

Tocqueville's Idea of Revolution and D.H. Lawrence's The Rainbow: A Study of Social Change and The Liberation of Women

Alev BAYSAL*

Abstract

As a modern novelist, D.H. Lawrence is not interested in the portrayal of individuals possessing a conventional moral and psychological mind within a certain moral scheme. In *The Rainbow*, he uses the Industrial Revolution as a predominant feature and urges a spiritual revolution within the females, to liberate the mind from its materialist chain and conventional gender roles. The concept of the revolution can be interpreted in the light of Alexis Tocqueville's ideas.

Key Words: D.H. Lawrence, *The Rainbow*, Industrial Revolution, Tocqueville, independence/ liberation

Özet

Modern dönem roman yazarı olarak D.H. Lawrence alışlagelmiş ahlaki ve sosyal normlar içindeki karakter analizleriyle ilgilenmez. Gökkuşluğu adlı romanında, endüstri devrimini romanın vazgeçilmez bir ögesi olarak kullanan romancı, karakterlerini dönemin getirdiği maddiyatçı zihniyetten ve geleneksel cinsiyet rollerinden kurtarmak için özellikle kadın karakterler arasında başkaldırı unsurunu kullanmıştır. Bu başkaldırı terimi, Alexis Tocqueville'in bakış açısıyla incelenebilir..

Anahtar Sözcükler: D.H. Lawrence, *Gökkuşluğu*, Endüstri Devrimi, Tocqueville, özgürlük.

As an artist who is interested in “profound institutions of life, which together imply a radical revision of traditional moral ideas” (Schapiro 82), D. H. Lawrence (1885-1930) is not interested in the portrayal of individuals possessing a conventional moral and psychological mind within a certain moral scheme. In *The Rainbow* (1915) Lawrence uses industrialisation (Industrial Revolution) as a predominant feature and urges a spiritual revolution within each individual, to liberate the mind from its materialist chains. This liberation or spiritual revolution is presented often in metaphorical or symbolic terms, and covers three generations of the same family from the Industrial Revolution to the First World War. Each generation is an extended analysis of the same

(*) Dr., Hacettepe University Department of English Language and Literature

problem. Lawrence sets the characters' experience within a context of an "economic machine" (Doherty 118): the necessity of work and the primacy of the business. In *The Rainbow*, Lawrence, through three generations of the Brangwen family, lets her female characters become aware of their identities and makes them revolt against the established norms and regulations of British society.

The term "Revolution" can be interpreted from the point of Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-59) who not only changed the style and mode of thinking of the time in which he lived, but also affected the ideas of the philosophers with his detailed analysis of the concept of revolution. It cannot be clearly stated whether Lawrence had been affected by Tocqueville's concept of Revolution or not, but in his *The Rainbow* the traces of this great writer's ideas can easily be seen.

Alexis de Tocqueville is recognised as one of the most important 19th century French political writers and statesmen. His deep and sharp analysis of every aspect of society from the viewpoint of law, religion, customs, literature, and history (Boesche 89) differentiates him from the other politicians and thinkers of his time. He suggests, "every single aspect of society interrelates with each other, so that the part always reflects the whole" (Boesche 80). Thus, Tocqueville asserts that in social sciences, the disciplines cannot be separated from each other. This means that anyone who studies any of the social disciplines should not ignore the others in order to reach healthy conclusions.

Different from the other politicians and statesmen, Tocqueville is a major observer and philosopher of democracy, which he saw as an equation that balanced liberty and equality, and concern for the individual as well as for the community. He focuses neither on strict political rules nor on policies but on "human liberty" and "society" (College 243; Gossman 503). His idea of equality also complements his idea of 'Revolution' in which he is mainly concerned with human beings who constitute the societies that are the major issue of politics. He thinks that "extreme social equality would lead to isolation, more intervention by the government and thus less liberty" (1861) for the individual. He also believes that "association, the coming together of people for common purpose, would bind [society] to an idea of nation larger than selfish desires" (1998). At this point, Tocqueville, who believes that social scientists cannot deny the importance of human beings, gives his priority to human psychology in order to grasp the real meaning of an event. He affirms that, in order to practise politics adequately and to make healthy political analyses, a politician should, first of all, understand the psychology of human beings, thus of the society (Beloff 29). Hence, as a politician, he deals with the psychological causes and effects of political events. Berry College points out that Tocqueville's "political analysis, and ... perceptive observations concerning the

psychological effects of ...[important] conditions” (243) make him a much studied figure.

In his methodology Tocqueville follows the other French thinkers like Bodin and Pascal who believe that “knowledge of the whole emerges from a thorough understanding of any part” (Boesche 81). In his research he begins from “the particular case which is best known to [him]” (Boesche 81). Thus, for him, using specific examples is of primary importance and he believes that “each individual fact mirrors and illuminates the whole” (College 255). Boesche clarifies this issue stating that, “according to Tocqueville, each social mobile exhibits one or more ‘generating principles’ that convey the spirit or character of the whole”(83). Hence, it can be understood that each social event conveys the spirit or the character of the whole. The word “spirit” plays an important role in his studies. An event, or an action should be evaluated within “the entire pattern of meaning found in society” (Wells 63). This denotes that the “spirit of society” or “the meaningful fabric of society” (Boesche 82) in which the action takes place should be understood very well in order to grasp its significance.

For understanding the spirit of a society, the French word, “les mœurs” [the manners] which signifies “customs, habits, and manners, all of which assist in disclosing what a people considers meaningful” are important (Boesche 87). Thus, “les mœurs” constitute “the character of mind and [...] the moral and intellectual condition of a given culture” (Hodges 164). Tocqueville emphasises the significance of this issue; he says:

“Les mœurs” are of greater importance than laws in maintaining a society, and that to alter a society one must alter the prism of meanings through which a culture views the world. Mores are the only tough and durable power. (Boesche 87)

Thus, knowledge of the spirit of a culture and the “mœurs” of a people enable him to “attempt to know the particular by lived experience rather than to explain the causality of particulars by general laws” (Kahan 586). This process of attaining unique knowledge makes him different from his contemporaries. He never pays special attention to the secondary sources of the subject on which he is conducting research. Tocqueville himself clarifies the reason for this:

When I have a subject to treat, it is almost impossible for me to read what has been already written on it: the contact of the ideas of other men disturbs and affects me painfully. I try therefore, to avoid knowing the explanations, which other writers have given of the facts, which I have to relate, or the inferences, which they have drawn from them ... I make the utmost effort to ascertain, from contemporary evidence, what really happened. When I have gathered in this toilsome harvest, I retire, as it were, into myself. (1861 63)

As a result, for him, without understanding “les mœurs,” it is impossible to acquire

the unique knowledge that leads to the analysis of the subject from the inside rather than from the outside. This is only possible when one grasps the feelings of a culture and its spirit. Hence, the meanings and the significance of the events within the given culture are of importance as they can be evaluated totally different in another culture. A clear idea of the customs, habits and manners that these people consider meaningful should be attained in order to evaluate an event. Hence, it would not be wrong to assert that Tocqueville's methodology in the analysis of Lawrence's *The Rainbow* should be applied in order to understand the reasons, for and the consequences of the Industrial Revolution. According to his principles, the spirit and "les moeurs" of British society should be analysed in detail.

The Industrial Revolution, which is generally associated with the technological and economic changes, is "a very long term process" (Ashton 1). In Allan Thompson's definition it is "a period of rapid economic growth sufficient to induce a fundamental change in the structure of economy and the nature of society" (30). It is called 'revolution' because of its "rapid speed and depth of industrial and economic [development]" (Mantoux 29). Factory organization, the use of steam power in manufacturing, specialization of labour, growth in industry and technique are the major financial issues with which the revolution is concerned. The other factors that are of crucial importance in this process are social, religious, scientific, educational and political.

The Industrial Revolution which began in the early 18th century through the use of steam power and new technologies and continued in the 19th century (Smelser 42) caused not only a technological change but also a mental change which brought about the social transformation in British society that

underwent a fundamental change in its character and outlook [...]The external appearance of the society altered- the majority of people were urban dwellers, their occupations as well as their dwellings divorced from the land; the ambitions of the society altered- at the upper levels land ownership lost its social position and the measure of social achievement was more material and wide-ranging ... It may take measures to ameliorate the difficulties created by over- rapid change, but fundamentally it tolerates and expects continuous change. (Thompson 30-28)

Hence, the transition from one kind of society to another is the unique aspect of the Industrial Revolution. This transformation of the society specially began in the nuclear family structure.

In pre-industrial societies, the family was bound to "a patriarchal figure, who maintained his authority by his control of the economic resources [...] legitimated by an [...] ideology which emphasised the woman's duty to obey and the husband's duty to provide" (Brown 72). The family structure was organised with established roles for the

young and the old as well as clearly defined roles for the adult men and women. For that reason, “the pre-industrial family had a comprised and ordered society in which the problems of the various age groups were catered for and the uncertainties of life were minimised” (Brown 72). The rapid industrialisation and economic growth, however, began to threaten the nuclear family structure in England. As Parsons states, “it reduces the family from an institution with many functions to an institution with rather few functions [...] the loss of functions [is the] evidence of the loss of importance of the family”(78). Smelser makes the process of family structural differentiation clear:

The family may become, under specific pressures, inadequate for performing its defined functions. Dissatisfaction occurs when it is felt either that performance of roles or utilisation of resources falls short of expectations... The model of structural differentiation is [the result of] several changes in the family and the community life of the British working classes in the nineteenth century; among these changes were the reorganisation of the economic roles of the family. (3)

Consequently, for Smelser, internal family organisation was influenced by the employment opportunities offered to women who provided cheaper labour to employ than men, and although “the man may obtain a job in the employ of the same employer it was likely to be outside the room where his wife and children work”(Brown 78). Women’s beginning to work outside the family structure brought first physical and then mental separation of the couples. Physically men and wives were separated because women spent less time in the house. Thus, the more the females worked outside, the more they learned about different circumstances of life besides their domestic existence. This process of their learning led to mental changes, which brought the mental separation with their husbands. The women’s needs and demands changed. They felt more independent as they earned their own living and wanted to be free from the social restrictions.

One of the best ways of eliminating these social restrictions on women was to support the “idea of extension of education” (Osborne 170). The old system of education that put emphasis on “the proper religious education and moral principles as the means of holding the social order” (Parsons 39) turned into the extension of education in which the main purpose was moral and social improvement. There was a great effort put on the reformation of the general educational system but women’s demand for getting more and more formal education was called the “revitalisation” (Osborne 172) of womankind. It was a peaceful revolution, which was going to play an important role in changing the framework of male dominated society. The growing insistence on females’ searching for educational status, despite the resistance coming from the conservatives, may be seen as a major success of the Industrial Revolution. In 1792, Mary Wollstonecraft’s publication of her *A Vindication of the Rights of the Women*, in which she stressed

coeducation and urged men to regard women as equals, created a kind of confusion in society (Jones 180). Also, Harriet Martineau's *Autobiography* on the liberation and education of women dealt with the treatment of women and created a kind of awareness among women about their identities. In both of these publications the masculine dominance which demanded piety, modesty and obedience to one's husband was severely criticised and men were forced to accept women's participation in the social order with equal rights. These financial and economic developments as a result of the Industrial Revolution destroyed the unity of the family and shattered the status of the husband and father as the symbol of authority over his wife and children. This mental change and liberation of women "threatened the patriarchal basis of the family" (Brown 78) and can be called women's spiritual revolution.

Focusing both on the change of the family structure and the mental change in women, Lawrence deals with the 'industrialized' revolutionary women in *The Rainbow*, and uses both the setting and three generations of the Brangwen families to depict the spirit of the society, undergoing social and mental changes. In this context he gives an accurate picture of the British culture beginning from the early years of the Industrial Revolution to the late years.

Marsh Farm, an isolated farmhouse, "which is two miles away the church-tower"(41) is the home of Tom and his Polish wife Lydia Brangwen and their three children, Anna, Tom and Fred. The marriage of Anne with her cousin Will moves the setting to a village of Cossethay where the effects of industrialisation are more vividly seen. With the third generation, the setting is totally industrialised and transferred first to the industrial metropolis, Beldover, then to the city of Nottingham and at last to London. As Nicholas Marsh states:

The main settings in *The Rainbow* follow a clearly structured progress moving in one direction: from an isolated house, through village, town, industrial conurbation, to city and finally to the capital. The original community is a single separate family, and with each successive stage of development the community that surrounds the characters becomes larger, more populous and wider. (158)

In the manner of Tocqueville, in order to present an illustration of British society, Lawrence depicts the pre-industrial agricultural social order within the Brangwen family, which represents the microcosm of the society. The Brangwen men are the typical patriarchal rural figures who are quite satisfied with their lives.

It was enough for the men, that the earth heaved and opened its furrow to them, that the wind blew to dry the wet wheat, set the young ears of corn wheeling freshly round about; it was enough that they helped the cow in labour, or ferreted the rats from under the barn, or broke the back of a rabbit with a sharp knock of the hand... earth and sky and beast and green plants, so much exchange and

interchange they had with these, they lived full and surcharged, their senses full fed, their faces turned to the heat of the blood, staring into the sun, dazed with looking towards the source of generation, unable to turn round.. (43)

On the other hand the Brangwen women, who are not portrayed as the typical obedient females anymore, “[are] different” (42) from their men. They “[look] out from the heated, blind intercourse of farm-life, to the spoken life beyond”(42) and are open to the developments and changes that the Industrial Revolution has brought into their life. The women also “[stand] to see the far-off world of cities and governments [...] where desires [are] fulfilled” (43), and begin to be aware of the life outside, and want “to enlarge their own scope and range and freedom” (43). They not only question the established norms and regulations but also demand equal rights with men both in education and in social life.

It was this, this education, this higher form of being that the mother wished to give to her children, so that they too could live the supreme life on earth. For her children, at least the children of her heart, had the complete nature that should take place in equality with the living[...], why should they suffer from lack of freedom to move? How should they learn the entry into the finer, more vivid circle of life? (44)

Hence the internal family organisation begins to be questioned by the women and the first steps of the spiritual separation of the couples are seen. Because the women learn more of the outside world, they demand more educational and economic freedom.

In the novel, according to Tocqueville’s principle, the individual fact, which illuminates the whole is Anna and Will’s marriage. Here the example of a liberated woman is clearly evident, because she not only asks for her domestic and economic freedom, but also exemplifies the separation of spiritual breakdown. Anna, thus, represents the unconventional woman who has a new sense of independence. Her resistance to the idea of total obedience of the female makes her realise that she and her husband are not one in their marriage and cannot build up a healthy relation because of their differences. She sees her marriage as an obstacle to her self-development and feels as if she were trapped like a wild animal. “Gradually she realise[s] that she [is] being borne down by the clinging, heavy weight of [her husband], that he [is] pulling her down as a leopard clings to a wild cow and exhausts her and pulls her down” (245). Hence, for her, they are totally “two separate people” (247) who have different worldviews. What she wants is

her own, old, sharp self detached, active but not absorbed, active for her own part, taking and giving, but never absorbed. Whereas he [wants] this strange absorption with her, which still she [resists]. But she [is] partly helpless against it. (242)

Unlike Will, who isolates himself from life, Anna wants to be involved in the vivid and shiny world outside, which seems to promise her a different future with its materialistic features. She “wants to get out of this fixed [...] movement [marriage] and to rise from it as a bird lifts its breast [...] ” (246). Here, Anna, according to Tocqueville’s principle, signifies the spirits of the women who become aware of their identities, and this is “the early period of industrialization that provides women with their first state of independence from the male dominance of the family sphere” (Brown 78). In this period, women not only question their marriages but also the social institutions.

Will’s extreme religious idealism disturbs Anna very much. What she wants to teach Will is the importance of the “world outside the church” (248).

She could not understand him, his strange, dark rages and his devotion to the church... The church was false, but he served it more attentively... Brangwen, [Will], occupied himself with the church, he played the organ, he trained the choir-boys, he taught the Sunday-school class of youths. (243-250)

Anna’s desire for changing Will’s conservative way of living destroys their relations. The more Anna tries to practice her power on him, the more Will resists her and tries to preserve his patriarchal authority at home. Consequently, “dark, chaotic rages” and also “horrible murderous fights” (252), which separate them spiritually from each other, are inevitable in their marriage. Here Anna stands for the liberated women who want to achieve their spiritual independence in their domestic lives and who want to have open-minded husbands who can easily adopt themselves to the conditions of the new world. Will, however, is the symbol of patriarchal power that he believes should be preserved in marriage. Thus, from Tocqueville’s point of view, both of these characters convey the spirit of the industrialised world with their attitudes towards life. This struggle of power continues until their first baby Ursula is born, who changes both Anna’s and Will’s ways of living. “Anna’s [spiritual and intellectual] journey in life appears to have stopped” (Marsh 85) when she becomes a mother who, willingly, “postpone[s] all adventures into the unknown realities (256) and “[leaves] her husband to take his own way” (256). On the other hand, Will’s mystic religious passion comes to an end with Ursula who lets “another man in him free. And this man turn[s] with interest to public life, to see what part he could take in it “ (280) Though their perspectives of life change with their five children, they cannot restore their original relation and live separate lives in the same house and are indifferent to each other. “Strange his wife was to him. It was as if he were a perfect stranger, as if she were infinitely and essentially strange to him, the other half of the world, the dark half of the moon” (278). Even the change in Will’s perception of life, his teaching night-classes in woodwork (281), his becoming “Art and Handicraft

Instructor for the County of Nottingham” (282), and “his crossing the barrier into intellectual work” (Marsh 158) do not affect Anna who puts an end to all her contact with her husband in the spiritual sense. Her major aim in life is not to continue her marriage any more but to create a new world with her five children under the institution of marriage. Though she is a liberated woman of her time, she is not courageous enough to get divorced from her husband yet and still prefers her motherhood to her intellectual freedom. In this regard, both of them prefer to live “in the darkness” (279) in the settled norms of the society.

Because Anna puts little effort to restore her relation with her husband, she builds up a new sphere of existence for herself with her children. This action can be considered as the initiation of the spiritual revolution of the women of that time. The more she tries to find her identity, the more she is revolutionised and cannot tolerate the old system and gets spiritually isolated. On the other hand, Anna’s mother, Lydia, following another philosophy, tries to renew her ties with her husband with the help of her patience and sympathy. Being a conservatist Lydia tries to preserve the old system, that is the marriage institution, whatever the condition is.

In *The Rainbow*, Lydia Lensky, the Polish wife of Tom, is the character, who embodies a woman trying to build a healthy relationship with her husband despite their different educational and social backgrounds. Lydia’s Polish background is of importance in the novel as it symbolizes the universality of the female identity and the influence of the Industrial Revolution on all women in the world. Being educated, emancipated and also aristocratic by birth, she prefers a very simple life of agriculture by getting married to her farmer husband in order to escape from the harsh realities of the industrialised world, London. At that time, though most of the people tried to go to the industrialised cities in order to earn more and have a better life, Lydia prefers a simple agrarian life to escape from the brutalities of the industrialised world. Here, Lawrence practising Tocqueville’s “les mœurs” tries to show all the aspects of an event in order to reflect the realities.

Before entering the life of Tom, Lydia’s losing her two young children and her husband made her tough towards life and also made her aware that “she would have to begin again, to find a new being, a new form, to respond to blind, insistent figure over against her” (58) in order to survive in this world. She managed to preserve her hope and courage in order to begin a new life. Hence, this marriage is a kind of shelter in her hopeless, tormented past. Tom’s existence means a lot to her. “It is Tom who is the fertilizing influence in her regeneration” (59). But their educational and social difference brings disillusionment because Tom, being a simple farmer, cannot respond to her needs. He is not even aware of his wife’s disenchantment. As a result of this lack

of communication, Lydia gradually closes herself and moves away from him and becomes indifferent to him. Tom does not fully feel himself as a husband since he thinks that Lydia is still a stranger to him rather than a wife. He is unable to build up a healthy relation with her. However, there is a growing fear in him of losing his wife one day and being left alone. Yet, he cannot reach out to his wife and does not know how his wife can reach him in the real sense. But, Lydia tries to preserve the family institution because she realises how important it is for her and thus she cannot afford to lose it. For the sake of her family, she decides to communicate with her husband when she realises the growing problem:

‘Why do you go away so often?’
‘But you do not want me’ he replied ...
‘You think I am not enough for you’
‘But how do you know me? What do you do to make me love you?...’
‘Why do you want to deny me?’ (99)

With the help of such kind of repetitive questioning, Lydia makes Tom realize that she is lonely and in need of her husband’s affection. She always makes Tom remember, “there is somebody there besides [himself]”(99). It is Lydia’s patience that opens up Tom’s eyes to the needs of a real marriage, which can be established through equal efforts of the couple. It can be deduced from this effort that both Lydia and Tom want to protect the established order of society, that is marriage. They do not let their relation fade away under the difficult conditions of life. Lydia as an educated woman is different from the other female characters in the novel who have a chance of getting education either during or after the Industrial Revolution. Unlike the other women, she does not rebel against the established norms and consider marriage as an obstacle in her life. Perceiving the meaning and the importance of having a healthy marriage in order to be happy and successful in life, she really makes a great effort in order to solve the problems with her husband. From Tocqueville’s point of view, she represents the other side of the coin, which means that people, who have really assimilated the wisdom of education, behave differently than the ones who cannot perceive the real importance of it. She uses education for her family happiness, not for her ambition. In the next generation, Ursula will be the best representative of the new generation of female characters who pursue their ideals. On the other hand, in Lydia’s marriage, her husband Tom’s role cannot be ignored. His realization of the meaning of “otherness” plays an important role in resolving their problems. This is the moment when they put away their fears and find themselves in each other.

She waited for him to meet her, not to bow before her and serve her. She wanted his active participation, not his submission. He wanted to come to her, to meet her.

She was there if he could reach her. The reality of her who was just beyond him [...]. (111)

Thus, in the end Lydia and Tom manage to establish a healthy union and create an atmosphere of hopeful marriage. At this point, their effort to protect their marriage, their love for each other and their respect for the established orders cannot be denied.

The most revolutionised female character among the three generations is the daughter of Anna and Will, Ursula, who neither pays attention to the established norms nor tries to build up a healthy marriage. Instead, she strictly questions the social regulations and goes against them purposefully to see her boundaries. She can be considered as “a revolutionised heroine”. Here, through Ursula, once more practising Tocqueville’s idea of “les mœurs”, Lawrence tries to show the different impacts of the Industrial Revolution on women.

In *The Rainbow*, Ursula is the only character who truly represents the industrialised woman who has an ambition to look outside in order to discover the unknown, and to gain a proper place in society for a better personal development. Unlike her mother and grandmother, Ursula forces the social restrictions to the extreme and tries to prove herself as an individual by achieving both her financial and spiritual freedom. That is why she can be considered as a heroine who fights for her desires in life.

Ursula, putting the so-called old terms love and marriage aside, gives all her energy and strength to formal education in which she gradually realises the responsibility of her own life. Her mother Anna was absorbed in motherhood whereas Ursula prefers to be absorbed in self-teaching. She wants to “move out of the intricately woven illusion of her life: the illusion of a father [...] in an outer world: the illusion[s] of her grandmother and [mother], of realities so shadowy and far-off that they become as mystic symbols”(312).

With the purpose of learning “how to become oneself”(317), Ursula “moves into a professional, intellectual level of work” (Marsh 159), and goes into higher education at Nottingham University although she fails to get her degree. From her father Will to Ursula, the “intellectual focus has moved from semi-manual craft to pure academic study” (Marsh 160) which shows the female desire to become more intellectual and more sophisticated. Being a revolutionised woman, Ursula “would fight for things that mattered to her [...] and would try to insist [...] on the right of women to take equal place with men in the field of action and work” (402).

Ursula begins to fight for her aims even at the age of twelve when she goes to the Grammar School where she realises new and wider opportunities. She “seat[ed] herself upon the hill of learning [...] trembled like a postulant when she wrote the Greek alphabet for the first time”(402). The more Ursula insists on her education and enlarging

her perspective, the more she is disillusioned as each step brings forth a further and new challenge.

When Ursula goes to University, she has similar feelings of awe about 'the wondrous, cloistral origin of education' ... However, Ursula's eyes are opened by disappointment in her second year. She realises that the professors are only 'middle-men' and the learning they impart is 'second-hand'. All the academic ideals of pure knowledge are 'spurious' because the aim of it all is only second-hand dealer's shop where one bought an equipment for an examination' in order for students to go and make more money. (Marsh 169)

However when she is given a chance to be a teacher, she is forced to act according to the rules of the institution but not according to her personal self. Being the representative of the revolutionised women of the society in which she lives, she rebels against the rules of the authorities, which deny her identity. Her rejection of the school is the "rejection of a mechanical teaching system" (427). Her discovery of self comes with the experiment in the microscope at the college.

It intended to be itself. But what itself? Suddenly in her mind the world gleamed strangely, with an intense light, like a nucleus of the creature under the microscope. Suddenly she had passed away into an intensely gleaming light of knowledge ... She only knew that it was not limited mechanical energy, nor mere purpose of self-preservation and self-assertion [...] To be oneself was a supreme, gleaming triumph of infinity. (421)

This discovery brings forth a kind of disillusionment with her contacts both in her intellectual life at the college and in her personal relations with men. In her affair with Skrebensky, she realises a bitter fact that his life lies in the established orders of things, which she strongly rejects. She likens him to "a brick in the whole great social fabric, the nation, the modern humanity" (399). Being a modern and liberalised heroine, Ursula questions the established norms, and challenges the difficulties and wants to change the old order. After Skrebensky's departure for Africa to war, her lesbian attachment with the school mistress is a consequence of her admiration for a modern woman and constitutes another part of her search for self-hood since Winifred Inger is described as "proud and free as a man and yet exquisite as a woman" (456). Although Inger enriches her life in many ways, Ursula knows that she should learn to be herself alone and her affair with the school-mistress [should be] a sort of secret side-show of her life, never to be opened. She did not even think of it. It was the closed door she had not the strength to open" (457).

Hence, Ursula's life can be considered as the process of women's search for their identities and personal improvements during the Industrial Revolution. Ursula, who represents the determination of self, becomes an individual, and a self-responsible

woman who takes her own decisions, as Lawrence wants a woman to do. At the end of the novel he describes Ursula “as an emancipated and self-aware heroine” (547).

To conclude it can be stated that Lawrence, through depicting three different female characters, Anna, Lydia and Ursula, shows women’s struggle into existence as a driving force, which is at work between individuals and their environments, and to become a separate and complete individual. At the same time Lawrence uses Tocqueville’s idea in which human psychology and “les moeurs” are of importance in order to grasp the real meaning of an event, thus Lawrence does not let the female characters to be destroyed and be their victims of the social aspiration as a result of the Industrial Revolution.

Works Cited

Primary Sources:

- Lawrence, D.H. (1983), *The Rainbow*. Ed.: John Worthen. Middlesex: Penguin.
- Tocqueville, Alexis. (1861), *Memoirs, Letters, and Remains of Alexis Tocqueville*. Cambridge: MacMillan,
- . (1998), *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*. Trans. Alan S. Kahan. (1856).Eds. Francois Furet and Francoise Melino. V.1. Chicago and London: U of Chicago Press.

Secondary Sources

- Ashton, T.S. (1961), *The Industrial Revolution In The Eighteenth Century: An Outline Of The Beginnings of The Modern Factory System In England*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Baugh, Albert. (1943), *A Literary History of England*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Beloff, Max, (1986). “Tocqueville and Gobineau: On Race, Revolution and Despair.” *ENCOUNTER*. Ed. Melvin J. Lasky. 67.1: 29-32.
- Bentley, Eric. (1947), *A Century of Hero-Worship*. Boston: Beacon.
- Boesche, Roger, (1983). “Why Could Tocqueville Predict So Well?”, *POLITICAL THEORY*.11:1. 79-105.
- Brown, David. et al. (1978), *A Sociology of Industrialisation: An Introduction*. Hong Kong: Macmillan.
- College, Berry, (1991). “Tocqueville on Human Misery and Human Liberty”. *SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL*. 28.2: 243-258.
- Doherty, Gerald. (1999), *Theorizing Lawrence: Nine Meditations on Topographical Themes*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Gossman, Lionel.(1990), *Between History and Literature*. Massachusetts: Harvard.
- Hodges, M, (1988). “Tocqueville’s Mirage or Reality?”. *JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY*. 60 :1. 28-54.
- Jones, Vivien, (1992). “Women Writing Revolution: Narratives of History and Sexuality in Wollstonecraft and Williams”. *BEYOND ROMANTICISM: NEW APPROACHES TO TEXTS AND CONTEXTS 1780-1832*. Ed. Stephen Copley 178-199. New York: Routledge, 178-199.

- Kahan, Alan, (1985). "Tocqueville's Two Revolutions." *JOURNAL OF THE HISTORY OF IDEAS*. 46. 4: 585-596.
- Marsh, Nicholas.(2000), *D.H. Lawrence: The Novels*.New York: St. Martine.
- Mitchell, Harvey, (1988). "Tocqueville's Mirage or Reality?". *JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY*. 60.1: 28-54.
- Montoux, P. (1955), *The Industrial Revolution in the Eighteenth Century*. London: Jonathan Cape.
- Osborne, John. (1970), *The Silent Revolution: The Industrial Revolution in England As A Source of Cultural Change*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Parsons, T. (1951), *The Social System*. Glencoe: The Free P.
- Porter, Roy. (1982), *English Society in the 18th Century*. London: Harmondworth.
- Schapiro, Barbara Ann. (1999), *D.H. Lawrence and the Paradoxes of Psychic Life*. New York: State U of New York.
- Smelsler, Neil. (1959), *Social Change In The Industrial Revolution: An Application of Theory To The British Cotton Industry*. England: Chicago UP.
- Thompson, Allan. (1973), *The Dynamics Of The Industrial Revolution*. New York: St. Martin's P.
- Wells, Roland, (1994). "Alistair Cooke: A Tocqueville for Our Time?". *JOURNAL OF AMERICAN CULTURES*. .17.2: 57-65.