

**Tribhuvan University**

**Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*: A Critique of Capitalism**

**Submitted to the Central Department of English**

**in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the**

**Master's Degree of Arts**

**in English**

**By**

**Ganesh Bista**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**Nepal, 2007**

## **Acknowledgements**

A good research work takes its shape under an experienced guidance. I extend my words of sincere gratitude to my respected supervisor Mr. Tika Lamsal for his scholarly guidance and encouragement. This dissertation would remain undone unless he provided concrete assistance and constructive suggestions. I always honor him for sharing his experiences.

I would like to express my cordial gratitude to Prof. Chandra Prakash Sharma, the then Head of Department who permitted me to conduct the present research. I am equally thankful to Prof. Krishna Chandra Sharma who helped me for the completion of my dissertation as the current Head of Department. I am highly indebted to the respected teacher Mr. Srijon Chhetri who helped me from the very beginning of the research. Mr. Ganga Prasad Chaudhary can't go unthanked for providing me with the necessary materials in the course of this task.

I am deeply indebted to my parents for their encouragement and financial support. Bunches of thanks go to my friends Krishna Prasad Wagle, Krishna Bhandari, Krishna Prasad Bhattarai and Khem Pokhrel who helped me directly or indirectly for the accomplishment of this dissertation. Sharmila Adhikari deserves special thank for her inspirational support.

Finally, I am grateful to my friend Moti Lal Yamphu (Rai) for offering me his computer service to make this dissertation a tangible work.

June 2007

Ganesh Bista

## **Abstract**

Human history has witnessed a series of significant changes in the stream of socio-political transformations. These transformations are seen to have occurred simultaneously with the change in the modes of social production. The twentieth century society wheels itself on the ground of towering industrial capitalism. The principle of its mechanism has reduced the humanity to a vast mass of commodities, thus no longer allowing the realization of human essence. The lust for money and material prosperity has crushed the instinctive side of man. Man can no longer realize his individuality, and consequently he is shattered by the sense of alienation. Being dissatisfied with the dehumanizing effects of industrial capitalism, Lawrence creates the characters like Connie and Mellors, Clifford's gamekeeper and sets them in opposition to Clifford, who represents a true devotee of capitalism. Connie's marital failure with physically and emotionally paralyzed Clifford transforms into a successful love between Mellors and Connie and her consequent pregnancy. Clifford's disintegrated life, Connie's defiance of existing social norm of class barrier, Mellors' disgust to the world of Clifford and Connie's pregnancy out of her love with Mellors are all suggestive of Lawrence's sharp criticism of capitalism in the novel.

## Contents

Acknowledgements

Abstract

I. Introduction	1
II. Marxism: A Sharp Dissection of Capitalism	10
2.1. Marxism and Class Struggle	10
2.2. Alienation and Dehumanization of Man under Industrial Capitalism	24
III. <i>Lady Chatterley's Lover</i> : An Attack on Industrial Capitalism	35
3.1. Clifford: A Representative of Industrial Capitalism	36
3.2. Connie–Mellors Relationship: An Emblem of Resistance against Industrial Capitalism	45
3.3. Connie's pregnancy: A Hope of Cultural Regeneration	53
IV. Conclusion	57
Works Cited	61

## **I: Introduction**

This research lays focus on D.H. Lawrence's most controversial but uncompromisingly candid novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. It tries to examine how Lawrence gives this novel the theme of severe criticism of modern industrial capitalism. It discusses Lawrence's presentation of industrialism, a system which has had enormous effects on those subjected to it; under its influence, whole communities had gradually become mechanized, their spirit made docile by its discipline. It makes an attempt to explore how the struggles of the principal characters against a repressive reality dominated by industrialism manifest Lawrence's attack upon disciplinary mechanisms of capitalism. More precisely, this research looks into the novel as a radically reactionary response to the mechanized system of the modern industrial society.

Lawrence has found modern condition of humanity foul, because it has killed the emotional side of relationship. The society emphasized upon the mechanized prosperity. He believed that modern industrialism represented an anti-spontaneous and anti-natural disorder. He speaks up for dynamic and spontaneous creative forces against contemporary mechanistic and industrial civilization. This research, in a way, analyses the novel as a record of Lawrence's personal reaction to the new "class-consciousness" and even "class-hatred" he had discovered in the mining Midlands in 1926, during what he called this "everlasting and unspeakable" strike.

Born as the youngest son to a Midlands coal miner in 1885, Lawrence introduced himself as a celebrated essayist, poet, novelist, short storywriter, playwright and critic in the universe of English literature. Though his mother possessed all the etiquettes of an urban middle-class family, his father had a purely working class background. Despite their poverty, Lawrence's self-sacrificing mother could manage all the required expenses on his education. Since his early age he showed his deep interest in the works of Longfellow, Scott, Dickens,

Carlyle, Schopenhauer, George Eliot and others. After he learnt French, he read Baudelaire and some other French writers.

Lawrence began his career as a professional writer with the publication of some of his poems in *The English Review*. Soon he became well known in the literary circles of London and met H.G. Wells, Ezra Pound, and others. Lawrence, along with his wife Frieda, visited a number of European countries like Italy, Spain, Germany, France, Switzerland, Austria etc. He visited America and some Asian countries as well. He enjoyed the marvelous sights and beauties in continents. When Lawrence returned to England, he was extremely unhappy. On his return from his expedition, Lawrence made a motor trip through his native land. There he noticed nothing else but the same hideousness and ugliness, sordidness and squalor, drabness and desolation caused by the growing industrialism of his age. They all provoked his bitterness, repugnance and abhorrence such as that felt in his boyhood when he gazed in agonies from the window of the public library and felt like flying from industrial ugliness into the lap of soothing beauty. This industrial filth grew all the more unendurable to him, as he had long been feasting his eyes on the unique marvels and beauties of Europe, Australia and America. But on his return to England, his heart recoiled like anything from such ugly, unpleasant sights. It was really this vision which prompted Lawrence to write *Lady Chatterley's Lover*.

He began his journey in English literature as a novelist with *The White Peacock* (1911), the first novel preceding many others: *The Trespassers* (1912), *Sons and Lovers* (1913), *The Prussian Officer* (1914), *The Rainbow* (1915), *Twilight in Italy* (1916), *Look! We Have Come Through* (1917), *New Poems* (1919), *Women in Love* (1920), *Kangaroo* (1923), *The Plumed Serpent* (1926), and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928).

D.H. Lawrence is a great novelist, a great creative writer, testing his ideas against the act of living and the fact of experience. Lawrence drew freely on his personal obsessions,

experiences, and relationships in his fictional writings; yet he did not embody everything which he remembered to have happened either to him or to his acquaintances. His novels are written with extraordinary power because he has a strong moral honesty and courage to accept life with no pretence. Much of Lawrence's writing reveals the themes of sex and gender, human psychology and relationship, class-conflict and politics, etc. Many critics have reflected upon the works of Lawrence. Dr. Madhusudan regards his works as the artistic blendings of fact and fiction. He writes:

He was a pre-eminent artist in the strictest sense of the term and included some significant episodes from his life strictly on a criterion of aesthetic rather than casual relevance. Fact and fiction are inextricably intertwined in his novels. A careful study of the autobiographical element in his commendable capacity for "control and selection" as well as his constant [...]. (126)

David Daiches agrees with the fact that Lawrence has dealt with the issues like sex, human psychology and gender consciousness in his writings. He opines:

[...] in *Kangaroo* (1923), set in Australia and containing moments of brilliant insight into Australian society and psychology together with passages transcribed straight out of his disputes with his wife, and in *The plumed Serpent* (1926), set in Mexico, an unsatisfactory novel with its willed atavism and compulsive anti-feminism. With *Lady Chatterley's Lover* (1928) [...] the possibilities of adequate human relationships in modern civilization [...] because of its frankness about sex, it remains the only one of his novels that most people read. (1166)

Lawrence's writings, however, do not remain away from the theme of class consciousness and class conflict. He creates the characters affiliating to different social classes and the clashes in various ways of life. F.R. Leavis writes:

[...] 'no man was ever more conscious of class distinctions'. The *Daughters of the vicar*, I say, is profoundly representative of Lawrence, and class distinctions enter as a major element into its theme. The man who wrote it may certainly be said to have been very conscious of them. (85)

David Daiches points the fact that the works of D.H. Lawrence display a powerful portrayal of class conflict. He further remarks:

In much of his later works, especially in some of his short stories, the deadening restrictiveness of middle-class conventions are challenged by forces of liberation often represented by an outsider – a peasant, a gipsy, a working man, a primitive of some kind [...] mechanizing world that Lawrence saw in modern industrial society. (1165)

Of all the novels by D.H. Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is the last one, although it was followed by two novelettes viz. *The Escaped Cock* and *The Virgin and The Gipsy*. The novel marks a break with Lawrence's previous three novels – *Aaron's Road*, *Kangaroo*, and *The Plumed Serpent*. These novels were carelessly written and are full of "undigested lumps of personal experiences". But Lawrence took *Lady Chatterley's Lover* very seriously and returned to the Nottingham – Derbyshire area of the English Midlands. This novel has a significant social theme and presents a severe criticism of the industrial society.

There are three versions of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. The version entitled as *Lady Chatterley's Lover* itself is the third version. It is indeed a momentous achievement of Lawrence who had been seriously ailing and heading for his end. The third version was privately published in Florence in 1928. But it was banned in England under the Obscene Publication Act for thirty-two years after its publication, and it was subsequently acquitted in 1960. Though we don't find any substantial difference among the plots of all the versions, the



third version is more sharpened with intellectual issues than the previous ones. The first version, like the third one, is largely concerned with class distinctions.

Lawrence wrote *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in later period of his life. The period was of intense industrialization already showing the sign of human disintegration. Of all the novels of Lawrence, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is by far the most celebrated partly because of its trial and acquittal and partly because of its intrinsic merits, and indeed millions of readers have read this novel without ever having the slightest inkling of its autobiographical nature. A close analysis of the autobiographical element in the novel reveals its thematic novelty.

*Lady Chatterley's Lover* is a novel populated by the three principal characters – Clifford, Connie, Clifford's wife, and Mellors, Clifford's gamekeeper. The plot of the novel revolves round the triangular relationship among these characters. Connie being a member of the intelligensia, belongs to a higher stratum of society and falls for Mellors, who belongs to a much lower stratum. But, despite this class distinction, she finds ample solace and satisfaction in Mellors' superior vigour and virility, sympathy and tenderness.

Connie, the wife of physically crippled writer and industrialist, is initially fascinated by her husband's will of becoming a well-known writer and she assists him, thus indulging herself in the world of mind. But gradually she feels her husband as something dead, not having warmth and physical tenderness. She feels herself losing her substantial and vital life, and is tormented by a fear of the nothingness. She comes to feel too that his role as an industrialist involves a life-denying will to power, which has a damaging effect on her feelings. Her sense of forlornness is broken by her move from the mental to the sensual; the main stages of her reawakening are marked in her recognition of the presence of "new life" through the touch of something natural, and through the tenderness brought out by Mellors. Mellors, a working-class man, lives in the "sacred" wood where he maintains the bond between himself and nature and resists the force of the industrial mechanism. Isolated from

the mechanical sex of her wife, Mellors celebrates the tenderness of body with Connie, who is frustrated by Clifford's dead and uncreative intellectualism. This novel, in short, is about a conflict between the life of mind and the life of body.

Connie and Mellors criticize Clifford representing industrial capitalism. Their sexual journey is what Lawrence sympathizes with in opposition to the life of mind that does not let the man have "wholeness of being". At a point, Connie is found to be in a serious disagreement with Clifford, her husband, who defends himself saying that he, as an Industrialist, is serving the humanity. But Connie thinks that the industrialism has reduced all the workers in machine-like creatures having no feelings and emotions, thus destroying all the vitality of life. In the novel, the physically unsatisfied characters proceed for their instinctive desires. Lawrence calls that the real life centers on the physical experience and involvement.

In the novel, Lawrence criticizes the intellectual elite. He mixes the working-class people with the owners in relation. A gamekeeper with his instinctive power counters the landowner, and enchants the landlady. As Clifford, the landowner, loses his capacity for the essence of conjugal life, he starts to take marriage as a medium of inheriting the property. He shatters not only the dreams of Connie, but represents himself as an aimlessly wandering mind in the wasteland of modern industrial society. Clifford seeks money as the visible yet abstract emblem of success. Connie, on the other hand, follows the gamekeeper's natural life rather than materially successful but emotionally vacuum. Connie is attracted to the real instinctive life by challenging the formal one. Connie, faced by her husband's incapacity, merely sinks into a sullen malaise until she comes across the strong stimulus of Mellors. Connie desires for the passionate life waiting for the child. But, Clifford wants the child, but with the partialness relation. Connie is struck not simply because he is physically crippled

and can't perform sexual intercourse but because he is only thoughtful and lacks masculine glow under mechanical system of life.

Since its expurgated publication in 1928, it has received much critical appraisals. As the background context of the novel was the Victorian tradition, the novel could not be warmly received in the 1930s. Some critics severely charged the novel with obscenity for its explicit description of sex. But Lawrence himself defends this novel in 'A Propos of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*'. Explaining why this novel is an honest and healthy book, he writes, "I want men and women to be able to think sex, fully, completely, honestly and cleanly" (327). Lawrence, in one of his letters to Rolf Gardiner, writes in defense of the novel, "It is strictly a novel of the phallic consciousness as against the mental consciousness of today. It is perfectly wholesome and normal. But I protest against its being labeled 'sex'" (713).

Viewing the novel at the level of its structural effect on the reader, Charles M Burack, like Lawrence, explains it as a novel of sacred experience, not of pornography. Therefore, expressing this idea, he writes:

Lawrence did not want his novel to be pornographic i.e., to produce a head-centered experience of sexual intercourse. And he certainly did not want readers to masturbate while reading. His relational view of sex, and his esteem for life energy, prohibited erotic self-pleasing. The novel's sacred discourses and vivification devices would have to act on the reader's whole body, not specifically on the genital. (106)

Some of the critics celebrate feminist reading of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Elaine Reuben says, "*Lady Chatterley's Lover* lends itself to a feminist attack" (317). He further writes:

The anti-woman line of the novel is easily documented: the repeated pejorative use of "woman" to define the female as one whose nature perverts

positive "male" traits and limits the quality of her own; the discussion of a woman's womb as her primary organ of being and thinking; the hostility to all women but the suppliant Connie, which she is taught to share, for their sin of desiring sexual Satisfaction [...]. Connie is essentially passive, acted upon by others. (317)

Some critics have offered psychoanalytical reading of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Gerald Dorothy comments upon the novel by saying, "In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Lawrence is uncompromising in his determination to name parts, processes and functions in relation to phallic sexuality [...]" (3). Adopting Freudian psychoanalysis as a literary tool to look at the novel, he writes:

Indeed the governing obsession under writing the discussions between Clifford and his Cambridge "cronies" is the possibility of substitute satisfactions in place of the sexual act. It is this which gives their conversation a tinge of the "perverse". Among the variety of surrogates they discuss, the most striking is language itself: it is the ritualized focus of their erotic desire, and the object of their fetishistic concern. (6)

The novel, thus, has been interpreted from various angles. However, the approach of the present study is different. It is the Marxist mode of interpretation that centers upon the damaging effect of modern industrial capitalism. This study is, in a way, an exploration of the horror of modern industrial society into Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. It pivots round the two opposing worlds – mechanical and natural–brought in conflict in the novel. The novel carries a story of love and sex on its surface, but Lawrence has skillfully handled those ideas to address the intellectually powerful issue of modern industrial capitalism, which lives on the instrumentalization of humanity. The cold rationality of Clifford's industrial world is counterpointed with Connie's development from despair to fulfillment, and Mellor's

commitment to the warmth of sensual tenderness. The novel empowers itself with a duel between the two worlds—natural world and alienating and insensitive world. Clifford leads a mental life at the expense of a physical one, whereas Mellors seeks a true individuality, and this is best achieved when he places himself in the context of the natural world outside the society.

Since this research involves an attempt to reveal Lawrence's attack upon industrial capitalism in his novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, the major stress in the second chapter centers on clarification of the tool on which the research is based. The third chapter analyzes the text on the basis of the theoretical modality. It examines the proofs of Lawrence's indignation towards modern industrial society. Finally, the conclusive chapter sums up the whole research along with its findings.

## II. Marxism: A Sharp Dissection of Capitalism

### 2.1. Marxism and Class Struggle

Marxism is generally considered to be Marxist philosophy. However, Marxist philosophy constitutes one of the three component parts of Marxism – Marxist philosophy, political economy and the theory of scientific communism. Therefore, Marxism is a very broad subject. Marxism, as defined by P. Nikitin in his book *Fundamentals of Political Economy*, is "The science which deals with the laws of social development, the socialist revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, the building of socialist and communist society" (7). The term itself suggests that 'Marxism' is what Marx conceived of the development of human life and the society. Though there are a number of theories explaining the development of society, the theory developed by Marx is the only theory that offers a scientific and satisfactory answer to the question of the development of society.

Any society will collapse if it ceases to produce material wealth, which includes all the things as food, clothing, housing and other material means of life that make life possible. Therefore, says Marx, the production of material wealth is the basis of life and the development of any society. The production of material wealth includes human labor, means (instruments) of labor and the object of labor (nature). Labor is a purposive activity of human being directed towards the production of material wealth. The means of labor include machinery and equipment, tools, buildings, land, etc. Object of labor is what human labor acts upon with an objective of producing material wealth. The means of labor and objects of labor together form the means of production. The means of production and labor constitute productive forces. During the process of the production of material wealth, people work together to produce a single commodity, thus entering in to a definite relation with one another. Marx calls these relations the production relations or economic relations. Production relations may take the form of either co-operation, or exploitation of man by man. This

depends upon who owns the means of production. When the means of production are privately owned, belonging not to the whole society but to separate individuals, social groups or classes, the relations established are the exploitation of man by man, domination and subordination. It is because the workers under capitalism are deprived of the means of production that they are obliged to work for the capitalists. P. Nikitin states, “Under capitalism, the bourgeoisie, which possesses the means of production, has at its disposal the whole output of the workers, while the majority of the latter live in poverty” (*Fundamentals* 10). Thus, the basis of the production relations under capitalism, as under feudalism, is private ownership of the means of production. Private ownership has caused and continues to cause a division of society into hostile classes – the exploiters and the exploited. Therefore, violent class struggle is the basic feature of capitalism. For Marx, it is only under socialism, where socialist ownership of means of production forms the basis of the production relations and where there is no class struggle, that society consists of friendly classes.

Karl Marx, an ideologist, economist, historian and sociologist of 19<sup>th</sup> century occupies a significant field in the area of politics. Marx’s thought centered on the concept of an ongoing class struggle between those who owned property and those who owned nothing but whose work produced wealth. Karl Marx, in association with Fredrich Engels, invented radical but revolutionary economic, social and political theories in *Das Capital* and *The Communist Manifesto*. Marx formulated the most revolutionary and scientific theories in the time of tremendous socio-economic changes resulted from the scientific discoveries and establishment of large-scale production industries. His theories, in a very scientific way, disprove the bourgeois economic, social and political system establishing the philosophy of proletariat, the lowest stratum of society.

Marxism is a highly complex subject, and Marxist literary criticism is no less so. Marxism brought a significant change in bourgeois ideology. Marx expresses his

dissatisfaction with the trend of the worldview the previous philosophers adopted in their works. As Marx himself clearly stated that “philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it” (qtd. in Selden 24), and explained life and world from quite a different perspective. Taking into account the process of change as the inevitable process, his theory brought considerable change in the concept of art and literature as well.

Although Marx and Engels did not propound any systematic theories concerning art and literature, Marxist criticism grounds its theory and practice on their discussion about base and superstructure, the Marxist philosophy. So, even if Marxism is basically a theory of social, economic, political and revolutionary activities, it does not leave art and literature untreated.

According to Marxist philosophy, base affects superstructure, and the change in base results in the automatic change in superstructure. To be more specific, the change in socio-economic relations brings the change in ideology, politics, religion, art and literature as well. So, basic characteristic of art and literature is determined by socio-economic factors. Before Marx people believed that their ideas, cultural life, legal systems and religions were the creations of human and divine reason, which should be regarded as the unquestioned guides to human life. But, Marxist philosophy reverses this formulation and argues that all ideological systems are the products of real socio-economic structure. Economic and social forces together constitute the base on which erects the superstructure– the politics, law, culture, ideology, religion, values, philosophy, and art and literature. Thus, according to Marxists, base is primary and the superstructure is secondary. Marx himself states:

The mode of production in material life determines the social, political, and intellectual life processes in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determine their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness [...] with the change of the economic foundation the entire



immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed [...] this consciousness must be explained rather from the contradictions of material life. (Adams 626)

The production of ideas, that of consciousness, is directly interwoven with the material activity and the material intercourse of men. The basic ideas about the Marxist literary criticism is best expressed in the works like *The Communist Manifesto* and *The German Ideology* written collaboratively by Marx and Engels. They believe that each economic structure e.g., feudalism, capitalism or socialism leads to its own type of social organization and production of its own literature, art, culture and religion. An ideology is no other than the product of the position and interest of a particular class. In any historical era, the dominant ideology embodies and serves to legitimize and perpetuate the interest of the dominant economic and social class of the time. Marx and Engels offer a very sensitive response to all kinds of difficulties, especially socio-economic, facing the humanity on the rise of industrial capitalism. For them, the working class, which emerges remarkably with the advent of capitalism, is the exploited class with both the desire and the ability to overthrow the bourgeoisie, the class of exploiters, and reorganize society in its own social interest. Marx and Engels interpreted social and historical events to come up with a revolutionary outcome, while they comment on their own theories as “the reflex of proletarian struggle in the world of ideas” (Cohen 320).

Marxist philosophy of “dialectical materialism” emerged in response to Hegelian philosophy of “dialectical idealism”, which argued that the matter is determined by consciousness. But, Marxist philosophy believes that the relation between base and superstructure is dialectical with the latter being determined by the former. Marx represented “ideology” as a superstructure of which the concurrent socio-economic system is the “base”. Engels described “ideology” as “a false consciousness”. He further claims that the governing

ideology in the capitalistic socio-economic structure incorporates the interest of the dominant class, the bourgeoisie. All kinds of social and cultural institutions and practices including religion, morality, philosophy, politics, the legal systems as well as art and literature are dominated and permeated by the ideology. Bourgeois ideology seems to be offering a natural and inevitable way of explaining and dealing with the world, but in fact, it has a hidden function of legitimizing and maintaining the position, power and economic interests of the ruling class.

Marxism treats literature as an expression of socio-economic life and judges it on the basis of how far it has fulfilled this function. Orthodox Marxist critics are of the opinion that the origin, development and success or failure of a literary work should be examined on the basis of its relation to socio-economic life of the contemporary society. Orthodox Marxist literary theory strongly insists that a work of literature should reflect the class relations and be committed to the cause of working class. A writer's success or failure should be judged on the basis of his works which exhibit his insight of the socio-economic situation of the era. Leon Trotsky writes, "The poet can find material for his art only in his social environment and transmits the new impulses of life through his own artistic consciousness [...]. Art is always a social servant and historically utilitarian" (Adams 794). Marxist criticism, thus, examines how far a literary work carries the ability in altering human existence and leads it in the path of progress, prosperity and emancipation. It demands the authors to produce reality objectively with special attention to class divisions, the exploitation of the lower class by the upper one. Marxism aims at revolutionizing the whole socio-economic life establishing a new political system led by proletariat. Literature, for Marxist critics, should be an auxiliary in spreading ideology of working class. So, literature, instead of rendering outward superficial appearance of reality, should explore the inner causes. Outward superficial depiction of things, like that of naturalism and modernism, bracketing off all the contradictions can never

lead to reality. Marxist literary criticism is thus very critical of the movement of “art for art’s sake”, which treats a work of art as an autonomous entity. For Marxists, literature should have social as well as political implication. Marxist literary criticism denounces the modernist trend of writing as it concentrates on minute subjective picture of the world. For Marxists, writers should have profound understanding of wretched condition rather than subjective experience and aestheticism. Yakhot says, “It is a well-trying compass, a guide in everyday life and activity. Bound up with the study of Marxist philosophy, with mastery of the scientific world outlook is the optimism of the working people, their unshakeable confidence in a happy life for all people throughout the world” (223).

Thus, literature, for Marxists, should revolutionize the conscience of the people of the working class to topple over the exploitative capitalistic society and to establish the society ruled by the majority class of the working people. They advocated the need of literature as a weapon to lead human society in the path of prosperity and progress. Literature is unthinkable when attempted to treat it in isolation. So, it should be interpreted in socio-economic context. Marxist critics explain literature of any historical era as ‘product’ of the economic and ideological determinants specific to that era, not as work created in accordance with timeless artistic criteria. As Trotsky states in his attempt to prioritize Marxist approach to literature over the formalist approach, “They (formalists) believe that in the beginning was the word. But we (Marxists) believe that in the beginning was the deed” (Adams 799).

Marxist literary criticism, thus, analyses literature in terms of the historical conditions which produced it. It conceives the idea that the external reality is prior to ideas in the mind and that the material world is reflected in the mind of man and translated into forms of thought.

Marxist literary criticism incorporates not a single approach but approaches, thus accommodating variations within. So, there is no programmatic way of applying Marxist ideas. Yet, Marxist critics will continue to discuss such issues as class struggle,

commodification and alienation of labor and so on. Literature might be seen as a means of opposing the ill effects of capitalism, and, of course, art is a part of society.

Marx was concerned with the forces of history and his view of history was that it is progressive and, to some extent, inevitable. *The Communist Manifesto* carries this view as its prominent content. Marx reviews the sequence of the development of human society and finds “class struggle” as the driving force. The famous opening lines in *The Communist Manifesto* read:

The history of hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle.  
Freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word oppressor and oppressed, stood in a constant opposition to one another carried on an on interrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended, either in a revolutionary, reconstitution of society at large, or in the common ruin of the contending classes. (Marx and Engels 79)

Marxism initiates the movement of the proletariat against those who possess abounding amount of wealth without much labor. The emancipatory movement initiated by Marxism aims at abolishing the concentration of wealth in the hands of tiny minority by seizing the political and legal power from the hands of bourgeois class. In this sense, Marxism is a political theory that advocates the class struggle of the proletariat against the ruling class until the political power is seized and socialist society is established. Marx thought that it was inevitable that the bourgeois and the proletariat would engage in a class struggle from which the proletariat would emerge victorious.

Marx adopted materialist view and said that history is progressive and all things that exist in society are inevitably changing. He is of the opinion that economic institutions of the

society develop naturally. He found the economic society always divided into two hostile camps with ongoing class struggle— The bourgeoisie (capitalists, property owners) and the proletariat (workers/laborers without property). In each age, in any form, there is the existence of two classes: one class ruling over the other. Marx looks back into the way the economic society developed over the history of mankind. The modern ruling class, the bourgeois, has developed from the ruins of feudal society which still had to face class-antagonism. In simple terms, feudalism gave way to modern capitalism. Capitalism, by replacing the feudal society, has celebrated new form of oppression and new form of struggle between the two hostile camps— laborers and capitalists. They are found struggling—one trying to turn victorious over the other. For Marx, it is the mode of production in any society that produces the features and characteristic forms of class inequality. He defines mode of production as the dynamic combination of two major components: the relations of productions and productive forces. The productive forces are the most mobile elements in the mode of production; they are continually changing, since people are constantly improving the instruments of labor and accumulating production experience, thus enhancing their skill. A definite level of the productive forces requires the corresponding relations of production. This is what we call Marx’s “economic law”. This law states: production relations correspond to the character of the productive forces. Discussing the relationship that exists between the forces of production and the relations of production, Marx says:

In the social production which men carry on the earth into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material forces of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitute the economic structure of society—the real foundation [...]. (Adams 626)

When the relations of production, says Marx, correspond to the level of the development of the productive forces, the latter develop uninterruptedly. This is possible only in socialist mode of production. When the relations of production do not correspond to the level of development of the productive forces, they act as a brake on production. Capitalist mode of production observes the production relations not corresponding to the level of development of the productive forces. Production develops comparatively slowly, because “in bourgeois society, private capitalist ownership of the means of production predominates, and this hinders the further growth of the productive forces” (Nikitin 11). Thus, in Marx’s view, the productive forces establish the material preconditions for the existence of production relations in a society. Similarly, the evolution of productive forces is well dependent on the growth and development of the relations of production. P. Nikitin states in his *Fundamentals of Political Economy* as:

When the relations of production lag behind the development of the productive forces, become outdated and hamper their development, they are inevitably replaced by new ones. In a society divided into hostile classes the old relations of production are superseded by new ones through social revolution. (11)

Thus, in view of Marx, one mode of production itself produces the necessary situation of getting transformed into the other. In his *Early Writings* Marx argues:

[...] the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production.[...] forms of development of the productive forces these relations turn into fetters. Then begins an era of social revolution [...]. No social order is ever destroyed before all the productive forces for which it is sufficient have been developed, and new superior relations of production never replace older ones [...]. (425–426)

Capitalistic society lays its heavy blow on humanity and results in the crush of human sentiments and feelings. It breaks the bond between man and man. The sense of self-interest heightens in the system of capitalism. We no longer enjoy family relation. Individual is important and all kinds of interests and relation are reduced to mere "cash payment". Marx states in *The Communist Manifesto* as:

It has resolved personal worth into exchange value and in place of the numberless indefeasible chartered freedoms has set up that single, unconscionable freedom— Free Trade. In one word, for exploitation veiled by religions and political illusions, it has substituted naked, shameless, direct, brutal exploitation. (22)

Therefore, the relation that exists among the people of capitalistic society is of give-and-take. Under capitalism, everything is bought and sold taking the form of commodity. The relation between people in society appears in the guise of relations between commodities. Marx views the commodity production as the production of goods not for personal use, but for sale, for exchange on the market. P. Nikitin argues:

[...] in order to exploit the worker, the capitalist has to hire him, while the worker has to sell his labor power, which is now a commodity. The capitalist pays the worker a wage, with which the latter buys his means of subsistence— commodities. Thus, the production relations between the worker and the capitalist are expressed not directly, but through commodities, and assume the character of commodity relations. (*Fundamentals* 31)

So, personal worth changes into exchange value. All the ecstasies of human relation of ideal enthusiasm and of sentimentalism are turned to bitter egotistical and selfish calculation. All are professional. Physician, lawyer, priest, poet, scientist and all other people

of occupation have been made “wage laborers”. “The bourgeoisie has torn away the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation” (*Communist* 23). Therefore, success of possessing more and more wealth is given privilege. Love relation is considered an obstacle in success of life. The bourgeoisie substitutes naked, shameless, direct and brutal exploitation for the exploitation veiled by religious and political illusions.

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instrument of production. The innovative use of modern technological advancement in capitalist mode of production results in the increment of surplus value, which in turn increases the size of capital. Increasing productivity of labor is an important factor, which speeds up the accumulation of capital. It leads to the cheaper commodities, making it possible for the capitalist to cut the value of the commodity labor power, which means that with the same amount of variable capital a greater mass of live labor can be set in motion, so that more output and, consequently, more surplus value can be produced. But the rate at which workers are drawn into production becomes slower and slower, and lags behind the rate of the accumulation of capital, thus producing an ever-increasing section of workers, which find no employment for their labor. Unemployed population in capitalistic society form an industrial reserve army. The existence of reserve army of the unemployed is a desired thing in industrial capitalism, because the employed ones are compelled to work at low wages. He is also compelled to increase his working hour to sustain his living. P. Nikitin argues in his *Fundamentals of Political Economy* that, “a reserve army of labor in industry is essential to capitalism as a means of systematic pressure on the employed workers, it enable to capitalist to lower the wages under threat of dismissal, and to increase the intensity of labor, i.e. to intensify the exploitation of the working class” (89). Thus, the greater the accumulation of wealth by the bourgeoisies, the larger becomes the army of unemployed, the higher the



degree of exploitation of the employed workers and worse the material position. So, the accumulation of capital and the deterioration of the position of the proletariat are seen to be two inseparable aspects of capitalistic society.

As the magnitude of capital increases and gigantic machines are introduced, colossal amount of things are produced. In other terms, industrial capitalism abides by constant revolutionization of production to meet its motives. To sustain and strengthen the existence of industrial capitalism, there needs a constantly expanding market for its products. As a result, the bourgeoisie expand its realm all over the world. Marx argues in *The Communist Manifesto* as:

The bourgeoisie has through its exploitation of the world market given a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. To the great chagrin of reactionaries, it has drawn from under the feet of industry the national ground on which it stood. All old, established national industries have been destroyed or are daily being destroyed. They are dislodged by new industries, whose introduction becomes a life and death question for all civilized nations, industries that no longer work with indigenous raw material, but martial, but [...]. (23)

So, the mechanism of industrial capitalism makes the world economy serve the interest of the bourgeoisie, thus compelling the working-class people to live the hellish life under the heightening exploitation. Marx states, "It (bourgeoisie) has agglomerated population, centralized means of production, and concentrated property in a few hands" (*Communist* 24).

For Marx, the clash between the relations of production and the gradually developing productive forces is natural. The transition of feudal society into the capitalistic society is a

natural phenomenon. But structurally there exists no substantial difference between feudal society and capitalistic society, because both the societies do have class-antagonism— one class exploiting the other. At a certain stage of the development of productive forces, it comes in conflict with the bourgeois conditions of production to pave the way for socialism, which puts an end to the long established social structure of class-antagonism, thus resulting in the emancipation of the whole humanity from the ruthless grip of modern industrial capitalism.

The collapse of industrial capitalism is, for Marx, not because of external factors, but because of the problems inherent within its own mechanism. Marx states in *The Communist Manifesto*, “The weapons with which the bourgeoisie brought feudalism to the ground are not turned against the bourgeoisie itself” (21). Similarly, P Nikitin states, “The preconditions of socialism arise under capitalism” (*Fundamentals* 198).

Industrial capitalism is always regressive in terms of further development of the productive forces. Socialist relations of production differ radically from those of capitalism and other social formations based on private ownership of the means of production. The basis of socialist production relations is social ownership of the means of production. The matter of importance in the system of production relations is the way the workers are connected with the means of production. Under capitalism, the two are not connected at all, but oppose each other, since the means of production are the private properties of the capitalists. Consequently, working people are tirelessly battling to abolish private ownership. P. Nikitin writes in his *Fundamentals of Political Economy* as, “The victory of socialism means that private ownership of the means of production has been replaced by social ownership of the means of production [...]. In this process, the exploiting classes are eliminated, exploitation of man is ended” (218). He further argues, “Socialist revolution, whether it is achieved peacefully or non-peacefully, always means the radical breaking up of obsolete capitalist

relations and the establishment of new, socialist relations. These transformations are carried out by the government of the working class in the interests of the whole of the people” (197).

The productive forces in socialist society are represented by large-scale machine production in all branches of national economy, based on the highest technology and the labor of workers freed from exploitation. Under socialism, large-scale machine production develops on planned lines and serves to improve the material well-being and cultural level of all working people. P. Nikitin argues in his *Fundamentals of Political Economy* as:

Contrary to capitalism where mechanization and automation make millions of workers redundant, causing unemployment, in socialist conditions, mechanization and automation do not and cannot lead to unemployment. In socialist society, comprehensive mechanization and automation of production process accord with the vital interests of the workers, lighten and radically change the character of the work of millions of people, raise productivity, create conditions for shortening the working day and eliminating the basic distinctions between mental and physical work. (224)

Socialist ownership of the means of production determines the character of the respective relations among people in production, exchange and distribution. These relations are cooperation and socialist mutual assistance among people freed from exploitation, and the distribution of products to the advantage of the working people. When means of production belong to the working people, when every individual member of society and society as a whole are alike interested in increasing production, people's relations are friendly, and people do all they can to help one another achieve greater success. This, as a result, offers boundless opportunities for developing the productive forces. Nikitin further states, "Socialist production is organized to satisfy the material and spiritual needs of all members of society" (*Fundamentals* 235). Though rising productivity is a universal economic law, operating in all

socio-economic formations, it is limited under capitalism. The growth of labor productivity is uneven and in some period productivity even declines. But, with the abolition of private ownership of the means of production, the barriers to increased labor productivity are thrown down. In socialist society, a steady growth of labor productivity is an objective necessity arising from the very essence of socialist production relations. So, the labor in socialist society is of creative nature, whereas in capitalist society the compulsory character of labor turns it into a heavy burden. Socialism uses every achievement in science and technology to lighten labor, shorten the working day and improve working conditions, thus providing the workers with the real freedom. P. Nikitin states, "Under socialism, the workers have no fear of being deprived of the means of subsistence, the abolition of unemployment in all its forms gives the working people complete confidence in the future and genuine freedom" (259)

Thus, Marxism explains socialism as an inevitable outcome of the heightening class struggle in industrial capitalism, which lays very destructive effects on whole humanity. Capitalist exploitation is not merely on economic exploitation, it is moreover the exploitation of man's right to an integrated life.

## **2.2. Alienation and Dehumanization of Man under Industrial Capitalism**

The central issue of Marx's philosophy is that of the real individual man, who is what he does, and whose "nature" unfolds and reveals itself in history. In contrast to Kierkegaard and others, Marx sees man in his full concreteness as a member of a given society and of a given class, aided in his development by society and at the same time its captive. The full realization of man's humanity and his emancipation from the social forces that imprison him is bound up, for Marx, with the recognition of these forces, and with social change based on this recognition. Marx's philosophy, like much of existentialist thinking, represents a protest against man's alienation, his loss of himself and his transformation into a thing; it is a movement against the dehumanization and automatization of man inherent in the

development of western industrialism. It is ruthlessly critical of all answers to the problem of human existence which try to offer solutions by negating the dichotomies inherent in man's existence. The very essence of Marx's philosophy is a concern for man and the realization of his potentialities.

Marx's philosophy is primarily concerned with the emancipation of man as an individual, the overcoming of alienation, the restoration of his capacity to relate himself fully to man and to nature. In a way, Marx's philosophy constitutes a spiritual existentialism in secular language. Getting to Marx's philosophy is knowing historical materialism or "dialectical materialism". This materialism claimed that the substratum of all mental and spiritual phenomena was to be found in matter and material processes. This aspect of "materialism," Max's "materialist method", which distinguishes his view from that of Hegel, involves the study of the real economic and social life of man and of the influence of man's actual way of life on this thinking and feeling. Discussing "dialectical materialism", Erich Fromm says, "In its most vulgar and superficial form, this kind of materialism taught that feelings and ideas are sufficiently explained as results of chemical bodily processes" (9). In his famous book *The German Ideology*, Marx himself wrote:

In direct contrast to German philosophy which descends from heaven to earth, here we ascend from earth to heaven. That is to say, we do not set out from what men imagine, conceive, nor from men as narrated, thought of or imagined conceived in order to arrive at men in the flesh. We set out from real, active man and on the basis of their real life process we demonstrate the development of ideological reflexes and echoes of this life process. (14)

In opposition to Hegel's philosophy of history which develops in such a way that mankind is only a mass carrying an abstract spirit consciously or unconsciously, Marx further describes his own historical method very succinctly:

The way in which men produce their means of subsistence depends first of all on the nature of the actual means they find in existence and have to reproduce. This mode of production must not be considered simply as being the reproduction of the physical existence of the individuals. Rather, it is a definite form of activity of these individuals, a definite form of expressing their life, a definite mode of life on their part [...]. The nature of individuals thus depends on the material conditions determining their conditions. (7)

In contrast to Hegel, Marx studies man and history by beginning with the real man and the economic and social conditions under which he must live and not primarily with his ideas. Historical materialism is not at all a psychological theory. It claims that the way man produces determines his thinking and his desires, and not that his main desires are those for maximal material gain. Economy refers thus to the mode of production, not to a psychic drive. Dealing with Marx's theory of "dialectical materialism" in his book *Marx's Concept of Man*, Erich Fromm says, "Certain economic conditions like those of capitalism, produce as a chief incentive the desire for money and money and property; other economic conditions can produce exactly the opposite diseases [...] and contempt for earthly riches" (12).

Marx's "materialistic" or "economic" interpretation of history conceives the idea that man, the real and total man, the "real living individuals"— not the ideas produced by these "individuals"— are the subject matter of history and of the understanding of its laws equally. Marx's fundamental idea is that man makes his own history; he is his own creator; man gives birth to himself in the process of history, for Marx the history of mankind is a history of the increasing development of man, and at the same time of increasing alienation. His concept of socialism is the emancipation from alienation, the return of man to himself, his self realization.

Marx is best known for his scientific analysis of how capitalist mode of production reduces a man to merely a thing. Marx's central criticism of capitalism is not the injustice in the distribution of wealth. It is the perversion of labor into forced, alienated, meaningless labor; hence the transformation of man into a "crippled monstrosity." According to Marx, man feels alienated under the system of industrial capitalism. The longing for unity with one's self, with nature from which man has alienated never comes to reality in capitalist society. Shedding light on Marx's theory of alienation in his famous work *Marx Concept of Man*, Erich Fromm says, "Capitalist production transforms the relations of individuals into qualities of things themselves, and this transformation constitutes the nature of the commodity in capitalist production" (50).

Alienation means, for Marx, that man does not experience himself as the acting agent in his grasp of the world, but that the world (nature, others, and he himself) remains alien to him. They stand above and against him as objects, even though they may be objects of his own creation. Alienation is essentially the experiencing the world and oneself passively, receptively, as the subject separated from the object. Hegel, who coined the concept of alienation wrote in *The Philosophy of History*, "What the mind really strives for is the realization of its nation; but in doing so it hides that goal from its own vision and is proud and well satisfied in this alienation from its own essence." (qtd. in Fromm 47). For Marx, as for Hegel, the concept of alienation is based on the distinction between existence and essence, on the fact that man's existence is alienated from his essence, that in reality he is not what he potentially is.

For Marx, the process of alienation is expressed in work and in the division of labor. Work for him is the active relatedness of man to nature, the creation of a new world, including the creation of man himself. Marx says that the development of division of labor

and private property initiates the separation of labor and its product from man. Discussing the exploitation and alienation of labor under capitalist system in his famous work *Capital*,

Marx writes:

Within the capitalist system all methods for raising the social productiveness of labor are brought about at the cost of the individual laborer; all means for the development of production transform themselves into means of domination over, and exploitation of, the producers; they mutilate the laborer into a fragment of a man, degrade him to the levels of an appendage of a machine, destroy every remnant of charm in his work and turn it into a hated toil; they estrange from him the intellectual potentialities [...]. (708)

Marx writes in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* as:

Private property (capital which hires labor) is therefore the product, the necessary result, of alienated labor, of the external relation of the worker to nature and to himself. Private property is thus derived from the analysis of the concept of alienated labor; that is, alienated man, alienated life and estranged man. (105-6)

In capitalist mode of production, the object produced by labor, its product, stands opposed to it as an alien being, as a power independent of the producer from the product of work and from circumstances, is inseparably connected with alienation from oneself, from one's fellow man and from nature. What is true of man's relationship to his work, to the product of his work and to himself is also true of his relationship to other men, to their labor and to the objects of their labor. In *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, Marx says, "The alienated man is not only alienated from other men; he is alienated from the essence of humanity" (103). For Marx, in the alienated world of capitalism, needs are not expressions of



man's latent powers that is they are not human needs. In capitalism, every man speculates upon creating a new need in another in order to place him in a new dependence, and to entice him into a new kind of pleasure and thereby into economic ruin. Erich Fromm says, "Everyone tries to establish over other an alien power in order to find there the satisfaction of his own egoistic need [...] private property does not know how to change crude need into human need" (55). Marx contends, "In bourgeois society, capital is independent and has individuality, while the living person is dependent and has no individuality" (qtd. in Fromm 44).

Capitalism is characterized by the existence of private property and division of labor. Simply speaking, capitalism is an economic system in which exists the private ownership of means of production. Existence of private property and the division of labor result in the alienation of man. Marxist philosophy begins in man and ends in the emancipation of man from alienation and exploitation. Though Marxist thought underwent many variations, his starting point has remained intact: the possibility of total man. It is often believed that Marx spoke primarily of the economic exploitation of the workers, and the fact that his share of the product was not as it should be, or that the product should belong to him, instead of to the capitalist. He is not concerned primarily with the equalization of income. Erich Fromm, commenting upon Marx's philosophy, writes in his work *Marx's Concept of Man* as:

He (Marx) is concerned with the liberation of man from a kind of work which destroys his individuality, which transforms him into a thing, and which makes him into slave of things. Just as Kierkegaard was concerned with the salvation of the individual, so Marx was, and his criticism of the capitalist society is directed not at its method of distribution of income, but its mode of production, its destruction of individuality and its enslavement of man, not by

the capitalists, but the enslavement of man–worker and capitalist–by things and circumstances of their own making. (49)

Accumulation of capital in a few hands is the defining feature of capitalism, thus dividing the whole society into the two classes— property owners and propertyless workers. In capitalist system, a vast majority of workers are always in conflict with a few hands owning property. Social production is a social phenomenon. But in bourgeois (capitalist) mode of production, the worker becomes poorer the more wealth he produces and the more his production increases in power and extent. Marx says, “The worker sinks to the level of a commodity, and to a most miserable commodity. The misery of the worker increases with the power and volume of his production” (*Economic* 93). For Marx, in capitalist economy, labor does not only create goods; it also produces itself and the worker as a commodity. The product of labor is labor which has been embodied in an object and turned into a physical thing; this product is an objectification of labor. The worker is, thus, deprived of the most essential things not only of life but also of work. Worker’s own creation gets estranged and becomes hardly accessible. Marx states in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts* as:

Labor itself becomes an object which he can acquire only by the greatest effort and with unpredictable interruptions. So much does the appropriation of the object appear as alienation that the more objects the worker produces the fewer he can possess and the more he falls under the domination of his product, of capital. (*Economic* 95)

He further writes:

The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, assumes an external existence, but that it exists independently, outside himself, and alien to him, and that it stands opposed to

him as an autonomous power. The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien and hostile force. (*Economic* 96)

Labor, for Marx, is something that mediates between man and nature. Man works upon the objects of nature to earn his existence. But in capitalist mode of social production, the worker deprives himself of means of existence in two respects: first, that the sensuous external world becomes progressively less an object belonging to his labor or a means of existence of his labor, and secondly, that it becomes progressively less a means of existence, a means for the physical subsistence of the worker, thus losing the integrity with oneself and with nature. Marx writes:

Labor certainly produces marvels for the rich but produces privation for the workers. It produces palaces, but hovels for the worker. It produces beauty, but deformity for the worker. It replaces labor by machinery, but it casts some of the workers back into a barbarous kind of work and turns the others into machines. (*Economic* 97)

Marx's theory of alienation is deeply concerned with the crisis of whole humanity. Marx assumed that the alienation of work, while existing throughout history, reaches its peak in capitalist society, that the working class is the most alienated one. He says, "Its (capitalist economy) principal thesis is the renunciation of life and of human needs" (*Economic* 144). For Marx, alienation in the process of work is inseparably connected with alienation from oneself, from one's fellow man and from nature. The alienated man is not only alienated from other men; he is alienated from the essence of humanity, from his "species being," both in his natural and spiritual qualities. It [alienated labor] alienates from man his own body, external nature, his mental life and his human life. Thus the capitalist economy fosters at its root the ruthless dehumanization of the whole humanity.

Marx discusses the theory of alienation not only in terms of the products of labor but also in terms of the productive activity itself. A worker can not stand in an alien relationship to the product of his activity if he has not alienated himself in the act of production itself. The work is, thus, external to the worker that is not a part of his nature. Consequently, he does not fulfill himself in his work but denies himself, has a feeling of misery rather than well being. His work is not voluntary but imposed. It is not the satisfaction of a need, but only a means for satisfying other needs. Marx states, “External labor, labor in which man alienates himself, is a labor of self-sacrifice, of mortification” (*Economic* 99)

For Marx, man is a communal being. He needs the community to develop into a free individual. But his personality is, after all, determined by his social relationship. Marx claims, “What I myself produce I produce of society and with the consciousness of acting as a social being” (*Economic* 130). But the expectation of free and total individual becomes merely a dream in capitalistic society. In general, in capitalistic society, a man, a laborer is alienated from himself. By exploitation, his individuality, sense of ownership is lost forever. He is dehumanized, fragmented, alienated and frustrated. Capitalism empowers itself along with the introduction of advanced technology in industrial production. The concept of “technological advancement” is nothing but the simplification of machinery. But the simplification of machinery and of work in industrial capitalism is used to make workers out of those who are just growing up, who are still immature, children, while the worker himself has become a child deprived of all care. As Marx states in his *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, “Machinery is adopted to the weakness of the human beings in order to turn the weak human being into a machine” (143).

Marx argues that the capitalist division of labor destroyed an earlier phase of human history in which artistic and spiritual life was inseparable from the processes of material existence. The separation of manual and spiritual work destroyed the unity of spiritual and

material activities, thus intensifying the sense of alienation. Extensive use of machinery and the division of labor under industrial capitalism destroys the charm of work for the workman. He becomes simply an appendage of the machine. In *Communist Manifesto* Marx writes:

In proportion as the bourgeoisie, i.e. capital, develops, in the same proportion the proletariat, the modern working class, develops— a class of laborers, who live only so long as they find work, and who find work only so long as the labor increases capital. These laborers, who must sell themselves piecemeal, are a commodity, like every other article of commerce, and are consequently exposed to all the vicissitudes of competition, to all the fluctuations of the market. (25)

He further says, “Not only are they slaves of the bourgeois class and the bourgeoisie state; they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine” (31). So, under industrial capitalism, the matters of freedom and individuality can never be realized. Man’s wholeness of being is lost forever. Marxist thinkers like Adorno and Horkheimer are also very much critical of bourgeois culture, which deprives us of our personality. They write:

The most intimate reactions of human beings have been so thoroughly reified that the idea of anything specific to themselves now persists only as an utterly abstract notion: personality scarcely signifies anything more than shining white teeth and freedom from body odour and emotions. The triumph of advertising in the culture industry is that consumers feel compelled to buy and use its products even though they see through them. (Adams and Searle 219)

In capitalistic society, the typical situation of the worker is one in which he must perform tiresome labor on objects that he will not himself use or own. They will instead be claimed by his employer when they are finished. So from worker's point of view, the objects

so manufactured are produced without a purpose. The only reason the worker does the work is to acquire wages to buy outside the factory the necessities of life. Thus, the worker is alienated from the objects he produces since they are appropriated by others and used for capitalists' purpose. So, the worker loses genuine interest in his work. While working, the worker doesn't have the feeling that 'I am doing my work'. He is alienated not only from his work and capitalists but also from his fellowmen, because he has to compete with them for jobs and wages. Lukacs argues, "The worker had already become a narrow specialist in a single direction and the state apparatus had already begun to transform its civil servants into mindless and soulless bureaucrats" (qtd. in Adams 904).

Marx states that the free development of individual is possible only in socialism, because the mode of production itself has to do with the matter of alienation. Under socialism, workers themselves own the means of production and production relations are of co-operation. So, every worker enjoys freedom to work as his wishes and desires. Emancipation from alienation, dehumanizing condition is realized when there is creative labor. So, the revolution for socialism is emancipatory in nature and this emancipates the human beings from every kind of suffering.

### III. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*: An Attack on Industrial Capitalism

*Lady Chatterley's Lover* written by D. H. Lawrence in response to the First World War celebrates as its central issue of discussion the post-war inhuman mechanical discipline of modern industrial capitalism, which has had a deadening effects on those subjected to it. Lawrence pours through the novel his personal reaction to the sense of "Class-Consciousness" that affected greatly the post-war Britain and the other European societies. The nature of the relationships among the principal characters and their development suggest Lawrence's negative outlook to the post-war hierarchical British society founded on the capitalistic mode of social structure.

The Great War brought about fundamental changes in post-war British and European societies. Apart from a massive destruction of life and property, it had profound effects on attitudes, encouraging disillusionment, cynicism, and political, social and moral disturbance. Traditional Christian values and traditional political and social hierarchies were weakened , and the world that had existed before the war disappeared. The death toll was enormous. The ruling class was badly hit, but the exceptional scale and range of British losses did serious damage to the established socio-cultural systems at every level in the society. It also created bitter anger at, and savage contempt for, the rigid social rules and class barriers of the pre-war years. Throughout the Christian era, the emphasis had been on altruism and self-restraint rather than self-assertion, and the long dominance of that tradition had made possible the establishment of the inhuman mechanical discipline of modern industrialism. *Lady Chatterley's Lover* not only portrays the degeneration and dehumanization of mankind under industrial capitalism but also envisions a society, which is a tentatively hopeful one the coming of the era will bring to an end both the social divisions of present-day society and also the psychic divisions which threaten human creativity.

The novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* develops with the increasing tension among the principal characters adopting their own principles of life — the life of mind and the life of body. The novel at its large scale is devoted to an elaboration of the characters' views of life and the world. Though on its surfacial level, the novel is a glimpse of a relegation of an upper class woman to the level of working class people for the fulfillment of her instinctive sexual desire, it demonstrates the victims of industrial capitalism seeking an integrated life or wholeness of being, enjoying freedom doing away with the existing mechanical discipline of Capitalistic socio-economic structure.

### **3.1. Clifford: A Representative of Industrial Capitalism**

In *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Clifford Chatterley is a representative of the inhuman mechanical determinism of the post-war period, in which a new type of human relationship between the industrial magnates and their workers is established. The bodies and the minds of the latter become mechanized and made docile, and they are reduced to being instruments in the colossal machine of productive system. Badly wounded in the war, Clifford, with lower part of his body completely paralyzed, takes up a job of writing literature with an assistance of his wife Connie and starts living at Wragby Hall, the family 'seat' "to keep the Chatterley name alive" (1). Clifford's wound in the war symbolizes not only psychic death and the paralysis of the extra-rational dynamic forces but also the inexorable destructive forces of industrialism itself. It is his psychic barrenness and his devotion to the mechanical principle rather than his physical impotence, which frustrates the deepest desires of his wife Connie. Since his return to Wragby Hall, he has gained fame as a writer of ultra-modern stories, while also being a technocrat and industrialist, developing new techniques for exploiting the mines. As a Colliery owner and industrial master, he is naturally interested in developing the industry further, and he creates a system which allows him to dominate his workers through a harsh system of control. His drive to perfect the organization and technology of the industry



and to turn the workers into instruments of the productive system, are ways of compensating for the physical paralysis caused by war injury. Chatterley exercises total control over his employees in order to increase efficiency; his aim is to increase their economic “utility”. How Clifford Chatterley advocates the principle of industrial capitalism is apparent in his slogan that “the industry comes before the individual” (158). In a hot debate with his own wife Connie, who denounces the life-denying mechanism of industrial capitalism, Clifford further says:

They (workers) are animals you don't understand, and never could. Don't trust your illusions on the other people. The masses were always the same, and will always be the same. Nero's slaves were extremely little different from our colliers or the Ford motorcar workmen. I mean Nero's mine slaves and his field slaves. It is the masses: they are the unchangeable. An individual may emerge from the masses. But emergence doesn't alter the mass. The masses are unalterable. It is one of the most momentous facts of social science [...]. The masses have been ruled since time began, and till time ends, ruled they will have to be. It is sheer hypocrisy and farce to say they can rule themselves (159-160)

Though Clifford's deep-rooted desire for fame and money through the world of literature fascinates Connie in the early days of their living at Wragby Hall, she, afterwards, feels something cold and void in her routine life as her physical awareness gradually develops. As a member of an aristocratic upper class family, Clifford is preoccupied with the sense of his social status of ruling class. He advocates the life of mind over the life of body, thus frustrating the deepest desires of his wife Connie. Connie feels that the intellectual discussions among Clifford and his Cambridge cronies simply deny her life. Connie

gradually grows aware that she is losing the touch with the substantial and vital world. For Clifford nothing but lifelong companionship mattered:

Poor Connie! As the years drew on it was the fear of nothingness in her life that affected her. Clifford's mental life and hers gradually began to feel like nothingness. Their marriage, their integrated life based on their habit of intimacy, that he talked about: there were days when it all became utterly blank and nothing. It was words, just so many words. The only reality was nothingness, and over it a hypocrisy of words. (41)

Tommy Dukes, one of Clifford's intellectual cronies, however is critical of life of mind and thus offers a solace to Connie. He explains the foundation of industrial capitalism as a part of the life of the mind. He argues:

[...] it seems to me a perfect description of the whole of the industrial ideal. It's the factory owner's ideal in a nutshell; except that he would deny that the driving power was hate. Hate it is, all the same: hate of life itself. Just look at these Midlands, if it isn't plainly written up... but it's all part of the life of the mind, it's a logical development. [...] it is the inevitable outcome of forcing ideas on to life, of forcing one's deepest instincts; our deepest feelings we force according to certain ideas. We drive ourselves with a formula, like a machine [...] we are all Bolsheviks, only we are hypocrites. (31)

Thus, Clifford's assertion of the life of mind is, in a way, the assertion of the routine and mechanical principle of modern industrial society, which denies the natural physical "tenderness" of body. Consequently, the wholeness of being is lost forever, and man becomes nothing more than an instrument. Clifford's indifference to Connie's innermost feelings for

physical “tenderness” brings about forlornness in both of their lives, and there no longer exists an organic but mechanical relation between them.

Permanently paralyzed from waist down and confined to a motorized wheelchair, Clifford feels insecure amidst all the other lower class humanity:

He was at his ease in the narrow ‘great world’, that is, landed aristocratic 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 paralyzing way, conscious of his own defenselessness though he had all the defense of his privilege, which is curious, but a phenomenon of our day. (6)

Clifford, on the one hand, seems afraid of the growing defenselessness of his class, while, on the other hand, he is more self-assertive and supercilious. His fear of the men also reveals his own subconscious recognition that their ‘queer, crude life’ is, nevertheless fuller than his and that, looking at him, they are aware of this. The miners, regarded in the widest sense, represent the masses and the harsh mechanical power system is an expression of Clifford Chatterley’s strong sense of his ruling superiority:

The miners were, in a sense, his own men; but he saw them as objects rather than men, parts of pit rather than parts of life, crude raw phenomena rather than human beings along with him. He was in some way afraid of them; he could not bear to have them look at him now he was lame. And their queer, crude life seemed as unnatural as that of hedgehogs. (11)

The relation between the man and the mode of social production occupies the most significant space in Marxist approach to socio-historical development of mankind. What man

confronts with in capitalist mode of production are alienation and commodification of his individuality. Man can not do away with social production. His creativity is what defines him. A laborer puts his creativity into what he produces. But, in capitalist mode of social production, the commodity overpowers him as it leaves the hand of the laborer, because it is no longer his. This is how the alienation begins. Along with the alienation of the self, the laborer is reduced merely to a commodity having no individuality. He is now nothing more than a part of a machine.

Connie (Lady Chatterley) feels extremely sorry at the sight of the mechanized lives of colliers/ pit workers and of the nature spoiled by the growing industrialism. Moreover, she is deeply shocked by the way the colliers are exploited by mine owners like her husband Clifford Chatterley. She can't help raising questions on dehumanizing effects of industrial capitalism:

Everything is to be sold and paid for now; and all the things you mention now, Wragby and Shiply sell them to the people, at a good profit. Everything is sold. You don't give one heartbeat of real sympathy. And besides, who has taken away from the people their natural life and manhood, and given them this industrial horror? Who has done that? [...] why is Tevershall so ugly, so hideous? Why are their lives so hopeless? (159)

Clifford Chatterley, in his discussion with his wife Connie (Constance Chatterley), affirms bourgeois ideology to justify the mechanism of industrial capitalism. The ruling of the lower class by the upper is, for Clifford, the eternal truth of human society. He even resorts to some Biblical references to strengthen his position of ruling class. He argues:

The ownership of property has now become a religious question: as it has been since Jesus and St. Francis. The point is not: take all thou hast and give to the

poor, but use all thou hast to encourage the industry and give work to the poor. It's only way to feed all the mouths and clothe all the bodies. Giving away all we have to the poor spells starvation for the poor just as much as for us. And universal starvation is no high aim. Even general poverty is no lovely thing. Poverty is ugly. (158)

Clifford is quite aware of the fact that he can't have a child by himself. However, his thought of the need of a son frequently hits his life as a strong sense of urgency. But he is not interested in fatherhood. He wants his wife Connie to give birth to a son by another man on condition that the man wouldn't poison Clifford's lifelong companionship with Connie. Clifford simply wants to continue Chatterley tradition of aristocracy. He argues that an individual is shaped by what function he is given, not by where he comes from. He divides the whole society in two functions— the ruling and the serving— as an endlessly designed process:

Neither my mind nor my will is crippled, and I don't rule with my legs. I can do my share of ruling: absolutely, my share; and give me a son, and he will be able to rule his portion after me. [...] I will make a perfectly competent Chatterley of him. It is not who begets us, that matters, but where fate places us. Place any child among the ruling classes, and he will grow up, to his own extent, a ruler put kings' and dukes' children among the masses, and they will be little plebeians, mass products [...] Aristocracy is a function, a part of fate. And the masses are a functioning of another part of fate. The individual hardly matters. [...] It is the functioning of the whole mass that makes the common man what he is. [...] I believe there is a gulf and an absolute one, between the ruling and the serving classes. The two functions are opposed. (160)

The above extract suggests very explicitly that Clifford defends the established class divisions as a necessary element of the order of things, claiming that the disparity between the different classes is a matter of unalterable “fate”, in which the masses are doomed to be controlled, tamed, and dominated. The power, which he sets out to impose, comes from the dominance of the ruling classes over the lower classes.

Clifford adheres to the sense of his antagonism to the social change, thus clinging to the idea of status-quo. He is madly preoccupied with the taste of ruling superiority. He expresses his will to continue and preserve the remnants of old England, which has nothing but a social structure of class hierarchy as its defining feature. Clifford’s arguments genuinely exhibit his possessive nature as he expresses his sense of ownership of the wood he inherited:

I consider this is really the heart of England. I want this wood perfect... untouched. I want nobody to trespass in it. We have preserved it. Except for us it would go... it would be gone already, like the rest of the forest. One must preserve some of the old England! If some of the old England isn't preserved, there'll be no England at all. And we have this kind of property, and the feeling for it, must preserve it. [...] I feel every man of my family has done his bit here, since we have had the place. One may go against convention, but one must keep up tradition. (34-35)

Clifford had a deep-rooted threat of social revolution with the colliers in the vanguard. But Mrs. Bolton, Clifford’s personal caretaker, assures him that he was safe and collier lads simply wanted money to enjoy themselves. Mrs. Bolton tells Clifford that “they don’t care about another thing. They have not the brains to be socialists. They have not enough seriousness to take anything really serious, and they will never have” (89). Mrs. Bolton now promotes his interest in Tevershall pits, which he legally owned. Clifford dreams of emerging as a successful industrialist by developing and inventing modern technologies. He

exploits his knowledge of coal-mining technicalities, which he studied before the war broke out. Under Mrs. Bolton's influence, "Clifford began to take a new interest in the mines. He began to feel he belonged. A new sort of self-assertion came into him. After all, he was the real boss in Tevershall, he was really the pits. It was a new sense of power, something he had till now shrunk from the dread" (89).

Chatterley's overriding aim is to impose discipline on Nature so as "to capture the bitch-goddess by brute means of industrial production" (91). By "the bitch-goddess", Clifford Chatterley means Nature, rather than simply fortune. His fundamental aim is to impose rational and mechanical order on nature as far as he can. His attitude indicates that he sees nature as there solely for human use. Chatterley's project is to exercise the most effective power over nature in order to extract from it those things which human beings want. For Clifford Chatterley, his coal-mining enterprise requires a collaborative strategy, harnessing the most powerful technologies available and eliminating human "friction" from the process through turning the workforce into an entirely obedient group of people capable of conforming to mechanical rhythms and pace. The spontaneous impulses—the "Dionysian" elements in the communal life of the pits—are rigorously excluded from the new industrial regime. Confined underground, constantly supervised, subject to strict discipline and to the demands of machine, the miners are like prisoners deprived of individuality, and they have become parts of a mechanized system. They have lost their vital life and their spontaneity. The world of the disciplined and domesticated miners in the mines resembles not only the prison but other disciplinary mechanisms of modern states like the military barracks. The life-forces or Dionysian impulses of Children, miners, colliers, factory workers are subjected to routines, disciplines, punishments and rewards – all aimed to render resistant human material suitable for the demands of the mechanical industrial world.

We see Clifford's relentless conscious machine-like will to dominate nature in the scene where his motorized wheelchair breaks down. He becomes furious, rejecting Connie's offer to help push the chair up the hill, and forces the chair into action, crushing the bluebells under his wheels. When he realizes his desperate efforts are in vain, he asks the gamekeeper, Mellors, to push him. Mellors is forced to the point of near collapse as he lifts the heavy weight of his master and the mechanical chair, whilst the other man harasses him verbally. This episode illustrates Chatterley's desire to impose his will on nature, and also the simultaneous futility and destructiveness of his desire. This episode also provides an example of how he subordinates his own deepest desires and turns them into the reliance on mechanized order, thereby subjecting them to instrumentalization.

### **3.2. Connie–Mellors Relationship: A Symbol of Resistance against Industrial Capitalism**

Connie's world at Wragby Hall is an enclosed and barren one, a kind of cocoon of "mechanical cleanliness" and "mechanical order"; everything is dominated by the mechanical or by its psychic equivalent: the conscious exertion of the intellect. She realizes that the men around her represent the dominant post-war ethos, in their attachment to social hierarchy and their dead, uncreative intellectualism. The bleakness and hollowness of her mentally dominated life gradually oppresses her. Her sense of emptiness is increased by her awareness that the "intelligence" which her husband displays as a dilettante writer represents simply a dead kind of cleverness. She comes to feel too that his role as an industrialist involves life-denying will to power, which has a damaging effect on her feelings. On one level, Chatterley's physical impotence is a surface manifestation of a deeper incapacity which leaves unsatisfied his wife's need for "tenderness" and "closeness". Connie feels herself losing her substantial and vital life, and is tormented by a fear of the "nothingness" at the heart of her life at Wragby: "A strange, weary yearning, dissatisfaction had started in her. Clifford did not notice: those were not things he was aware of. But stranger knew. To Connie,



everything in her world and life seemed worn out, and her dissatisfaction was older than the hills” (39). She sees all around her the almost total loss of the Dionysian element in life.

Connie sees the miners as only half-alive, the “industrial masses” as a new kind of race on the process of creation, half-mechanical in their present state of development, and who have lost most of their spontaneity and intuitive vitality. Her fears of mechanical processes, and of Chatterley’s exertion of his machine-will, play a central role in increasing Connie’s sense of isolation and alienation, and, on subconscious level, of suppressing her libidinal energies. Her sense of forlornness is broken by her awakening to passion, and her move from the mental to the sensual; the main stages of her reawakening are marked in her recognition of the presence of “new life” through the touch of something natural, and through the tenderness brought about by Mellors, Clifford’s gamekeeper.

Connie’s life with Clifford at Wragby Hall is devoid of natural human “tenderness”, which results in an increasing tension between them. Clifford’s “machine-will” and “mental consciousness” denying the spontaneity and vitality of life distance himself from Connie. Moreover, the sight of Tevershall pits deeply saddens Connie as she sees the lives of the miners being reduced to half-dead bodies. She is extremely shocked at the sight of the burning pits, which have seized the beauty of life:

[...] Tevershall, the blackened brick dwellings, the black slate roofs glistening their sharp edges, the mud black with coal-dust, the pavement, wet and black. It was as if dismalness had soaked through and through everything. The utter negation of natural beauty, the utter negation of gladness of life, the utter absence of the instinct for sharply beauty which every bird and beast has, the utter death of the human intuitive faculty was appalling. [...] what could possibly become of such a people, a people in whom the living intuitive

faculty was dead as nails, and only queer mechanical yells and uncanny will-power remained? (133)

Connie is badly hit by the cruelty of the world around her. She becomes very much contemplative over the matter of the loss of friendly relation among the people under growing industrial capitalism. She expresses her hopelessness and wonder as she finds the humanity being crushed:

Ah God, what has man done to man? What have the leaders of men been doing to their fellowmen? They have reduced them to less than humanness; and now there can be no fellowship any more! It is just a nightmare. She felt again in a wave of terror the grey, gritty hopelessness of it all. With such creatures for the industrial masses, and the upper class as she knew them, there was no hope, no hope any more. She was wanting a baby, and an heir to Wragby! An heir to Wragby! She shuddered with dread. (133)

Connie is not simply an innocent figure being shattered by the dead intellectualism and machine-will of the world of her husband. She is well aware of how the creativity and spontaneity of man is getting crushed under the mechanism of industrial capitalism. Man is not living an integrated life enjoying all its vitality, but its race for money has killed the intuitive side: "Tevershall! That was Tevershall! Merrie England! Shakespeare's England! No, but the England of today, as Connie had realized since she had come to live in it. It was producing a new race of mankind overconscious in money and social and political side, on the spontaneous, intuitive side dead, but dead. Half corpses in the other half" (133).

Sympathizing with Connie, Lawrence, thus, sees the vital Dionysian in the self as element as threatened and weakened by penal, educational, and industrial discipline.

The emergence of Mellors, Clifford's gamekeeper, is very significant in that he represents the possible coming of a new order which will transform industrial society into something more humane. By setting the affinity between Connie and Mellors against life principle of Clifford, Lawrence speaks up for the natural movement of the senses against mechanical discipline and restraints of industrial capitalism, and for dynamic and spontaneous creative forces against contemporary mechanistic and industrial civilization. The love between Mellors and Connie gives a hope of social renewal, of a kind of community where the inhabitants are transformed into free, fulfilled beings, possessed of "wholeness of being."

Having been trodden by Clifford's uncreative cold intellectualism and machine-oriented instrumentalism, Connie seeks an escape and subsequently takes a refuge in Mellors. In the tragic circumstances of the modern age of industrial capitalism, Mellors, the gamekeeper stands as the antithesis of the relentless industrial mechanism. In contrast to the upper-class Chatterley, Mellors is a working-class man, the son of a blacksmith who works in the mines. He lives in the "sacred" wood where he maintains the bond between himself and nature, and resists the forces of the mechanical. He expresses his feelings of disgust at the loss of human vitality and "tenderness":

I tell you (Connie), every generation breeds a more rabbit generation, with India-rubber tubing for guts and tin legs and tin faces. Tin people! It's all a steady Sort of Bolshevism just killing off the human thing, and worshipping the mechanical thing. Money, money, money! All the modern lot get their real kick out of killing the old human feelings out of man, making mincemeat of the old Adam and the old Eve. They are all alike. The world is all alike : kill off the human reality [...] pay money, money, money to them that will take spunk out of mankind and leave'em all little twiddling machines. (191)

Isolated and deracinated, a solitary man, Mellors seems to be the keeper and superintendent of the wood and the game within it, and preserves both wild life and the secret of renewal and regeneration in the natural world. He always carries his gun to protect his home, the wood from disorder or invasion. This implies his resistance against the outside mechanical world. Mellors defends the sacred wood where life-mysteries are acted out, as an alternative order where new life buds and grows, grows old and dies, in the cyclical seasonal rhythm. As Wayne Burns puts it the wood for Mellors is “remnant of an earlier England—illusory Eden in the midst of the industrial hell that is Clifford’s (Chatterley’s) world” (30). Mellors defends it from war-stricken traumatized England, but also from the industrial machine-willed invasion represented by Chatterley’s attachment to industrial and economic power mechanisms. He is a woodsman whose understanding of non-human life reflects the fact that he is close to his own instinctive side. Mellor’s defiance of Chatterley’s machine-oriented instrumentalism and the mechanization of the masses is directly linked to his role in the preservation of “tenderness” and creative realities. Mellors speaks to himself as:

I stand for the touch of bodily awareness between human beings and the touch of tenderness. And she (Connie) is my mate. And it is a battle against the money, and the machine, and the insentient ideal monkeyishness of the world. And she will stand behind me there. Thank God I’ve got woman! Thank God I’ve got a woman who is with me, and tender and aware of me. Thank God she’s a tender, aware woman. (247)

The above extract also exhibits Mellors’ encounter with the “tenderness” and “warmth” of Connie’s life, which he could not have with his wife Bertha. It is explicit that Mellors feels his life reawakened to the real life as he comes into the life of Connie. Mellors has been bruised and damaged by his marriage to Bertha, and particularly by her attempt to assert herself during the sex act with her genital "beak" which tore at him during their love-making.

In his five or six years of married life, he has been beaten down by his wife's perverted and mechanical intercourse, and by her demand that Mellors surrender himself to becoming her sexual machine. He has come to realize that Bertha has no "tenderness," no bodily awareness or touch. He even wishes her dead. Mellors' bitterness towards his wife gradually gives way to the possibility of a new relationship with Connie based on their mutual discovery of a natural "tenderness of desire" between them. This natural "phallic" tenderness and "cunt-awareness" between them in a new human relationship is Mellors' answer to Connie's question: "And what will the real future have to be like?" (245).

The effects of Mellors' education are significant. Industrialism had opened up education to the working class of his generation, and yet its result is a desire to transform industrial society and its mechanical human relationships into something radically different. In fact, Mellors' education and his personal qualities have provided him a route to independence which eventually allows him to break out of the boundaries of his own class. Education is an essential element in his upward mobility and in the development of his personal and social vision of a new basis for human relationships and a new kind of society. His promotion to lieutenant during the Great War from an officer's servant was a result of war-time circumstance, in which advancement by merit was possible and during which the rigidities of peacetime class hierarchies were sometimes set aside.

Mellors is a "natural aristocrat," a gentleman in everything except birth, and his background and education allow him to condemn both the destructive industrial capitalism and the world of the disciplined modern masses: "men turned into nothing but labor-insects, all their manhood taken away, and all their real life. I'd wipe the machines off the face of the earth again, and end the industrial epoch absolutely, like a black mistake" (194). He views industrial bourgeois society as "insane". He further more expresses in his own dialect the desire to do away with the money-minded spirit of industrialism:

Let's live for summat else. Let's not live to make money, neither for us-selves nor for anybody else. Now we are forced to. We are forced to make a bit for us-selves, an' a fair lot for th'bosses. Let's stop it. Bit by bit, let's stop it. We needn't rant an' rave. Bit by bit, let's drop the whole industrial life, an' go back. [...] Look at Tevershall! It's horrible. That's because it was built while you were working for money. Look at your girls! They don't care about you, you don't care about them. It is because you've spent your time working an' caring for money. You can't talk nor move nor live, you can't properly be with a woman. You are not alive. Look at yourselves! (193)

Mellors' bleak view of contemporary society impels him to seek a new basis for relationships through the sharing of physical "tenderness" and "touch" with Connie. Through the characterization of Mellors, Lawrence suggests that the worship of the mechanical thing, the basis of modern mechanistic society has led to the loss of man's spontaneous extra-rational instinct and intuition. It has subjected mankind to a relentlessly mechanized industrial system, taking manhood away along with contact with the real life forces and deepest needs. For Mellors, the effect of industrial capitalism on the workforce has not been simply a matter of external regimentation; its effects have been more inward, distorting even the private realm of sexuality.

Mellors opposes the industrial machine through sustaining the spirit of life represented by the primordial wood (which embodies the extra-rational forces of Dionysian vitality), and in himself by resisting Clifford Chatterley's will-to-power. Mellors' relationship with Clifford retains the sense of class-opposition. Clifford's outlook to the life and the world is all sharpened with bourgeois ideology, whereas Mellors, by isolating himself from the life-denying mechanism of industrial capitalism, seeks an integrated life full of spontaneity and vitality. Connie's increasing distance with her husband Clifford is accompanied by her

reawakening to life with the warmth of bodily tenderness brought about by Mellors. What frustrates Connie (Lady Chatterley) is not his physical inability to satisfy her sexual need. It is rather his devotion to the mechanical discipline of modern industrial capitalism, which has swept away his “masculine glow”:

And yet, deep inside herself, a sense of injustice of being defrauded began to burn in Connie. The physical sense of injustice is a dangerous feeling once it is awakened. [...] Poor Clifford, he was not to blame. His was the greater misfortune. [...] And yet was he not in a way to blame? The lack of warmth, the lack of the simple, warm, physical contact, was he not to blame for that? He was never really warm, nor even kind, only thoughtful, considerate, in a well-bred, cold sort of way! But never warm as a man can be warm to a woman, as even Connie’s father could be warm to her, with the warmth of a man who did himself well, and intended to, but who still could comfort a woman with a bit of his masculine glow. (60)

Industrialized civilization becomes the curse to the human relation. The nature and the wood provide the relaxing rescue for Connie. Connie finds her natural instinctive life with Mellors, who lives in the wood as a gamekeeper. Both Connie and Mellors are frustrated by the industrial life. The bond between them grows stronger as their hatred towards the ghastly and deadening effects of industrial capitalism increases. Mellors declares that the source of all evil lies in modern man’s excessive urge to earn and to spend money. He criticizes the money minded young generations which have education and civilization yearning for money as he becomes the mouthpiece of Lawrence: “the young ones get mad because they’ve no money to spend. Their whole life depends on spending money, and now they’ve got none to spend. That’s our civilization and our education; bring up the masses to depend entirely on spending money, and then the money gives out” (128). The industrial landscape dominates

the lives of those who work in it, turning them from human flesh to soulless mechanism making people simply strive to do better within the industrial system to earn more money.

The rapidly advancing industrializations and mechanizations are seen as dominating not simply to economic relation between the classes and between the individuals, but also familial, sexual and cultural relations between all the characters in the novel. Even the characters like Bolton, Hilda, Bertha, Sir Malcolm Reid etc. have not the successful familial life. Everybody has their either second affair or have the victimized life. They are the mere victims of money, mine and machine dominated society. They don't have their tender sexuality. The industrial capitalism has become the real curse in their sexual life. But Connie and Mellors are shown to resist the domain of such life, and they subsequently come into a strong bond of companionship. Mellors is extremely unhappy to see the world around being trodden by mechanized greed of the modern people:

Oh, if only there were other men to be with, to fight that sparkling electric thing outside there, to preserve the tenderness of life, the tenderness of women, and the natural riches of desire. If only there were men to fight side by side with! But the men were all outside there, glorying in the Thing, triumphing or being trodden down in the rush of mechanized greed or of greedy mechanism. (102-3)

Connie–Mellors relationship is, thus, an advocacy of an integrated man having all his vitality of life and denial of harsh mechanical discipline of modern industrial capitalism represented by Clifford Chatterley.

### **3.3. Connie's pregnancy: A Hope of Cultural Regeneration**

*Lady Chatterley's Lover* opens with a pessimistic diagnosis of the modern age as "tragic": "ours is essentially a tragic age, so we refuse to take it tragically. The cataclysm has



happened, we are among the ruins [...]”. By “tragic age” Lawrence means an age of regimentation and mechanization epitomized by Chatterley’s collieries. It also suggests Connie’s personal tragedy– her barren existence with her mutilated husband and the “mental-lifers”, her intellectual friends. “The ruins” are, on the physical level, the destruction wrought by the war, but, more significantly the damaged values and social order which are its legacy. But the “ruins” are also an image of the psychic damage wrought over the centuries by the growing industrial capitalism. In the tragic state of contemporary society, with the exterior and interior ruin left by the war, and the destructive machine-power represented by Chatterley, Connie’s pregnancy by Mellors can be identified with the hope and rebirth of spontaneous life-activity and cultural regeneration.

Though Connie gets her social status after her marriage with Clifford, she does not find her inner desires fulfilled. The marriage, for her, established by property and social status does not satisfy her. She longs for a lively future life. Connie revolts against marriage as a formal ties, a passionate revolt against its ties and restrictions.

Connie, because of her own instinctive arousals, quests for the satisfaction. The need of sex and bearing of the child is inevitable for normal human beings. She desires for a phallic man who can understand her. Connie crosses the marriage bondage and the restrictions of the boundaries of the house. The desire of motherhood always looms around her heart. Her marriage with Clifford is vacant in this respect. Her desire to bear a child deepens as she visits Mellors' cottage and observes the chicken coop:

“She came everyday to the hens, they were the only things in the world that warmed her heart [...]. Yet it was spring, and the bluebells were coming in the wood, and the leaf-buds on the hazels were opening like the spatter of green rain. How terrible it was that it should be spring, and everything cold-hearted, cold-hearted. Only the hens, fluffed so wonderfully on the eggs, were warn

with their hot, brooding female bodies! Connie felt herself living on the brink of fainting all the time” (97).

The desire of motherhood makes Connie cry when she sees the chickens. Moynahan interprets the cry as the outcome of her frustrated instincts which is painful too: “She weeps because her own maternal instincts have been frustrated, because her life is emotionally barren, because she is a woman without a warm physical connection without body and or thing” (88).

The sense of motherhood incessantly torments Connie. Leaving her physically crippled husband under the care of the nurse Mrs. Bolton, Connie often escapes Wragby Hall in frustration. She, once, visits her friend Mrs. Flint, who has a female child. As Connie plays with the child, something void hits her female: “How warm and fulfilling somehow to have a baby and how Mrs. Flint had showed it off! She had something anyhow that Connie hadn’t got, and apparently couldn’t have. Yes, Mrs. Flint had flaunted her motherhood. And Connie had been just a bit, just a little bit jealous. She couldn’t help it” (114).

Connie desires a child as a hope of the rebirth of a society which will be the antithesis of the present mechanized and dehumanized one. But Clifford is sexually dead and his interest rests only for his selfishness. Connie's and Clifford’s views confront upon money and human love. Clifford, a machine-man keeps the parasitic nature for his selfish desires, not for the primal desires.

As Connie shifts from the world of Clifford’s uncreative intellectualism to that of Mellors’ physical tenderness, she is well-thrilled by the beauty and warmth of Mellors' body, which has a good respect for her female and enlivens the vitality of her life. As the novel progresses, there is a significant change in the life of Connie. Connie falls prey to the post-war mechanical society dominated by industrial capitalism: “The war had brought the roof

down over her (Connie) head” (1). Her vitality of life reawakens when she defies the social restrictions and takes in Mellors as her lover. Connie finds the world represented by Mellors as the only source of life: “I would like to have all the rest of the world disappear and live with you (Mellors) here” (187). What Connie misses in her living with Clifford is fulfilled by Mellors. The devastating frustration brought about by Clifford’s cold intellectualism ends in the rebirth of her instinctive life with Mellors. The destructive war, which hit Connie’s life on both the psychic and physical level (Clifford’s lameness), ends in her pregnancy. Pregnancy symbolizes future. Connie is very much hopeful of the future, which will bring the mankind living with the all its tenderness: “But you’ve put it into me. Be tender to it, and that will be its future already. Kiss it!” (247). Thus, Connie secures her future with the forthcoming child and rebels against the ‘industrial magnets’.

*Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is not merely a story of passion triumphing over class when the potency of a working man proves irresistible to a well-born lady. It is moreover a novel hinting at the regeneration of culture which proves to be a healer of the psychic damages brought about by the modern industrial capitalism. In *Britain in the Century of Total War* Arthur Marwick observes that, as a result of the war “society in the Twenties and Thirties exhibited all the signs of having suffered a deep mental wound, to which the agony and the bloodshed, as well as the more generalized revulsion at the destruction of an older civilization and its ways contributed” (62).

The natural landscape and the industrial background are juxtaposed for emphasizing upon Lawrencian intention to those who seek successful human life. But those who are stuck with the industrial magnets kill the instinctive desires and want to exploit the others. The revolt against such exploitation takes the helps of primal desires. So industrial and natural instincts counter, but only the primal desires win. Connie’s experience of a kind of psychic “death” and “rebirth” is very clear through her living connection with the solitary Mellors and

her union with him in solitude. This reflects her rebirth as “newborn thing”. The change heralds the germination of both the phallic mystery and desire and of their unborn child. A new life and society seem possible as the antithesis of the tragic post-war situation; the fact that Connie carries in her womb the seed of hope suggests that she is committing herself to a new future and a better world to come, which is an allegorical expression of Lawrence’s belief in the emergence of a new life and society in post-war Britain.

Thus, Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* is a poignant illustration of the deadening and suffocating blow of modern industrial capitalism on the human existence. Lawrence skillfully weaves plot, situation, and characters to show his deliberate intellectual attack on industrial capitalism, which, instead of enhancing the vitality of life, merely destroys it. Lawrence advocates the human cry for the new culture and society that enlivens the basic human instincts and its vitality. Lawrence bases this novel on the historical context of the contemporary British society which got the industrial capitalism flourished in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century with the commodification and mechanization of man at its heart, thus denying the defining essence of what man is. Lawrence, thus, comes up with the novel *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* as an attack on the destructive mechanism of modern industrial capitalism.

#### IV. Conclusion

Laden with a very powerful socio-political theme, *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is an expression of Lawrence's disgust to the industrial capitalism, which denies the emotional side of man and reduces the relationship between human beings to merely a commodity relation. Capitalism is the system of production which ensures private ownership of means of production and divides the whole society into two opposing factions — property owners and propertyless workers. The ideological clash, as Marx says, between the two classes at a certain stage of the development of the productive forces results in the victory of the working class people, opening the door to the establishment of a new order of society which liberates the mankind from mechanized discipline of industrial capitalism. The deliberate creation of the characters and their ideological confrontation in the novel has a great deal to do with the core of Lawrence's insight into the life and society of postwar Britain.

The major characters — Clifford Chatterley, Connie, and Oliver Mellors, Clifford's gamekeeper — constitute a triangular relationship, whose nature embodies the real thrust of the novel. Clifford and Mellors represent the two ideological extremes, which developed into a kind of horrible tension in the postwar British and other European societies. The dramatic change Connie experiences in her life between these extremes and the direction she takes reflects the novel's critical concern over the dehumanizing effects of heightening industrial capitalism.

As an industrialist and technocrat, Clifford is well-thrilled by the sense of his ruling power. He defends his position by advocating the class-based hierarchical social structure as the ultimate social reality. What distracts Connie from her marital relation with Clifford is his machine-oriented life. Clifford's growing sense of fame and money grounded on his principle of status-quo reduces himself to a machine man having no warmth, tenderness and vitality of life. Physically paralyzed Clifford and his sexual impotence bear a conspicuous symbolic

significance that industrial capitalism stands on life-denying mechanism. The conditions under which Clifford, the representative of industrial capitalism, lives no longer allow his integration with Connie, who wanders with a desire of an integrated life full of natural physical tenderness and vitality. The novel on the whole reflects crippling, destructive, dehumanizing and life-denying effects of industrial capitalism. Oliver Mellors, a working class man, dissociates himself from all kinds of existing social hypocrisies and takes a shelter in the wood, and thus establishing a bond with nature and its beauty. Connie's hatred towards Clifford's principle of life and the world intensifies as she tightens her bond with Oliver Mellors. The shift of her life from Clifford's infertility to Mellors' vitality and fertility suggests Lawrence's hope of cultural regeneration. Connie's defiance of class barrier itself is a revolt against the mechanism of industrial capitalism. The way Lawrence characterizes Mellors suggests that the worship of the mechanical thing, the basis of modern mechanistic society has led to the loss of man's spontaneous extra-rational instinct and intuition. It has subjected mankind to a relentlessly mechanized industrial system, taking all the real life-forces and deepest needs.

*Lady Chatterley's Lover* is, in a way, an exploration into the crisis of humanity under industrial capitalism of twentieth century world. In addition to economic exploitation, mechanism of industrial capitalism denies the real essence of what it is to be human. Human feelings, emotions and all kinds of spontaneous life-forces get crippled. Man feels himself to be nothing more than a part of a machine, and an industrial worker loses his control over what he produces as it goes off his hands. Moreover, the product overpowers him, leaving the producer alienated.

*Lady Chatterley's Lover* demonstrates the tension between two opposing ideologies. Clifford Chatterley, who represents the industrial capitalism of postwar Britain, is strongly opposed by Mellors, who represents an attempt to defend the life from machine-willed

invasion. Clifford is portrayed as a ghostly figure, whereas Lawrence has remarkably extended a sympathetic attitude to Mellors and Connie. The transformation of unsuccessful marriage between Clifford and Connie into a successful love between Connie and Oliver Mellors is significant for the reason behind it. The love between Connie and Mellors represents Lawrence's recognition that there may be the possibility in postwar Britain of new kinds of relationships which will transcend class divisions and which, ultimately, will be the basis of a revitalized social order. Through his spokesman, Mellors, Lawrence tries to define a new set of values based upon his cyclical view of history as shaped by the dialectics of "death" and "rebirth." The exploration conducted in the novel is directed at discovering a way out of the industrial wasteland through the revival of the vital Dionysian phallic relation of man and woman. The cold rationality of Clifford Chatterley's industrial world, representing postwar Britain, is counterpointed with Connie's development from despair to fulfillment, and Mellors' commitment to a sensual tenderness.

Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover* illustrates horrible effects of Clifford's industrial regime on the pit workers, whose bodies are made instrumental and mechanical. Clifford's deep seated desire to control the natural and human world is portrayed with a sharp critical tone to exhibit the novelist's attack on industrial capitalism. Thus, shedding light on the creative bond of the relationship between Connie and Mellors, the victims of bourgeois industrial regime represented by Clifford, and on the void and disintegrated life of Clifford, Lawrence makes a deliberate attack on modern industrial capitalism.

## Works Cited

- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, 1992.
- Adorno, Theodor and Max Horkheimer. "The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception." *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams and Leroy Searle. Florida: FSUP, 1983. 202-19
- Burack, Charles M. *Revitalizing the Reader: Literary Technique and the Language of Sacred Experience in D.H. Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
- Burns, Wayne. "Lady Chatterley's Lover: A Pilgrim's Progress for Our Time." *Paunch* 26 (1966): 16-33.
- Cohen, Walter. "Marxist Criticism." *Redrawing the Boundaries*. Ed. Stephen Greenblatt and Giles Gunn. New York: MLA, 1992. 320-48.
- Daiches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Vol.4. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 2002.
- Dorothy, Gerald. *Papers on Language and Literature*. Vol. 34. Edwardsville: Fall, 1998.
- Fromm, Erich. *Marx's Concept of Man*. New York: TCPC, 1966.
- Lawrence, D.H. "A Propos of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*". *D.H. Lawrence: A Selection from Phoenix*. Ed. A. A. H. Inglis. Middlesex: Penguin, 1971. 327-61
- ....*Lady Chatterley's Lover*. London: Wordsworth Editions Limited, 2005.
- Levis, F.R. *D.H. Lawrence: A Novelist*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1955.
- Lukacs, George. "The Ideal of the Harmonious Man in Bourgeois Aesthetics." Adams 902-8.
- Marwick, Arthur. *Britain in the Century of Total War: War, Peace and Social Change*. London: Bodley Head, 1968.
- Marx, Karl. "Economic and Philosophical Manuscript." Trans. T.B. Bottomore. *Marx's Concept of Man*. Ed. Erich Fromm. New York: TCPC, 1996. 87-167



- .... "A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." Adams 625-27.
- .... *Capital*. Vol. 1. New York: The Modern Library, 1906.
- .... Preface. *Early Writings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1975. 425-26.
- Marx, Karl and Fredrich Angles. *The German Ideology*. Trans. W. Laugh et al. Ed. A.J. P. Arthur. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1970.
- .... *The Communist Manifesto*. Trans. S. Moore. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967.
- Moynahan, Julian. *The Deed of Life: The Novel and Tales of D.H. Lawrence*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1963.
- Nikitin, P. *Fundamentals of Political Economy*. Moscow: Foreign Language Publishing House, 1963.
- Prasad, Madhusudhan. *D.H. Lawrence: A Study of His Novels*. Bara Bazar: Prakash Book Depot, 1998.
- Reuben, Elaine. *Women's Studies*. Vol. 1. London: Heinemann Education Book Ltd., 1973.
- Selden, Raman. *A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.
- Trotsky, Leon. "The Formalist School of Poetry and Marxism." Adams 792-99
- Yakhot, O. *What is Dialectical Materialism?* Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1965.