workers as a mine owner, neither is his contact with Connie and his relatives very close (LC17). Connie and Clifford are intimate on mental level, but they are "utterly out of touch" (LC19) physically. Clifford thinks that the best way to keep up and protect their family name was to keep Wragby "shut off from the world" (LC45). He even considers Connie's family as outsiders and thus as a some kind of threat to Wragby (LC80).

As well as being afraid of the world outside his class, Clifford is also, according to Connie, "scared of life" (LC72) altogether. He dares not risk anything that he has gained or obtained in life. He wants to keep up traditions and lead a very conventional life (LC46). The routine and habits of everyday life mean everything to him and his companionship with Connie is one of the cornerstones of his life (LC47). Clifford is horrified and feels a "void" inside of him when Connie doesn't kiss him anymore before going to bed, for this had belonged to their routine for years. He thinks that "it was on such formalities that life depends" (LC145). After Connie declares that she will leave Clifford permanently, all he can think of is how "used to her" he was and how his "order of life" is now "broken up" (LC306-307). He doesn't really love her and considers her more like a possession than a real human being.

Like his father Clifford is determined to keep alive the family name and his position (LC12). For example, he dreams of an heir, although he realises the possible heir couldn't be biologically his. So, he suggests that Connie could have an affair with some gentleman in secrecy and produce an heir to Wragby, which was really an insensitive idea and reflects Clifford's mind values. It also reflects how full of pretence his life is. One of his mottoes is "What the eye doesn't see and the mind doesn't know, doesn't exist" (LC19). Besides, he knows at the back of his mind that Connie will eventually leave him, but he has chosen to live outwardly like everything was fine between them (LC300).

Clifford's mind-consciousness is more obvious than Gerald's, for Clifford preaches it and discusses about it openly. Clifford declares to Connie that "I ride upon the achievements of the mind of man" (LC186). Sanders (1973:185) includes to his mental life such things as : "insistence on social forms, fascination with science, lust for domination, acquisitiveness, devotion to industry, physical impotence and substitution of art for life". However, even if he were a blood-conscious person like Mellors, he would still be impotent, because he is paralysed. Thus Lawrence treats Clifford unjustly by making his impotence the symbol of his over-reliance on the mind. On the other hand, Lawrence often uses the word impotence to convey lack of passion, i.e. when a man is "sort of tame" (LC204). Scheckner (1985:165) points out ironically that all the main characters in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* seem to agree on at least one thing, i.e. the English people are sexually impotent, insane, apathetic and materialistic. It is true that Lawrence often tends to make these overgeneralizations.

Clifford and Connie have an argument, where Clifford speaks for the mind and Connie for the body (LC243-245). Clifford believes that "the universe is physically wasting and spiritually ascending" (LC244), which means that the human beings are becoming more and more spiritual and the body will lose its meaning, for "The life of the body ... is just the life of the animals" (LC245). Connie, in turn, being already in love with Mellors, is proud of her body and thinks that Clifford wants to deny the value of the body just because he is a cripple and cannot be sexually active himself. However, Clifford seemed to have the same opinion about sexual life before he was paralysed (LC13). He considers sex as an "accident" or a "clumsy" "organic process" (LC13).

Part of the mental life, according to Clifford's friends, is the "instinct for success" (LC35). Clifford is very ambitious, too. Firstly, he manages to gain success through his writing. He wrote "very personal stories about people he had known" (LC17). However, his works, according to Lawrence, are "meaningless", artificial and have no connection with reality (LC17). Secondly, he turns his ambitions towards the mines, which I shall deal with later.

Clifford, unlike the other characters in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, is totally unable to feel sympathy towards anyone. Connie thinks Clifford "was never really warm, nor even kind, only thoughtful, considerate, in a well-bred, cold sort of way" (LC75). Connie also criticises Clifford for treating his workers, for example Mellors, inhumanly, which makes him less of a gentleman (LC201). Later Connie starts to see Clifford as the symbol of death, for "He seemed to sit there like a skeleton, sending out a skeleton's cold ... will against her" (LC202). Lawrence hints clearly at the beginning of the novel that Clifford had lost his feelings because the war had crushed something inside him (LC6). Connie also admits that Clifford was the victim of war, "part of the general catastrophe" (LC75). However, all this sympathy towards Clifford seems to vanish as the novel goes on and Connie starts to believe that all Clifford's inhuman characteristics or mind values are intrinsic in him. She claims that he has always been like this because he belongs to the upper class.

Connie starts to resent all Clifford stands for and thinks that sometimes he acts like a common man. "To Connie, Clifford seemed to be coming out in his true colours: a little vulgar, a little common, and uninspired; rather fat" (LC104). Mrs Bolton finds that Clifford and the ordinary working men have a lot of common. "He wasn't so very different from the colliers after all" (LC86). Namely, Mrs Bolton had thought that there was something special about gentlemen like Clifford. At the end of the novel she despises him so much that she thinks "The merest tramp was better than he" (LC304). I think Connie contradicts herself when she first connects Clifford's mind-consciousness to the upper class and then says that he has a lot of common with the colliers.

Classes, according to Clifford, are not different races, but they are groups with different functions in society (LC190-191). Individuals are not important for society, only the different classes as they function as whole units (LC191). In Clifford's mind, the functions of the ruling classes and the working class "are

opposed” (LC191) and it is necessary for the society that the situation remains that way. Sanders (1973:50) defines the functions of the upper class as “planning, designing, controlling, coordinating”, whereas the working class performs all the “physical functions”. Sanders points out that these differences of function lead to further difference in education, culture and conditions of living between the classes. In Clifford’s opinion, everybody should accept their fate and he disliked “anyone of the lower classes who might be really climbing up” (LC72). That is why he doesn’t like Mellors. He thinks that people are privately free to behave and feel as they like as long as they go on fulfilling their obligations in the society, so that the order of society would remain “intact” (LC187).

Clifford is afraid that the strikes in his mines are a threat to the social order and, consequently, what the mining industry needs at the moment is proper management (LC187). I think Clifford is realistic about the situation, for he says that the owners, instead of giving away their money to the poor, should use their wealth to better the industries and in this way provide work for the people (LC188). He also says that the welfare and conditions of work of the miners have improved greatly during the years. Of course, their lives have also become more industrialised and their work has become more mechanical, which in Lawrence’s opinion has made the working men less masculine and less human (LC189). This is how Lawrence felt, this is his interpretation of industrialism and society after the war. What makes Clifford so inhuman is his further claim that the lower-class men are not really men, but they belong to a lower species like the animals, that shouldn’t be “poisoned” (LC189-190) by giving them education. He considers the masses as a class of slaves that can be put to order by using whips (LC190). Sanders (1973:184) writes that Clifford uses the industrial system to dominate men and materia. The using of “whips” doesn’t, however, work in Mrs Bolton’s and Mellors’ case, for they both get the better of him at the end.

As a result of this fierce mental activity Clifford has used to renovate the mines, his interior begins “to go soft as pulp” (LC112). He feels empty inside, like Gerald does in *Women in Love*. He needs Connie to fill this void. Lawrence writes: “He needed Connie to be there to assure him he existed at all” (LC17). Like Gerald, Clifford tries to put the responsibility of keeping himself alive on Connie (LC117). But Connie, like Gudrun, refuses to give Clifford what he

wants. Consequently, Clifford starts “to fall into fits of vacant depression” (LC66).

Clifford with his mind values is the loser, whereas life, in the form of Connie and Mellors, is the winner. Clifford goes totally insane at the end of the novel, for he lets go “all his manhood” and sinks “back to a childish position that was really perverse” (LC303). Consequently, there is nothing sexual in the scene of Clifford’s total humiliation where he “would put his hand into her [Bolton’s] bosom and feel her breasts and kiss them in exultation” (LC303).

Moore (1951:535) considers Clifford as a symbol of all Lawrence despised, i.e. industrialism, intellectualism and lack of sexual vitality. I agree, because he is clearly a caricature created intentionally by Lawrence, so that he could make his point of view as clearly as possible to the reader. As a symbol of mind-consciousness, Gerald is different from Clifford, because he is not so intellectual and is sexually appealing. These characteristics of Gerald’s are found in working-class men in *Sons and Lovers*. Clifford, in turn, acts often like a common man. Consequently, Lawrence’s description of these men doesn’t give credit to the working class either.

In *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* and in *Women in Love* there are a few individuals like Birkin, Ursula, Mellors and Connie, who are conscious of the life values and criticise those who represent mind values and mind-consciousness. In both works the blame for the lack of life values of the working class is ultimately put on the shoulders of the upper classes, on men like Clifford and Gerald. However, it is the individual that matters, not the class background, when it comes to the ability to live blood-consciously. It was Clifford and Gerald who said the opposite, about the functions of different classes being more important than individuals.

## **8.2 THE UPPER-CLASS WOMEN**

### **8.2.1 THE BLOOD**

Although the upper class as a whole is under critical inspection in *Women in Love*, there is one upper-class character that receives full sympathy from Birkin, namely Gerald’s little sister who receives instruction from Gudrun. She is the incarnation

of Birkin's ideas and greatly admired by him. She is rather instinctive and spontaneous and appears to be quite unique, "deriving from nobody" (WL254). Lawrence's writes of her that "she accepted her equals where ever she found them, and she ignored with blithe indifference her inferiors, whether they were her brothers and sisters, or ... wealthy guests of the house, or ... common people or the servants" (WL254). The superiority, which characters like she and Birkin often feel, is thus not class superiority, but superiority of being able to act blood-consciously, instinctively and spontaneously.

Lawrence always found fault with women of his own class. Instead, in his novels as well as in his own life his heart beat for upper-class women, even if he ridiculed some of his female upper-class acquaintances in his works. For example Hermione Roddice in *Women in Love* is a caricature of Lady Ottoline Morrell, with whom Lawrence was acquainted in the literary circles and who was a patron of arts. Lady Cynthia Asquith was a very dear friend with whom Lawrence was in correspondence. Lawrence's own wife was of aristocratic origin and he married her after turning down two working-class candidates, Jessie Chambers and Louisa Brown. Partly as a consequence of the unfavourable influence of his mother he never made a working-class woman a heroine in his novels. The most typical relationship in Lawrence's works is that of a working-class man and a middle- and upper-class woman. Ursula is middle-class, but she is not yet the perfect heroine in my opinion. Constance Chatterley, on the other hand, is the real heroine who is often more courageous than the hero of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Mellors. Right from the beginning of the novel she shows life courage that comes to full bloom in her relationship with Mellors. I shall deal with Connie more fully in the section about upper-class women as heroines.

### 8.2.2 THE MIND

In *Women in Love* Hermione Roddice is the upper-class woman with whom Birkin has had a long lasting relationship before he met Ursula. She is the daughter of a baronet, a very rich and remarkable woman (WL28). Her looks match her character. She appears "macabre", for she is very tall and has a strange "long and pale" face with an "impassive look" (WL108), and wears very striking clothes (gowns, shawls, enormous hats etc.) (WL187). She has an "affected

smile” on her face (WL65) and her voice is a curious “sing-song” (WL164). Ursula says that she looks like a horse that “runs between blinkers” (WL334), which means her inability to live in full. Death is often connected with her. For example, Lawrence writes that “She was a leaf upon a dying tree” (WL335), “one half of her was lost to life” (WL334), Ursula thinks she only knows “the dead things” (WL339) and Birkin says that she has no “real body ... of life” (WL57).

Birkin insists that Hermione’s passion and instincts are faked because she wants to be consciously in control of them (WL57). That is why, in Birkin’s opinion, she cannot act truly spontaneously and sensually (WL57). Also Ursula thinks that Hermione can only live in the world of consciousness and is thus a very one-sided person (WL334). She says Hermione is spiritual, but still a materialist (WL335), “false” (WL339) and a hypocrite (WL351).

The word “idea” is also often connected with Hermione. Lawrence writes that she had connections with the world of arts and that she was “a medium for the culture of ideas” (WL29), for her thoughts and ideas were highly respected among the artists. Birkin thinks that Hermione regards herself as the “perfect Idea” (WL353), to which all men must submit. Sanders (1973:183) points out that the intellectual discussions between Hermione and her acquaintances bear resemblance to those that take place in Wragby in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, because they are as lifeless and mental.

Hermione is very class-conscious and feels class-superiority, although she pretends sometimes not to care about “social differences” (WL143). Gudrun thinks that Hermione “makes the most of her privileges” (WL66), for Gudrun knows that Hermione can’t possibly risk anything by inviting two inferiors (Ursula and Gudrun) to her home. She “could come up and know people out of simple curiosity, as if they were creatures on exhibition” (WL187). This is Gudrun’s observation in the scene where Hermione comes to meet Gudrun’s and Ursula’s parents in the water-party. Her superiority comes up often in her habit of dismissing people whom she considers as her inferiors (WL65) and in her mocking fashion of speaking to other people (WL51). Hermione sees herself as standing “among the first and those that were against her were below her, either in rank, or in wealth, or in high association of thought” (WL29).

Birkin detests Hermione’s powerful woman’s will to which she expects all men to submit (WL108). She is proud of her own will-power, developed

during the years (WL165). She seems so confident that not even Birkin dares to oppose her (WL166). He thinks that Hermione will never be able to resign her will to a “higher being” (Birkin?), which he considers the highest manifestation of love (WL166). This is what a blood-conscious woman would do in Lawrence’s novels.

### **8.3 THE UPPER-CLASS HEROINE**

Connie’s potential blood-consciousness shows already in her appearance. She is “a ruddy, country-looking girl with soft brown hair and sturdy body, and slow movements, full of unusual energy. She had big wondering eyes, and a soft mild voice, and seemed just to have come from her native village” (LC6). Lawrence here emphasizes her naturalness, vitality and gentleness. Her father refers to her as “a bonny Scotch trout” and he thinks that the life of a “demi-vierge” (half a virgin) doesn’t suit her (LC19). That is to say she has sexual appeal and energy in her. She is often described with such words as “feminine” and “womanly” (LC20), which are characteristics Lawrence appreciates in a woman.

Connie has a great capacity for sympathy, except that her sympathy for Clifford fades away rather quickly and changes almost to cruelty against him. There is genuine sympathy between Connie and Mrs Bolton (LC168). Connie is also concerned about Mellors’ health, for his lungs have been permanently injured by pneumonia (LC199). Lawrence writes about Connie that “when her sympathy was awakened she was quite devoid of class feeling” (LC27). This means she doesn’t classify people according to their class, but according to their true nature.

Connie suffers from the isolated life of Wragby and the lack of contact between its people. She feels that unconnected like this she has “lost touch with the substantial and vital world” (LC22). She wants to return to the community of the rest of the society and finally it turns out that Mellors is her way out of this isolated life. However, with Mellors she ends up to another kind of isolated life, as their affair is not accepted by the social standards of the day.

Connie criticises the “nothingness” of the upper-class life (LC65). She says that the concepts of home, joy, happiness, father, husband and sex have lost their real meaning among this class. In this way she is the opposite of Ursula who didn’t respect the conventional family ties. The life of the upper class is too

“mental” (LC74), for there was between these people only “words”, “books and ideas” (LC96).

On the other hand, Connie finds the working class more fascinating (LC15). When Mrs Bolton came to Wragby she felt excited about the “vibration of the working people ... invading” the house (LC87). Connie can immediately sense the blood-consciousness in Mrs Bolton, who talks to her about “the touch” of her husband and about the sensation of a man entering “into your blood” (LC170). Connie can also sense Mellors’ vitality when she meets him for the first time and from that moment she feels a growing restlessness inside her (LC51). When she sees Mellors almost naked washing himself, she is fascinated by his “slender loins” and this vision “hit her in the middle of the body” (LC69). And although Mellors also looked “thin and ill”, he was “sane, and wholesome” (LC118), compared to Clifford who appeared physically strong but insane.

Connie foresees her future at the beginning of the novel. After she has promised Clifford not to break their “integrated”, “harmonious” and steady life (LC48), she declares “only life may turn quite a new face on it all” (LC49). When she looks at herself in the mirror she sees “the life still lingered hoping” in her body (LC74). Furthermore, she is fascinated by the ideas of “the democracy of touch” and “the resurrection of the body” (LC79) referred to by Tommy Dukes, Chatterley’s family friend who shares Mellors’ philosophy, although only in theory. It is natural, considering all this, that after Bolton arrives to take care of Clifford, there began “a new phase ... in her life” (LC87). She falls in love with Mellors, who can sense the potential vitality and tenderness in Connie, which is “something that has gone out of the celluloid women of today” (LC125).

Besides her relationship with Mellors, nature also makes Connie experience life more deeply. This happened to Birkin as well. When she sits by the pheasant coops in the forest and looks at the baby pheasants, she exclaims in her mind: “Life, life! Pure, sparky, fearless new life!” (LC119). She often enjoys sitting with her back against the old trees. The tree is a symbol of life in Lawrence’s novels.

Connie discusses mind and body with Clifford. She speaks for the body, for she believes that “the life of the body is a greater reality than the life of the mind: when the body is really wakened to life” (LC244). She continues by saying that “so many people ... have only got minds tacked on to their physical corpses”

(LC244). These sentences really express the core of Lawrence's philosophy in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, and indeed of many of his other novels. This philosophy is a theme also in *Women in Love* and in *Sons and Lovers*.

Loving Mellors and having sex with him makes a different woman of Connie (LC257). She starts to love her own body (LC244). The description of their lovemaking resembles that of Ursula and Birkin. She gives up her will (LC38), she feels herself melting in the flame of passion and finally her "penetrating beauty" flows into his blood (LC180). "The resurrection of the body" happens to Connie, for Lawrence writes "She was gone, she was not, and she was born: a woman" (LC181). Connie becomes pregnant and can feel the new life inside of her womb (LC141). Lawrence writes that Mellors had given her life and, consequently, she decides to stay with him whatever comes (LC276).

In fact, Connie turns out to be more heroic than Mellors, although she has many moments when her class-consciousness troubles her. Mellors often fears the reaction Clifford will have when their love affair becomes public (LC129,281). For example, when he argues with Clifford and decides to leave his work as a game keeper, he had the opportunity to tell him honestly about his affair with Connie, but "his courage wouldn't carry him so far" (LC281). Connie, in turn, says: "I don't care what they think" (LC233). It is Connie who finally tells Clifford about her relationship with Mellors and about their future plans.

Connie as a heroine has a few flaws (mind values) as do Birkin, Ursula, Paul and Mellors. When she was younger, as a student in Germany, she used to enjoy the mental life, the discussions with other students (LC7). Also in Wragby she at first "got a great thrill out of" "the life of the mind", although she could sense how cold the upper-class minds can be (LC38). Connie's life at Wragby is full of pretence after meeting Mellors, because she has to conceal her affair and her new blood-consciousness from Clifford. She has to go on being the hostess for Clifford's guests, but she "had played this woman so much, it was almost second nature to her; but still, decidedly second" (LC126). At the end, however, Connie decides to be totally honest with Clifford and take what comes.

When she becomes pregnant, she at first plans to raise the child at Wragby with Clifford, because Clifford had hoped for an heir. Of course, Connie would have to make him believe that the child was begot by an upper-class lover, which Clifford would have accepted, as long as Connie wouldn't leave Wragby

for this lover. Consequently, Mellors accuses Connie of making use of him, which, according to Connie, was “in a sense ... true” (LC176-177).

In her relationship with Mellors, Connie is not able to forget their different class background, but her class-consciousness keeps coming up from time to time. At those moments she thinks about him and treats him like Clifford does, as a “hireling” (LC168). Connie would like to use the game keepers hut as a resting place on her long walks, but Mellors is reluctant to have a key made for Connie to get into the hut. Mellors “dreaded her cool, upper-class impudence of having her own way. For after all he was only a hired man” (LC93). “And she was angry against the self-willed male. A servant too!” (LC94). When Connie becomes conscious of her class, she often resents all Mellors stands for. For example, she may consider his naked male body “ridiculous” (LC131). She could become “cold and derisive” towards him and think of him as “a clown”, “a half-bred fellow” (LC179-180). At the end of the novel, when on holiday with her sister and father in sunny Italy, she feels repulsion for Mellors and all the common people. She thinks “How foul those common people were!” (LC273). She longs to be a respectable person among her class again and thinks of getting “rid of” Mellors, for he “was perhaps really common, really low” (LC275).

On the other hand, Connie starts to feel quite snobbish about her new life with Mellors. She says to her sister “love can be wonderful: when you feel you live”, which “was almost like bragging on her part” (LC251). This superior feeling in her makes her arrogant and cruel towards Clifford, who thinks “She was ... cold and callous to all that he did for her. He gave up his life for her .. She only wanted her own way” (LC145). Even though Clifford is insensitive towards Mellors, he really is very considerate towards Connie, which makes Connie’s attacks against him somewhat cruel.

As a heroine Connie resembles Ursula. Lawrence treated these women more gently than he did the working-class women. What strikes me is their sensual and womanly appearance, which reveals their potential blood-consciousness, whereas the heroes in these novels haven’t got masculine bodies, but are nevertheless blood-conscious. However, these women are able to reach blood-consciousness only through their lovers, after they have surrendered themselves to these men without reserve. Lawrence, as I have pointed out, didn’t like strong-willed women.

## 9 CONCLUSION

When the working class is observed from inside of the working-class community, like in *Sons and Lovers*, the working class as a whole has more blood values, whereas when it is observed from outside of this community, like in *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, it has scarcely any blood values.

In all the three novels the industrial landscape produces mind values and the rural landscape produces blood values. However, in *Sons and Lovers* the blood values of the working class, miners (industrial) and farmers (agricultural) alike, have not yet been defeated by mind values. In *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the industrial workers seem to have lost their vitality, because the nature of the industrial work has changed, as a consequence of the modernisation of the industries by the new owners.

In *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the classes are separated from each other and feel hostile towards each other. This hostility is mutual, which is the sign of the lack of human feeling of all classes. This break between the classes doesn't correspond to a split, blood values of the working class and mind values of the upper classes, because further analysis shows that, for example, the working class has also mind values in these novels (like materialism, fascination for machines etc.).

There are plenty of male working-class characters in *Sons and Lovers* and they represent solely blood values. Their masculine and healthy bodies are the main symbol of life in this novel. The suppression of the life values in the working-class men is first seen by the shrinking of their bodies. In the other two novels this symbol loses its meaning as a life value, but is also the characteristic of mind-conscious characters. Other blood values of working-class men in *Sons and Lovers* are masculinity, interest in physical activities, active communal life, warm-heartedness, rebelliousness and love for everyday routines. I see the vulgar behaviour of the working men in *Sons and Lovers* as their rebellion against the mind values that their wives try to impose on them. In *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the life of everyday routines and other conventions is mostly favoured by mind-conscious characters. Also the need of blood-conscious

characters to attend to communal life is not seen as necessary in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

In *Sons and Lovers* Lawrence already starts to make the distinction between the older generation and the younger generation of miners. The younger generation being those who have started to adopt the mind values, which in *Sons and Lovers* happens under the pressure of the women of the family. Although the older generation of miners are defeated, they never adopt the mind values. In *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the ruling class, the owners of the industries are mainly responsible for this suppression of life values. The consequence is that the working-class people, especially women and the younger men, have become materialistic. In *Sons and Lovers* the class struggle is fought only on family level and the women appear to be the only ones with materialistic aspirations. There are not yet any mind values in working-class men in *Sons and Lovers*, whereas in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* there are plenty. They have become materialistic and have subordinated themselves to the machine. Contradictorily, they also take part in the class struggle, which is also a sign of materialistic values of the working class in Lawrence's novels.

I don't think the life values of the working men are never finally defeated, although these men are described in a rather pessimistic way in *Women in Love* and even more so in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. In *Women in Love* there is a kind of hidden blood-consciousness in some of the working men. As a rule, however, when the working-class men are seen as a group in the latter novels, they represent mind values, but when observed as individuals they seem to have blood-conscious elements in them.

In *Women in Love* some of the characters seem to believe at least partly in the vitality of the working men. However, the hero of the novel, Birkin, doesn't think they have the potency to start the revolution of life. Contradictorily, he is one of the characters who can sense some of the blood qualities in the working-class men. In *Lady Chatterley's Lover* Lawrence is totally pessimistic about the working-class men, even though the main characters have observed the blood values of the older generation. Mellors is the only working-class male character portrayed individually in this novel and he represents the blood values. However, in many ways he is not like an ordinary working-class man.

In all three novels, Lawrence often admires the exterior qualities of working-class women, their “sensual bloom”, but not their interior qualities. Lawrence stresses their mentality as opposed to the physicality of the men. Consequently, the mind values of working-class women are abundant. All women are materialistic and have adopted bourgeois values. All the working-class women, as indeed most women in Lawrence’s novels, are very strong-willed or domineering, which is a mind value in Lawrence’s works. All the working-class women also feel superiority over the men and they are usually rather alienated from the community in which they live.

All three novels criticise the bourgeois society, but in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* the criticism extends to all the classes. For example, all classes are doomed because of excessive materialism. The middle-class values play a bigger role in all these novels than the middle-class characters themselves. Only in *Women in Love* there are three middle-class major characters who, however, do not consider themselves to be representatives of this class, but are critical towards it. It is not made clear what is these characters’ alternative to the middle-class life style they so detest.

In *Women in Love* Lawrence thinks that feelings and emotions are middle-class and thus regards them as mind values, whereas in *Sons and Lovers*, they belong to the working-class blood values. Similarly, the love for everyday routines is a middle-class mind value in *Women in Love*, although it is a blood value in *Sons and Lovers*, as represented by working-class men.

Two other mind values come up in these novels, namely individualism (as opposed to collectivism) and lack of spontaneity. Individualism is a middle-class value, which is doomed as a mind value in *Sons and Lovers*, but accepted as a characteristic of blood-conscious characters in the other two novels. Lack of spontaneity comes up in all three novels and is one of the mind values that separate working class from the middle class in *Sons and Lovers*, and the blood-conscious individuals from the mind-conscious middle- and upper- class individuals in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*.

There are actually no middle-class male characters, not even minor, who would represent mind values in these novels. In *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* the middle class and the upper class as a whole share the mind values, at least when being criticised by major characters in these novels. At a

closer look, however, in both works, there are individuals, from both middle class and upper class, who have life values, which is one of the contradictions in Lawrence's novels.

When Lawrence wrote *Sons and Lovers*, he was not yet acquainted with the upper classes, whereas in *Women in Love* there are already descriptions of upper-class life. The aristocracy in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is portrayed as very conservative and the upper classes in general, lead a very mental life. The over-mentality of these people is the mind value most criticised by Lawrence in these two novels. There is isolation inside the upper class as well as isolation of the upper class from the rest of the society, which both are the result of the mind values of this class. Contradictorily, as Moore (1974) has pointed out, Lawrence also felt sympathy for the aristocratic way of life, which he expresses through Connie in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

Lawrence felt that in the past people lived more blood-consciously than in these modern times. That is why he resented the rural life turning to industrial and urban life. He also felt that, before the mining industry was lead by big colliery companies, the miners had more life values than later, when the mines were modernised by these companies. The old generation of miners, referred to in Lawrence's novels, still shared the life values. Similarly, the old generation of upper-class company owners still have those life values that Lawrence appreciated so much. They were paternal, gentlemen owners who respected the workers and felt responsible for their welfare. Of course, Lawrence is here romanticising the past.

Furthermore, the life qualities of these older men find expression in realistic ways, for example in the form of charity. Whereas, the blood-consciousness of the heroes in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, happens more on an unconscious level. Also in *Sons and Lovers* the life values of the characters have more realistic manifestations, like the masculine bodies of the men.

Gerald in *Women in Love* and Clifford in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* belong to the young generation of miner owners who are the extreme symbols of mind-consciousness. They appear outwardly masculine and healthy, because otherwise they wouldn't be perfect instruments of the "mechanical order" that they both

have imposed in their mines. Thus the masculinity of men has become a mind value in these novels.

Both Gerald and Clifford make the functional division between the working class and the upper classes and put no value on individuals or on personal relationships between classes. In both novels, the heroes, in turn, believe that only a few individuals in society may have potentiality, for example to bring life values back to people, whereas classes as groups in society have little vitality left.

Other mind values shared by these men are feeling of class-superiority, inhumanity, strong will, hunger for success and conventionality. They are rather lonely and alienated figures as well, which characteristic, contradictorily, seems to be both a mind value or a blood value, depending on the character. In the case of Clifford and Gerald isolation is a sign of mind-consciousness. At the end the mental life of these men destroys them. In conclusion, in all three novels, the mind values are destructive. Only the mind values in each novel may vary.

There are differences between these men that are connected to the fact that Lawrence wanted to make the humiliation of Clifford and his mind values perfect. Namely, Clifford, but not Gerald, is also impotent, uncertain and often acts like a common man. Of course, Clifford can't help being impotent because he is paralysed, but nevertheless Lawrence makes his impotence as the ultimate symbol of mind-consciousness. Acting like a common man, in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, is a negative thing, whereas in *Sons and Lovers* it would probably have been a virtue, in Paul's opinion at least. This shows Lawrence's contradictory feelings towards the working class, which was already obvious in *Sons and Lovers*.

Lawrence was clearly more sympathetic towards middle- and upper-class women than he was towards working-class women. He made no heroines of working-class women and was usually critical towards them. However, Lawrence wasn't totally blind to the flaws in middle- and upper-class women. There are female characters from the upper classes whose mind values include, for example, class-consciousness, spirituality, lack of passion, individualism, superiority, lack of spontaneity, materialism and strong will. In *Sons and Lovers* the middle-class-minded working-class women also share all these mind values. As a generalisation, the class-consciousness of these mental women has killed their life values.

In Lawrence's novels the heroes or heroines, who are supposed to be representatives of blood values, do not always come from the working class, but they can also be middle-class or upper-class. In all three novels the heroes want to establish a blood-conscious relationship with a woman.

Mellors and Birkin are pessimistic, because they believe that the realisation of blood values is only possible if you live an isolated life. Consequently, the blood-consciousness has meaning only to the heroes and the women they share it with. Whereas, Paul saw that the way to the full realisation of blood values is through community with other people. Birkin and Mellors stress the vitality of certain individuals as opposite to the anaemic groups in society called classes, and they consider the blood conscious life possible only if you lead a life separated from these collective groups. Consequently, the "democracy of touch" between Mellors and Connie or between Birkin and Ursula doesn't bring back the bond between classes, because the rest of the society doesn't share their philosophy. Scheckner (1985) is right by claiming that the escapism of Mellors and Birkin makes them less heroic, whereas Paul is a real hero, because he chooses community.

Individualism and isolation lead to destruction in *Sons and Lovers*, whereas in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* the heroes and heroines seem to value individualistic behaviour and separation from the social community. On the other hand, in *Women in Love* and in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, the isolation and alienation of the classes and inside the classes is seen as destructive as well. As a matter of fact, isolation and loneliness are the characteristics of most of the main characters in Lawrence's novels, whether they were blood-conscious or mind-conscious. As I pointed out, the heroes are isolated because they feel that the rest of the community do not share their blood values. The alienation of the middle- and upper-class characters and those working-class characters that have adopted middle-class values, however, results from their mind-consciousness, i.e. living in the world of ideas while forgetting their bodies.

For Paul in *Sons and Lovers* masculinity is purely a life value and in *Women in Love* it is still the sign of potential life qualities in a human being. The heroes often admire the masculine bodies of other men, but not always the mechanical way they use them. As a contradiction to this, all the heroes have delicate bodies, pale complexion and poor health. On the other hand, they have

intrinsic strength. They all share the philosophy that the difference between human beings should not be made on the basis of class or other exterior characteristics but according to their level of blood-consciousness. Their frail bodies may also signify the fact that these men are not able to lead the blood-conscious life they want, but are forced to conform to the class society and its rules of behaviour. The heroes similarly share the idea that being alive in flesh is more important than happiness and that class-superiority kills blood values.

There are characters in Lawrence's novels who can sense blood-consciousness in other people and think that a revolution in life is necessary for the mankind. Contradictorily, these characters don't live blood-consciously themselves. It seems that sometimes there is more preaching of blood-consciousness in Lawrence's novels than actual realisation of blood values! Birkin, Mellors and Paul are the preachers of Lawrence's philosophies in these works. However, I agree with Scheckner (1985) that they too often tend to translate their philosophy of life into speech, instead of living according to this philosophy themselves. First of all, they often feel superior towards other people who don't share their knowledge of blood-consciousness and because of this may often act cruelly towards them. Secondly, these heroes often show lack of spontaneity in their behaviour and seem as stiff as the more mind-conscious characters. Thirdly, all the heroes criticise materialistic people, but have often no real experience of being poor. So, perhaps their criticism is not justified.

Paul and Mellors turn back to working-class life. Birkin, in turn, doesn't want to go back to the conventions of his earlier middle-class life, but has no concrete alternative to offer either. He will probably continue his life in middle and upper class circles, which proves that, at the time Lawrence wrote *Women in Love*, he didn't believe that for blood-conscious individuals it was necessary to lead a working-class style of life. All in all, the heroes all have contradictory feelings towards the working class and its vitality. None of the heroes can be referred to as classless, although Lawrence clearly wanted them to appear as such. The fact is that a totally "declassed" life is really an utopia, a life value that cannot be reached.

For Lawrence the balance of the blood and the mind was more important than class. Mellors has the blood values and mind values in balance at the beginning of the novel, whereas Paul and Birkin have to make an effort to achieve

it. All the heroes are kind of “Chameleons”, because they all change their behaviour according to the situations they find themselves in. Paul leads a double life between his more middle-class friends and his more “common” friends, because he enjoys both lives in a way (middle-class culture and working-class physicality and sociability). Birkin has a spiritual bond with Hermione and a blood-conscious relationship with Ursula. Mellors is the “natural aristocrat” who shares the best characteristics from the upper class and from the working class (upper-class decency, good manners and education and working-class physicality, spontaneity etc.). Through heroes like this Lawrence wanted to show the importance of the balance of the mind and the body in a human being and the insignificance of class in a blood-conscious life.

The heroines in Lawrence’s novels always come from the middle or from the upper class, never from the working class. I consider the heroines more heroic than the heroes, because they are more lively, more open and more spontaneous. Both heroines want to escape the deadly routines and deadly mentality of their middle-class / upper-class lives, and they are less afraid of the reactions of the other people than their lovers are. They often suffer from the lack of feeling from the part of their lovers. They are emotional, which was a life value in *Sons and Lovers*, but a mind value, a product of the conscious mind, in the latter novels.

The heroines are very feminine and sensual, whereas the heroes are not so masculine in appearance, but have frail bodies. So, potentially blood-conscious women in Lawrence’s novels always have womanly bodies. However, they are able to reach blood-consciousness only through the men they love. The heroines are not strong-willed like the mind-conscious women. Their snobbery is connected to their being alive in flesh, whereas the snobbery of mind-conscious women is connected to the feeling of class-superiority.

The heroes and heroines also have mind values. What strikes me most is a certain cruelty in blood-conscious characters in Lawrence’s novels after *Sons and Lovers*. The way the heroes and heroines treat those close to them does not always tend to strengthen the bond between human beings or indeed between different classes. The democracy of touch, consequently, only works between a few individuals in these novels. And besides, their ruthless breakage from their former family ties leads to social isolation and thus it seems to lead nowhere, as Scheckner (1985) pointed out.

One of the themes of these three novels is the triumph of life over class distinctions, like Leavis (1955) and Martin (1982) claimed. The blood-conscious characters all stress the intrinsic qualities over the class status or other superficial values (money, good looks etc.). Totally “declassed” life, however, appears to be impossible even on personal level. Whereas Martin (1982) suggested that it was possible on personal level only. I think instead that blood-conscious relationships and living according to blood values are indeed possible only on personal level in these novels, in the personal lives of the heroes and heroines, the rest of the society being overcome by mind values.

Martin (1982) insisted that the opposition between the mind values of the middle and upper class and the blood values of the working class is a permanent feature in Lawrence’s work. However, as I have shown, this opposition is not totally applicable anymore in *Women in Love* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, although it may have been so in *Sons and Lovers*. Sanders (1973) claimed that psychological divisions reflect the social divisions in Lawrence’s novels. I think the psychological qualities vary to some extent in each novel and there are diversions from the basic pattern Sanders (1973) presented. For, as I have shown, there are characters from the upper classes that share blood values and characters from the working class that share mind values. Furthermore, which qualities to count for the mind values and which for the blood values may vary in each novel. For example, language is the medium for both the mind-conscious and the blood-conscious characters, individuality is valued also by the blood-conscious characters, the mind-conscious characters often have masculine bodies and vice versa and the blood-conscious characters suffer often from the lack of spontaneity. In addition, Lawrence makes a difference between male and female characters and between women from different classes. Women and especially working-class women have more mind values than men from any class. He also makes a difference between classes as a whole and individuals. That is why the heroes and heroines can have any class background (except for working-class women).

There are inconsistencies in Lawrence’s treatment of class, like Scheckner (1985) claimed, and I have shown in my thesis that those inconsistencies also apply to the theme of class from the point of view of blood and mind values. This diversity is due, like Scheckner (1985) claimed, to the fact that Lawrence’s views changed according to his situation of life and the state of

society at the time of writing a particular novel. Many of the differences are also connected to the extent of realistic and modernistic features in Lawrence's writing. Sometimes blood values have more concrete realisations in the characters' lives (realism used) and sometimes they appear only as unconscious, purely intrinsic qualities (modernism used).

In *Sons and Lovers*, although there are no middle-class characters, there is more criticism of the bourgeois society in particular than in the other novels, although this criticism is not presented in a straightforward way in this novel. In the latter works all classes are criticised for adaptation of mind values. In *Sons and Lovers* the blood values are attached to class, whereas in the latter novels they are not anymore attached to particular classes but to certain individuals. The blood values of these individuals are not necessarily the same as were attached to working class in *Sons and Lovers*. In all the novels there is no individual that would be purely a representative of the blood values. In conclusion, I find that Lawrence's ultimate purpose seems to have been to bring the mind and blood into balance and disconnect them from those class distinctions he first made in *Sons and Lovers*.

When reading the critical literature about Lawrence I have noticed that no critic has concentrated on studying further the racist or homosexual tendencies in Lawrence's writing. For further study I could look at either of these areas by comparing biographical data on Lawrence and his works. Besides the biographies, his essays and his letters might provide useful information. When reading for this thesis I already noticed many inconsistencies between his life and ideas and his novels concerning these topics.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary sources:

- Lawrence, D. H. 1911. *The White Peacock*. London: Heinemann.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1913. *Sons and Lovers*. London: Penguin Books.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1915. *The Rainbow*. London: Penguin Books.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1921. *Women in Love*. London: Penguin Books.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1922. *Aaron's Rod*. London: Heinemann.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1928. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. London: Penguin Books.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1930. *The Virgin and The Gipsy*. London: Penguin Books.
- Lawrence D. H. 1968. *Phoenix II: Uncollected, Unpublished and Other Prose Works by D. H. Lawrence*. Collected and edited with an introduction and notes by Warren Roberts and Harry T. Moore. London: Heinemann.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1972. *Apocalypse*. London: William Heinemann.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1981. *The Lost Girl*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawrence, D. H. 1984. *Mr Noon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

### Secondary sources:

- Aldington, Richard. 1972. Introduction, in D. H. Lawrence, *Apocalypse*, London: William Heinemann. Vi-xviii.
- Bailey Nancy E. M., Copperwaite Paul, Munro Michael (eds.). 2000. *The Illustrated Dictionary of Unfamiliar Words*. London: Robson Books.
- Briggs, Asa. 1967. The Language of 'Class' in Early Nineteenth-Century England, in R. S. Neale (ed.), *History and Class*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2-29.
- Calhoun, Graig. 1980. Community: Toward a Variable Conceptualization for Comparative Research, in R. S. Neale (ed.), *History and Class*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 86-110.
- Drabble, Margaret (ed.). 1998. *The Oxford Companion to English Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, John R. 1966. *The Reactionaries*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.

- Hewitt, Douglas. 1988. *English Fiction of the Early Modern Period 1890-1940*. New York: Longman.
- Holderness, Graham. 1982. *D. H. Lawrence: History, Ideology and Fiction*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.
- Hopkins, Eric. 1979. *A Social History of the English Working Classes 1815-1945*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Kettle, Arnold. 1953. *An Introduction to the English Novel Volume II: Henry James to 1950*. London: Hutchinson.
- Leavis, F. R. 1955. *D. H. Lawrence, Novelist*. London: Chatto and Windus.
- Martin, Graham 1982. D. H. Lawrence and Class, in P. Widdowson (ed.), *D. H. Lawrence*, London: Longman, 35-48.
- Mc Kibbin, Ross. 1990. *The Ideologies of Class: Social Relations in Britain 1880-1950*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Moore Harry T. 1974. *The Priest of Love*. Harmondsworth: Penguin ( First published in Great Britain by William Heinemann 1974).
- Moore, Harry T. 1951. *The Life and Works of D. H. Lawrence*. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Moynahan, Brian. 1997. *The British Century*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Neale, R. S (ed) 1983. *History and Class: Essential Readings in Theory and Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nehls, Edward (ed.). 1957. *D .H. Lawrence: A Composite Biography*. Volume One 1885-1919. Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Outhwaite, William and Bottomore, Tom (eds.). 1993. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Twentieth Century Social Thought*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Pinion, F. B. 1978. *A D. H. Lawrence Companion: Life, thought and works*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Powis, Jonathan. 1984. *Aristocracy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Raynor, John. 1969. *The Middle Class*. London: Longmans, Green and Co.
- Rose, Jonathan. 1986. *The Edwardian Temperament 1895-1919*. Ohio: Ohio University Press.
- Royle, Edward. 1987. *Modern Britain: A Social History 1750-1985*. London: Arnold.

- Salgado, Gamini. 1982. *A Preface to Lawrence*. New York: Longman.
- Sanders, Scott. 1973. *D. H. Lawrence: The World of the Major Novels*. London: Vision Press.
- Scheckner, Peter. 1985. *Class, Politics, and the Individual: a Study of the Major works of D. H. Lawrence*. London and Toronto: Associated University Presses.
- Stevenson, John. 1984. *British Society 1914-45*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Weber, Max. 1970. Class, Status, Party. in R. S. Neale (ed.), *History and Class*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 56-72.
- Vivas, Eliseo. 1960. *D. H. Lawrence: The Failure and the Triumph of Art*. London: Northwestern University Press.
- Widdowson, Peter (ed.). 1992. *D. H. Lawrence*. New York: Longman.
- Wiener, Martin. 1981. *English Culture and the Decline of the Industrial Spirit, 1950-1980*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Raymond. 1963. *Culture and Society 1780-1950*. London: Penguin.