

Marxism and Sons and Lovers

Hussein Theeb Albakrawi^{1*} Mutasim Mahadeen^{2*}

1. Chairman of Science and Basic studies Department, University of Tabuk, KSA

2. Preparatory Year, University of Tabuk, PO Box

Email of the corresponding author: mmahadin77@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper presents a new reading of Lawrence's Sons and Lovers, and from a Marxist angle of vision. Many critical readings have been introduced to the public dealing mainly with the themes of sexuality, feminism and psychology. This study tries to read the text in the light of other social forces that manipulated and shaped the identity of society in the twentieth century such as the interwoven clash between the materialistic and social identities within the fabric of the English society and how these forces played a key role in identity of the novel.

Keywords: Marxism, base, superstructure

1. Introduction

David Herbert Lawrence is considered as one of the greatest writers in the Twentieth Century. He presented many literary masterpieces that still occupy a significant place in the world's literary tradition. As a novelist, D. H. Lawrence introduced many great works that were characterized as both controversial and innovative. Sons and Lovers is probably one of the most controversial literary works that he introduced to the public. The novel received both positive and negative critical reviews from many critics and managed to stay as an essential constituent in the curriculum of the most prestigious educational institutions. Despite the fact that the work dealt with themes that were considered obscene at that time such as the theme of sexuality, Lawrence managed, skillfully, to bring to the literary arena innovative themes such as Feminism and Marxism.

This paper will be mainly interested in presenting a new reading of Sons and Lovers as a Marxist text. The paper is divided into two parts. In the first part of the paper a light will be shed on Marxism as both a philosophical theory and a school of literary criticism. In addition to highlighting the major concepts of Marxism, the paper will also introduce how Marxists view literature and literary texts according to the major conventions and principles of Marxism. The second part of the paper, tracks the threads of social and materialistic clashes in the text of the novel. It will investigate how the major themes and major forces in the novel are formed and shaped under the influence of the capitalist and materialistic forces. It also presents how the characters of the novel are motivated or forced by materialistic needs to act in a capitalist industrial society that classifies people according to their social class and materialistic value.

2. Marxism

Marxism as a cultural and a philosophical movement is mainly derived from the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Any cultural practice or theory that is based on an interpretation and understanding of the works of Marx can be called Marxism. As a philosophical and cultural theory, Marxism has witnessed and through the course of its history various stages of change and developments. Accordingly, many forms of Marxism were formed and molded with different principles and practices, but most of these forms share one or more of the following principles:

1- The belief that Capitalism is mainly based on the exploitation of workers by the owners of the means of production.

2- The dominant ideology in any society is usually shaped by the material conditions and relations of production and mainly by the dominant class in that society.

3- The class in any society is not only determined by wealth like the lower class, the middle class and the upper class. According to Marxism, the identity of any social class is determined or derived from its relationship to the means of production and the relationship between different classes is also built on these relations of production. Consequently, in any capitalist society we can witness the existence of the following classes:

A-The Proletariat: the proletariats are individuals who sell their labor power in the capitalist mode of production and do not own the means of production. They are usually referred to now as the working class.

B- The bourgeoisie: are those who own the means of production and buy labor power from the proletariats and by doing that they exploit them.

4- Marxists also see history and the historical changes in any society as formed and shaped by the struggle between the classes in that society. The evolving conflicts between classes according to their ideologies lead to revolutions and struggles and these in turn will lead to a historical change in that society. Accordingly, any historical change in the history of any society is usually formed by the conflict between the classes and the social

powers in that society. The victorious class will impose its ideology to become the dominant ideology of that society:

“According to the materialist conception of history, the determining element in history is ultimately the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. If therefore somebody twists this into the statement that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms it into a meaningless, abstract and absurd phrase. The economic situation is the basis, but the various elements of the superstructure – political forms of the class struggle and its consequences, constitutions established by the victorious class after a successful battle, etc. – forms of law – and then even the reflexes of all these actual struggles in the brains of the combatants: political, legal, and philosophical theories, religious ideas and their further development into systems of dogma – also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form.” (Engels 9)

2.1 Marxism and Ideology.

Marx and Engels presented a very famous passage that reflected the principal of ideology of Marxism:

“The production of ideas, concepts and consciousness is first of all directly interwoven with the material intercourse of man, the language of real life. Conceiving, thinking, the spiritual intercourse of men, appear here as the direct efflux of men’s material behavior . . . we do not proceed from what men say, imagine, conceive, nor from men as described, thought of, imagined, conceived, in order to arrive at corporeal man; rather we proceed from the really active man . . . consciousness does not determine life: life determines consciousness.” (Marx and Engels 1845-6)

A more complete version of these ideas can be found in *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*:

“In the social production of their life, men enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rises a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life process in general. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their being, but on the contrary, their social being that determines their consciousness.” (Marx and Engels 1859).

Marx presents two of the central concepts in Marxism which are the concepts of the base and the superstructure. According to him, the base is the economic system in any society. This economic system is divided between the capitalist class who owns the means of production, and the proletarian class whose labor power is bought for profit and through this process got exploited. These two forces or classes form what Marx calls the economic structure of society, or what is more commonly known by Marxism as the economic base or the infrastructure. The ideological theories and beliefs of the dominant class in any society are called the superstructure. The superstructure, consequently, refers to the cultural activities such as philosophy and literature. The relationship between the superstructure and the base is mainly based on the economic conditions that form the society. In other words, the economic base in any society determines the interests and styles of its superstructure. Terry Eagleton clarifies that in *Marxism and Literary Criticism*, all the elements of the superstructure are formed to serve the interests of the dominant class in society. The essential function of the superstructure is to legitimize the power of the social class which means the means of economic production (1976). To sum up what has been said, we can say that the superstructure must always be understood in relation to the base and the economical forces that shape this base.

2.2 Marxism, Art and Literary Criticism.

Art is known to be part of any ideological system in any historical period or any society. It is the representative of the major theological schools and the mirror through which the pains, struggles, victories and changes in any society or epoch are beautifully reflected. Through this mirror Marxists believe, as Eagleton explained, that the ideological principles of the rolling economical and social class should be transformed and presented: “Art, then, is for Marxism part of the ‘superstructure’ of society. It is part of a society’s ideology – an element in that complex structure of social perception which ensures that the situation in which one social class has power over the others is either seen by most members of the society as ‘natural’ or not seen at all. To understand literature, then, means understanding the total social process of which it is part.” (Eagleton 5-6). Since literature is considered as part of the super structure in any society it must be understood in relation to its historical and social reality. In the light of this fact, Marxist criticism studies literature in relation to its capacity to reflect the struggle between classes and the economic conditions in any given society. The aim of this criticism is to explore literature in relation to this Marxist vision, which is seen as a scientific truth. It should also be put into our consideration that Marxist criticism is not only based on giving a social study of a certain literary work by highlighting the major social and economical forces that formed or shaped it, but also depicting all the aesthetic and formative features in the work which are seen as the products of the economical and social realities: “Marxist criticism is not merely a ‘sociology of literature’, concerned with how novels get published and

whether they mention the working class. Its aim is to explain the literary work more fully; and this means a sensitive attention to its forms, styles and meanings. But it also means grasping those forms, styles and meanings as the products of a particular history.” (Eagleton 3)

Marxist criticism leads to social realism, the belief that literature should express directly the social realities as perceived from the Marxist point of view. This is considered as the most direct form of Marxism which is sometimes called Vulgar Marxism. In this form, there is a direct and deterministic relation between the base and the superstructure. Literature is seen as determined and formed according to the social realities in a certain society. Critics like Christopher Caudwell adopted this position between the base and the superstructure and accepted the mimetic nature of literature. In his essay *English Poets, The Decline of Capitalism* Caudwell criticized what he called the bourgeois poets. He accused them of what he called ‘commodity fetishism’ and of escaping from the contradiction of the class for whom they speak: “. . . This meant a movement which would completely separate the world of art from the world of reality and, in doing so, separate it from the source of art itself so that the work would burst like a bubble just when it seemed most secure.” (Caudwell 87). The poet accordingly, separates himself from the society he lives in. Georg Lukacs, as a Marxist critic, drew a difference between the Social Realism and the Critical Realism. He believed in the function of literature as reflecting socio-economic realities, but he rejected the exclusiveness of art in its mimetic nature. The great literary work does not reproduce or reflect only the dominant ideologies of its time but also help in the process of forming criticism of these ideologies. Accordingly, critical realism is not merely mimetic in its function but play a significant role in the process of highlighting the contradictions and defects of the capitalist society: “In regard to the past, theoreticians of socialist realism . . . have always considered the great critical realities allies in their struggle to establish the supremacy of realism in aesthetics. But the alliance is not merely theoretical. The historical insights in these writers’ works, and the methods they used to achieve these insights, are vital to an understanding of the forces shaping the present and the future. They may help us to understand the struggle between the forces of progress and reaction, life and decay, in the modern world. To ignore all this is to throw away a most important weapon in our fight against the decadent literature of anti-realism. . .” (Lukacs 90-1)

Other critics like Walter Benjamin emphasized on the production rather than the consumption of any literary work. Art, according to him, must be revolutionary, in that it must break radically with the traditional forms since even works which use conventional techniques to attack capitalism can be consumed by the bourgeois audience.

3. Marxism and Sons and Lovers

Sons and Lovers is considered by many critics to be Lawrence’s masterpiece and one of the most important literary works in the Twentieth Century. The novel was published for the first time in 1913 and came to be considered as a graphic representation to the life of the working class in the English society during that time. The novel is divided into two main parts and through which Lawrence presents the life of a struggling family in the age of industrialism. The story of the novel narrates the life and struggle of the Morel family to overcome the financial, social, and personal difficulties that they faced through the course of their lives. The story starts when Gertrude Coppard meets Walter Morel in a party. Gertrude is an educated and rich girl who came from a class that is socially and financially superior to the class from which Walter came. She was also raised up by a Puritanical conservative father and suffered from the constraints of the puritanical life. Gertrude fell in love with Walter and got married to him but soon she discovered the difficulties of living with the financial difficulties that faced them. Walter was a local coal miner who spent his nights at the local pub and wasted his salary on drinking instead of taking care of his family. In the light of these difficulties the passion between the couple faded and Gertrude decided to shift her passion and attention to her sons instead of her husband beginning with her oldest son William. Mrs. Morel gave her attention and passion to William who left the house for a job in the city and soon achieved his financial and social independence from both the family and his mother. After living in the middle class for a while, William died as a result of a skin disease leaving his mother with a broken heart. But soon the mother shifted her attention to her other son Paul. Paul, in his turn, worked in a factory and experienced love with girls such as Miriam and Clara. Unable to escape from the emotional control of his mother, Paul left the two girls and returned to take care of his dying mother. After the death of Mrs. Morel, Paul felt lost especially with his inability to return to Clara or resuming his interest in drawing. The novel ends with Paul who lost everything but decided not to give up to darkness.

The first glimpse of Marxism can be found in the authentic relationship between the novel and the real life of the author. The first reading of the novel enables us to track the deep connection between the plot of the novel and the real life of D. H. Lawrence who thought that by presenting his personal experiences in the work, he was more subjective than objective: Lawrence felt that the novel could become personal and less objective, he saw the possibility that language could describe in details the personal experiences of emotions and passion as it were ‘from the inside’ (Butler 8). But the most important thing in reflecting the personal experience of the author is that by doing so, Lawrence was portraying all the agonies and pains that he and his family were suffering from

as a result of the injustices that were practiced on the working class in England at that time. *Sons and Lovers* can be seen as a fictional version of Lawrence's own life. The reality in depicting his life through the characters that were portrayed in the novel will play a significant role in highlighting the entire clash and conflicts that were witnessed in both his life as an individual in the working class of England at that time and the upper class that his mother came from. Lawrence's mother Lydia who came from a proud and relatively refined background suffered during her life as a result of her marriage from Mr. Lawrence and led an unsatisfying life. She was married to a poor man from the mining community in England and suffered as a result of that from an unhappy life. Lawrence presented the actual life of his parents through the characters of Mr. Morel and Mrs. Morel and reflected at the same time the evils of industrialism and materialism. These evils that destroyed the seemingly happy life of the Morels and the Lawrence's family at the same time. Any reader, who has the chance of reading *Sons and Lovers*, will find himself experiencing the agonies of D. H. Lawrence struggling along with his family in the mining community of England. The roots of the novel are clearly located in the Lawrence's life. He reflected his young life in the working class of England and their struggle thorough the life of the Morels and their struggle to rise from the coal mining society into a better and higher social class.

Many Marxist critics and among them Georg Lukacs believed that the literary work should reflect the real world like a mirror. Through this mirror you can either see the injustices practiced by the rolling class or the upper class over the working class or you can see how the ideologies of the bourgeoisie are implanted in the superstructure of a certain society: "A 'realist' work is rich in a complex, comprehensive set of relations between man, nature, and history; and these relations embody and unfold what for Marxism is most 'typical' about a particular phase of history. By the 'typical' Lukacs denotes those latent forces in any society which are from a Marxist viewpoint most historically significant and progressive, which lay bare the society's inner structure and dynamic. The task of the realist writer is to flesh out these 'typical' trends and forces in sensuously realized individuals and actions; in doing so he links the individual to the social whole, and informs each concrete particular of social life with the power of the 'world – historical' – the significant movements of history itself." (Lukacs 28). Lukacs emphasized here the necessity of the literary work to be realistic, in that it should reflect the personal or individual reality in addition to the social reality. In other words, any literary work has to have the ability to reflect the historical and social realities of a certain society. Lawrence, as a realist writer, managed through the course of *Sons and Lover* to reflect the social and historical realities in his time in addition to the personal and psychological experiences of his characters. Through the novel, he portrayed the life and struggle of the working class at the beginning of the Twentieth Century. He also portrayed how industrialism was creeping into the fabrics of the English society and destroying the rural style of living in the kingdom. Lawrence as we mentioned earlier did not only concentrate on this side of reality. He also managed skillfully to concentrate on the individual part of this realistic experience by presenting the difficulties that faced the Morels as both a family and as individuals in their struggle against industrialism. The social experiences were skillfully mingled with the social ones to represent in a realistic and artistic way the hardships and agonies of living in a modern industrial society that dehumanized the individuals and turned them into machines in the hands of industrialization. Lawrence did not only resolve to depict the communal and social realities in his time, but he was mainly interested in the individual experiences through this historical period. As we have mentioned earlier, most of the plot in the novel represents actual fragments in the life of Lawrence that the novel seems to be autobiographical. Lawrence started working on his novel while his mother was dying and he tried to represent the hardships that she faced in her life through the character of Mrs. Morel. He depicted how his mother moved to live into a social class inferior to the one she came from originally and how she suffered according to that. Lawrence also reflected his experience through the character of Paul Morel and how he also suffered to find his true identity and to climb into another social class. By doing so and by being subjective, Lawrence did not realize that he was also objective in reflecting his experiences. Through presenting these hardships that he and his family faced at the beginning of his life, Lawrence was actually depicting all the hardships and difficulties that faced an entire generation or class in the English society and through a certain historical period. The difficulties that faced Lawrence were not only related to him but to all the English young men who faced the dehumanizing effect of industrialism and the discrimination between them according to their social class.

One of the most prominent themes in the novel is the clash between classes. Through the story of the novel you can witness an obvious discrimination between classes and this colored the life of all the characters. This discrimination was also considered as the main reason behind the failure of the Morels in their social experiences or their life in general. To start from the setting of the novel, the novel takes places in a place called 'the Bottom': "The Bottom' succeeded to 'Hell Row'. Hell row was a block of thatched, bulging cottages that stood by the brook side on Greenhill lane. There lived the colliers who worked in the little gin-pits two fields away. The brook ran under the alder-trees, scarcely soiled by these small mines, whose coal was drawn to the surface by donkeys that plodded wearily in a circle round a gin" (Lawrence 7). It is obvious, through the name of the place, the clear discrimination in the class and the social rank in society. Those who dwell in this place are the

lowest class in the society that they are literally in the bottom of society. Lawrence used the historical and geographical facts skillfully in the novel to draw upon the differences between classes and highlights classism in the Twentieth Century England. In an isolated house in this deserted area the Morels lived and the novel describes their lives and suffering in this capitalist materialistic society.

It seems that Lawrence was aware to the developing problem of classism that was growing in the English society due to facts such as the enlarging industrialization and the change from the rural to the modern style of living in the fabrics of the English society. Accordingly, most of the struggles and conflicts in the plot of *Sons and Lovers* were mainly based on the class discrimination and materialistic values that constituted the main fuel behind the ignition of these conflicts. The obvious example to depict this conflict can be found here in the relationship between Gertrude Morel and her husband. Mrs. Morel has married below her class. At first she was anxious to move to The Bottoms. But it was the best she could to escape her father's puritanical constraints and establish some kind of personal liberty. After a period of living with Walter Morel in this area, Mrs. Morel became unhappy and disillusioned with the life of the lower class. She was facing many challenges such as living in the poverty and the hardships of the mining community. This miserable state has colored the life of Mrs. Morel with ugliness and unhappiness. The life of her dreams has been altered by these economical and social circumstances into a continuous nightmare. Imbalance in this style of living was clearly depicted in the relationship between Mr. Morel and Mrs. Morel. The husband used to come to the house drunk while the wife waited for him with a feeling of disillusionment and sadness. At the beginning of their life, she was attracted to his freedom and sensuous life. The reason behind this attraction lies in the fact that Mr. Morel and his lifestyle represented everything opposite to what Mrs. Morel experienced before with her father. Her attraction to him was simply based on the attraction that could happen between the opposites. Later on, she discovered that these differences and among them the difference in the social and economical status were the main forces behind the failure of her marriage. She discovers that her husband had lied to her about paying for their house furniture, and about owning the house which they live in. The lies about the unpaid bills and about the owning of the house derived Mrs. Morel slowly to despise the man she once fell in love with. She was aware that her husband was very different from her socially and economically. Accordingly, She thought that she could change him and elevate him into her social class, but she couldn't and that destroyed eventually their relationship. Mr. Morel was a simple miner with no real ambition of climbing to any other social class but Mrs. Morel wanted him to upgrade himself financially and socially to be accepted within the elite bourgeoisie of the English society. When he failed to meet her great expectations, she abandoned him emotionally and tried to achieve her goals through her sons, William and Paul: "The pity was, she was too much his opposite. She couldn't be content with the little he might be; she would have him the much that he ought to be. So, in seeking to make him nobler than he could be, she destroyed him she injured and hurt and scarred herself, but she lost none of her worth. She also had the children." (Lawrence 21) Mrs. Morel and her husband came to represent two different classes in the family and the social fabric. Through them, we can also see that the differences between these two classes do not only lie in the economical and social plain, but also in the ideological plane. As we have mentioned earlier, Mrs. Morel came from a class that was considered as superior socially and economically. She was raised by a puritanical conservative father and came into contact with a man characterized by qualities such as the dishonesty, alcoholism, vulgarity and brutality. Consequently, She tried to escape from the influence of her father and the ties of his conservative life, but was struck by the poverty, meanness and ugliness of her husband's life. This interaction between the two different ideological and social classes was doomed to fail. The romance between the two was altered by hatred and distrust. As a result to that, the drunken husband pushes his pregnant wife out into the cold night and locks the door against her. It seems that the huge difference between the two parents was the main cause for this marriage that was characterized after that by violence, hatred and ugliness. These ideological differences were seen easily in the relationship between the two parents and their children. Through the course of the novel, Mrs. Morel tried to practice an ideological dominance over her children and force them to act according to her well as the dominant class would enforce his ideology over other classes. We see Mrs. Morel and her interference in the romantic relations that her sons lead through the novel. She also holds Paul's hands at every step of his quest to accomplish his artistic and social identity molding and forming every experience that he entered with her own opinions and judgments. Paul was seen by many critics as the product of his mother's driving power and ideology. After his success artistically, Mrs. Morel was not only welling but eager to see Paul moves into new social circles or upper classes. She wanted him to climb into the upper class and to reject all the previously reformed social ties with the lower class. Paul started to revolt against his mother saying that the difference between people is not in their class but in themselves: "Paul and his mother now had long discussion about life. Religion was fading into the background. He had shoveled away all the beliefs that would hamper him, had cleared the ground, and come more or less to the bedrock of belief that one should feel inside oneself for right and wrong, and should have the patience to gradually realize one's God. Now life interested him more. 'You know', he said to his mother, 'I don't want to belong to the well to do middle class. I like my common people

best. I belong to the common people.’

-‘But if anyone else said so, my son, wouldn’t you be in a tear! You know you consider yourself equal to any gentleman.’

-‘In myself,’ he answered, not in my class or my education or manners. But in myself I am.’

-‘Very well, then. Then why talk about the common people?’

-‘Because – the difference between people isn’t in their class, but in themselves...’ (Lawrence 250)

Paul suffered from the exhausting life in the modern industrial society. He felt as a prisoner of industrialism with its new system of values (Lawrence 92). He wanted to live a simple life in the rural society where he can enjoy his life with quietness and solitude but was forced to struggle in the new materialistic society in England. His main interest was helping his mother with his salary but that couldn’t be done easily. Lawrence wanted here to emphasize how the shift from the agricultural to the industrial society in England has affected people and drove them into a mechanical and straining system of life.

One of the constant and most important features in the life of the Morels is the financial or economical aspect that formed their relations with each others. It is noticed, as we have mentioned earlier, the importance of the financial constrains and difficulties that colored the conflicts and struggles they lead through the plot of the novel. Many critics concentrated on the psychological side of the relationships between the Morels without paying the suitable attention to the interaction between the psychological and economical ties that are clearly evident in the novel. The relationship between Mrs. Morel and her husband was mainly based on the economical plane and it was destroyed when Mr. Morel failed to accomplish his mission as the breadwinner of the family. Mrs. Morel also led an economical relationship with her sons. William, for instance, began his life outside the family by giving his earnings to his mother and even in London he used to send his mother ten Shillings a week. When William revolted against his financial and emotional submission to his mother by spending fifty shillings on himself and buying his girl jewelry, Paul came as the second financial source for his mother. He gave her all his money at the beginning of his life. These distinct economical ties were also mingled with the psychological aspects of the novel as we have witnessed in the character of Mrs. Morel. Through the novel, she presented a strange sense of possessiveness in her relations with her husband and her sons: “To possess her husband, then her sons, as Mariam tries to possess Paul. Lawrence saw this offense as a disease of modern life in all its manifestation, from sexual relationships to those broad social and political relationships that have changed people from individuals to anonymous economic properties or to military units or to ideological autonomous” (Van Ghent 17)

The unhealthy desire of possessiveness is seen here as a symptom to the capitalist system that infected the English society with the lust for materialistic possessiveness. This lust that was injected in society by the capitalist propaganda has changed people into either machines in the hands of the materialism or products stripped out of any individual characteristics.

In *The Theory of the Novel* (1920), Georg Lukacs considered the novel as the ‘bourgeois epic’, but an epic which unlike its classical counterpart reveals the homelessness and alienation of man in modern society. In his *Studies in European Realism and The Historical Novel*, Lukacs identified the greatest artists as those who can recapture and recreate a harmonious totality of human life. In a society where the general and the particular, the conceptual and the sensuous, the social and the individual are increasingly torn apart by the ‘alienation’ of capitalism, the great writer draws these dialectically together into a complex totality. His fiction thus mirrors, in microcosmic form, the complex totality of society itself. In doing this, great art combats the alienation and fragmentation of capitalist society, projecting a rich, many-sided image of human wholeness (Lukacs 28). According to this Marxist depiction of the character in modern art, we can witness how Lawrence portrayed many of his characters as lonely, disillusioned and alienated in the society of the new industrial London. Starting from the setting of the novel, the Morels lived in an area that was isolated from other social classes. Even their house was described as being an end house with only one neighbor. Mrs. Morel was also portrayed after her struggle with her husband, as a lonely, disillusioned and alienated character in her house. She used to sit in the dark places of the house waiting for the return of her husband from the pub in the midnight or early mornings. Paul Morel, one of the central characters in the novel, was also portrayed at the end of the novel as lonely after he lost everything in his life. He represented the fate of the man in the modern materialistic world as seen by the Marxist critics. He was left alone in the immense darkness of the uncertainty: “Everywhere the vastness and terror of the immense night which is roused and stirred for a brief while by the day, but which returns, and will remain at last eternal, holding everything in its silence and living gloom. There was no Time, only space. . . On every side the immense dark silence seemed pressing him, so tiny a spark, into extinction, and yet, almost nothing, he could not be extinct. Night, in which everything was lost, went reaching out, beyond stars and suns.” (Lawrence 406)

The domestic circle of the Morels was a reflection and a representation of the communal spirit in the modern English society. Paul Morel suffered from the strife between the parents and that led to feelings of helplessness

and isolation. He was a victim to this severe conflict between the two parents who came from different classes and reflected that in their lifestyle. They also created a big gap in the ideological and moral lessons that they could have implanted in their sons.

Many critics believed that this novel was written for the benefit of the working class. Through the plot of the novel, we can notice that Lawrence was mainly focusing on the hardships that faced English people as they moved from the simple life of the agricultural society to the evils of industrialism. This jump would lead eventually into spreading the gap between the classes in the social fabrics and replace the entire moral values in the society with materialistic ones. It is obvious, in the light of what has been mentioned, that the working class was the main part of the readers community to which the novel was created and oriented.

4. The Conclusion.

Through the course of this paper, we have been introduced to one of the most important literary works in the twentieth century. *Sons and Lovers* came to be considered as both an autobiographical work that narrated the life of the young Lawrence and his relations with his mother and family. The work also portrays in a realistic way the social and economical changes that were taking place in England during the first part of the twentieth century. The struggle which the young Englishman had in forming his identity and social independence while striving at the same time with the difficulties of living in an industrial society. The work also projected how the change from an agricultural to an industrial society attacked the moral foundations of the English society and implanted the lust for the materialistic possessions in the minds of the modern English citizen. The work also highlighted this social change that has affected the social fabric of the English society and led to the discrimination between classes according to ideological, social and materialistic values. This discrimination has expanded the gap between the individuals in the two classes and deemed any social interaction between them as impossible. Accordingly, this paper tried to present how the previously mentioned themes can be understood from a Marxist point of view. *Sons and Lovers* was characterized when it was first published by its obscenity and by concentrating on the psychological representation of its characters that can be seen and understood from a Freudian point of view. But a closer look to the novel will enable us to comprehend the social, realistic and materialistic traits in the novel. It portrayed, as we have mentioned earlier, the social changes in the society as a result of industrialism. These changes emphasized on classism and on the discrimination between individuals according to materialistic and social values. The novel also represents an authentic view of the modern individual in a capitalist society. The individual who faced the newly formed challenges in a capitalist society with the feelings of homelessness, alienation and fragmentation.

References

- Butler, Lance St. John. D. H. Lawrence: *Sons and Lovers*. Essex: Longman, 1980.
- D. H. Lawrence: *A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Mark Spilka. U.S.A: Prentice- Hall, 1963.
- D. H. Lawrence: *A Critical Study of the Major Novels and Other Writings*. Ed. A. H. Gomme. U.K.: The Harvester Press, 1978.
- D. H. Lawrence: *The Critical Heritage*. Ed. R. P. Draper. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1970.
- Eagleton, Terry. *Marxism and Literary Criticism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976.
- Klingender, Frances Donald. *Marxism and Modern Art: An Approach to Social Realism*. London: Lawrence and Wishort, 1977.
- Lawrence, D. H. *Sons and Lovers*. U.K.: York Press, 2004.
- Mark, Karl, Frederick Engels, V. I. Lenin and Joseph Stalin. *On The Theory of Marxism*. New York: International Publishers, 1948.
- Newton, K. M. *Twentieth-Century Literary Theory: A Reader*. London: Macmillan, 1988.
- Rice, Philip and Patricia Waugh. *Modern Literary Theory: A Reader*. London and New York: Edward Arnold, 1989.
- Salgado, Gamini. D. H. Lawrence: *Sons and Lovers*. U.K.: The Camelot Press, 1966.
- Smart, Barry. *Foucault, Marxism and Critique*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1983.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.