2008

Eugenic discourse in the work of D.H. Lawrence

Christopher Lawrence Cotton

EUGENIC DISCOURSE IN THE WORK OF D.H. LAWRENCE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

English Composition:

English Literature

---

by

Christopher Lawrence Cotton

June 2008

EUGENIC DISCOURSE IN THE WORK OF D.H. LAWRENCE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

by

Christopher Lawrence Cotton

June 2008

Approved by:

[redacted]

Holly Henry, Chair, English — Date 6/4/08

[redacted]

Jacqueline Rhodes

[redacted]

David Carlson, Graduate Coordinator

ABSTRACT

Inspired by Darwin's theory of evolution, in his 1883 book *Inquiries Into Human Faculty and Its Development* author Sir Francis Galton conceived of the pseudo-science of eugenics. A form of "social Darwinism," eugenics seeks to further the human "race" through controlled reproduction, sterilization, and genocide.

Eugenic discourse is apparent in the work of many writers of this time, but is especially explicit in D.H. Lawrence's novel, *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, as well as his private letters. A close reading of these works illustrates Lawrence's attempts to grapple with his advocacy of eugenic, which may well view Lawrence himself as an unfit specimen. Ultimately revealed in Lawrence's work is a man who indeed advocates eugenics, though a eugenic scheme which is completely unique to Lawrence, as he rejects the scientific element of eugenics in favor of a spiritual and sexual impetus for human betterment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was only made possible through the strong and unwavering support of a legion of fine folks. If I miss thanking you, and in the unlikely event that you ever read this, call me on it: I'll buy you a smoothie or something.

Many thanks to the faculty of the Cal State San Bernardino English Department, and particularly Professors Holly Henry and Jacqueline Rhodes. Even at seemingly the worst possible time for you, you have never failed to provide me good counsel. I cannot thank you enough. Special thanks to Prof. Suzanne Diamond of Youngstown State University, for her timely and badly-needed assistance.

To all the family, friends, and coworkers who suffered through my rants, whining, and frequent disappearing acts, my heartfelt thanks. Thanks and love to my mother dear, who taught me through example about courage and strength, rare and beautiful talents. You are never unappreciated, Mom. To my sister, for all the laughs, a few tears, and a sympathetic ear when I have needed one. To my father, for all the motivation to better myself that I will ever need. To my beloved Pop, long passed but always present. This was made with my head, not my hands, but I hope you're proud of me just the same. For all the lessons, all the memories, my

thanks. To my Aunt Vivian, loved and missed. Thanks for everything you did to make my young life a happy one.

Thanks to Robert Schlosser, for that first double scotch and everything after. You changed my life. That's trite, but true.

Many thanks to my brother, Frank. You've always been there; always been in my corner, always been someone I could depend on. Our lives, adulthood, often many miles have threatened to separate us, but nothing quite ever will. Believe in that.

Thanks to the Roselle family, for your wonderful friendship. You're the best thing about Claremont for Sarah and me. Your love, support, and generosity are our great good fortune.

Thanks to Sarah's family: Dakin, Susan, Ned, Cathy, Miss Marie, Jean, Charlotte, Rob, Katie, and Deana. If you had any doubts, you never let on. My love to you all.

Thank you, beautiful Sarah. Thanks for your patience, your kindness, your sweet smile. Thanks for believing, for trusting, for risking, and for pushing me when I needed it. Thank you for seeing me through, and for our shared, fantastic life. You're the best of me, the reason for it all, and I love you, so very much. Now kiss me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

BRITISH EUGENICS AND LAWRENCE'S CONNECTION

In a private, 1908 letter, a young D.H. Lawrence wrote:

> If I had my way, I would build a lethal chamber as big as the Crystal Palace, with a military band playing softly, and a Cinematograph working brightly; then I'd go out in the back streets and main streets and bring them in, all the sick, the halt, and the maimed; I would lead them gently, and they would smile me a weary thanks. (*The Letters* 81)

This macabre eugenic attitude toward social cleansing, so repugnant to the modern reader in its obvious similarity to the fascist Nazi regime, was nonetheless a commonly held one in Lawrence's England. Faced with a growing underclass and what many believed was a society in decay, many in Lawrence's time viewed eugenics as the cure to the perceived decay in the English "race."

The term "race" as applied to humanity is controversial at best. Today, nearly every credible scientist has rejected the notion of "race" as a valuable

means of describing supposed ethnic, social, or nationalistic differences in humankind, as all human beings share a common species and genetic heritage. In Lawrence's time, however, the idea of distinct racial differences between national identities was generally accepted. To the eugenicist of Lawrence's time, "race" was a viable means of describing humanity, and I use the term in that context. However repugnant the term "race" may be to the modern reader, the term's common use throughout Lawrence's time, and indeed any discussion of the British eugenics movement, makes it impossible not to employ "race" as a means of illustrating eugenics. What follows in this chapter is meant to be a primer for British eugenics in Lawrence's time. Here, I hope to lay the foundation for the assertions I make in the rest of my thesis: that Lawrence was aware of eugenics as a pseudo-science, and struggled with his advocacy of eugenics both publically and privately before conceiving of an individual notion of human revitalization dominated by sexual and spiritual reawakening.

The eugenics movement in Britain was born in the works of Sir Francis Galton, late in the nineteenth century. The half-cousin of Charles Darwin, Galton coined the term "eugenics," taken from the Greek word "eugenes," meaning

"good in stock" (Galton 24). His fascination with Darwin's discoveries led Galton to believe that thoughtful, planned, genetically favorable breeding in human populations could improve humanity. Galton's plan is strikingly analogous to the way in which controlled breeding programs result in favorable characteristics in livestock. Dairy cows have, for example, over generations of domestication been bred to produce far more milk than their ancestors. Similarly, Galton believed that humanity could, through careful and selective breeding, improve upon itself cognitively and physically. As he states in *Inquiries Into Human Faculty and Its Development*:

> We greatly want a brief word to express the science of improving stock, which is by no means confined to questions of judicious mating, but which, especially in the case of man, takes cognizance [sic] of all influences that tend in however remote a degree to give to the more suitable races or strains of blood a better chance of prevailing speedily over the less suitable than they otherwise would have had. (25)

Galton's goals are the same as generations of cowherds: select a favorable trait, breed this specimen with that,

and with a little patience and a generation or two, one is rewarded with offspring that are stronger, faster, or smarter than their ancestors. However, selective breeding apparently works better once one thins the herd a bit.

As Donald Childs illustrates, in his book *Modernism and Eugenics: Woolf, Eliot, Yeats and the Culture of Degeneration*, "[…] this new science of human breeding would supplement natural selection in two ways—negatively and positively" (3). The encouragement of eugenically favorable breeding, either privately or governmentally, is generally referred to as "positive" eugenics, while "negative" eugenics includes such practices as compulsory abortion, sterilization, and at its most extreme, genocide. Hypothetically, those targeted by eugenicists might be forced to submit (mandatory pregnancy or abortion, involuntary sterilization, murder), or might be compensated for their participation in the program.

In Britain, the eugenics movement rarely moved beyond talk,[1] while Nazi Germany instituted eugenics on a massive and brutal level. As Kåre Olsen, author of "Under the Care

[1] The sole achievement of the eugenics movement at the governmental level was the passage of the Mental Deficiency Act of 1913, which established levels of mental defect and at what point one was subject to being institutionalized (MacKensie 499-532).

of Lebensborn: Norwegian War Children and Their Mothers" notes, the state-sanctioned breeding of "positive" eugenics was the heart of the Nazi Lebensborn[2] program. In this program, SS officers were compensated (though participation was mandatory) for breeding, and pregnant, often unmarried women could receive medical care, have their babies, and potentially receive state aid, with no questions asked so long as the child was guaranteed to meet certain and exacting racial purity requirements (15-16).

While the Lebensborn program appears to contrast markedly with the more blatant inhumanity of the Nazi death camps, it was in reality no less appalling. "Lebensborn children" more often than not never saw their birth mothers again, and SS agents would comb the countryside of newly conquered, racially palatable nations, looking for children to kidnap in support of the Lebensborn program, a program designed to alleviate a perceived degeneracy in the German race. While Galton and his fellow English eugenicists might have vehemently disagreed with the methods of the Lebensborn program, English eugenics and Nazi eugenics had quite similar goals: both groups saw a nation in disarray,

---

[2] "The term 'Lebensborn' means [in German] 'well of life'" (Olsen 15).

and saw "good breeding" as a means to remedy that disarray. Like many of his time, Galton was concerned with a perceived degeneration of the English "race," a perception fueled by the public's fascination with, and misconceptions of, Darwin's recent treatises on evolution. The newly minted "science" of eugenics began to gain popularity in England as a way of curing and reversing the supposed genetic corruption plaguing the land.

However, much of the eugenic discourse produced by the most impassioned advocates of a British eugenics program, regardless of their politics, makes it quite clear that concerns about class, and not necessarily racial or genetic vigor, motivated many supporters of eugenics in Britain. As Childs observes, "in Galton's Britain, increasing urbanization confronted the middle class with an apparently permanent underclass of poor people—beggars, thieves, prostitutes—often in poor health, apparently indolent and lazy. This underclass, moreover, was increasing in size…" (1). As a result of this burgeoning lower class, Britain's middle and upper classes saw the alarming numbers of the poor, and the subsequent rise in violent crime and social diseases, as evidence of the degeneration of the English "race." The convergence of Darwin's revolutionary ideas on

evolution and a growing fear of England's lower classes surely must have made Galton's eugenics a seductive and perhaps inevitable social and scientific force, one that played upon the fears of Britain's middle and upper classes, including a number of prominent literary figures of the time, D.H. Lawrence included. Evidence of this fear and revulsion of the lower classes runs throughout his novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, in which characters frequently refer to the working class as more beast than human.

The paranoia over a growing and degenerate lower class in Britain soon made its way into Parliament: Childs also notes that the government began to question the vitality of the English "race" as well: "The early defeats of the British Army in the Boer War (1899-1902) confirmed for many that degeneration had become a national problem" (1). Such widespread concern over the fate of the English "race" set the stage for a national dialogue on eugenics.

Building upon Darwin's theory of natural selection, many in England began to call for "social Darwinism," that is, allowing the processes of natural selection to weed out any so-called "weakness" in British society. Galton's new science of eugenics was social Darwinism legitimized: as

Angelique Richardson, author of *Love and Eugenics in the Late Nineteenth Century*, notes, "The idea that humans might breed selectively, that they might exercise conscious control over the biological quality of the "race," was given precise formulation and a new, apparently scientific, authority" (3).

Yet while Galton's theories were based largely on Darwin's theories, other forms of eugenic discourse certainly surfaced, since other theories influenced eugenic discourse. Perhaps the most prominent of these alternatives incorporated Jean-Baptiste de Lamarck's theories of acquired characteristics (though this implies a probably artificial binary—in the pseudo-science of Galton's eugenics, Darwinian and Lamarckian evolutionary theory need not be mutually exclusive). Lamarck's theories on evolution were largely overshadowed by Darwin's work, since Darwin observed that an organism's characteristics are innate rather than acquired. In essence, the difference between the two theories is this: Lamarck held that limiting factors such as environment force organisms to adapt, and that adaptation (if beneficial) is immediately inherited by that organism's offspring (Campbell, Reece, and Simon 246). For example, if a particular rabbit's environment requires

that the rabbit needs to have exceptionally good eyesight and hearing (to evade predators, perhaps), then that rabbit will, over the course of a lifetime, strain and exercise its eyes and ears, and according to Lamarck, increase their acuity in the process; that rabbit's progeny will then inherit those adaptations. Darwin's theories state that these adaptations, rather than being acquired over the course of one organism's life span, in fact result from millions of years of evolutionary trial and error, since the processes of natural selection shape the inherent traits of an entire population of rabbit, rather than the individual.

Despite the overwhelming acceptance of Darwin's work over Lamarck's in the scientific community, many less-informed advocates of eugenics, and perhaps most notably Fabian socialist George Bernard Shaw, still held Lamarck's work in high esteem, and incorporated Lamarckian theories of evolution into their own eugenic discourse. It is probable that Lamarckian eugenics would be more palatable for those with leftist politics, since this brand of eugenics suggests that the degeneration of a "race" is something recently acquired, and so perhaps quickly remedied. Childs notes that:

> Eugenicists themselves often acknowledged the importance of environment in shaping human nature and behavior by incorporating within their explanation of heredity Lamarck's theory [...] In fact, because of its usefulness in this regard, Lamarckism continued to influence eugenics long after most biologists had dismissed Lamarck. (5)

The consequences of adopting a purely Darwinian stance toward eugenics would mean that the eugenically undesirable elements of the British population were unfit due to innate characteristics rather than largely environmental concerns, a fact which would dictate a much more far-reaching, long-term eugenics program than many advocates of eugenics were prepared to accept. Lamarckian evolution might occur over the course of a generation or two, but Darwinian evolution generally takes place at an excruciatingly slow pace, often at a geological time scale.

The more immediate gratification offered by Lamarck's theory is precisely what makes him so palatable and Darwin's theories potentially so problematic to eugenicists. Indeed, the pace of Darwinian evolution probably means that Lawrence, frequently a vocal critic of Darwinism, would have been much more interested in

Lamarckian modes of eugenic discourse. As Ronald Granofsky, author of *D.H. Lawrence and Survival*, notes:

> […] to so impatient a man as Lawrence, so keen on the rapid betterment of humankind, the Darwinian concept that such a development can occur only over vast stretches of time and, in modern terms, only through the passing on of a gradually amended gene pool through reproduction would have been most uncongenial. Lawrence saw an overemphasis on time to the detriment of space as one more example of his culture's loss of balance (15-16).

While Lawrence's aversion to Darwinism was far from unique, it must again be noted that a preference for one evolutionary schema over another is, so far as most proponents of eugenics in early twentieth-century Britain were concerned, probably overemphasized here for the sake of providing the scientific and historical context of eugenic discourse in Lawrence's time and place. It is certain, however, that Lawrence considered a number of different eugenic perspectives. As Jeff Wallace, author of *D.H. Lawrence, Science, and the Posthuman* notes, Lawrence's subscription to "the weekly paper *The New Age*" lasted "for

a period between 1908 and 1909" (42). This paper was essential to Lawrence's introduction to evolutionary theory and the pseudo-science of eugenics. Wallace illustrates this:

> Propositions based on eugenics [...] were a key element in *The New Age*'s utopianism. In the paper, Lawrence could access detailed debates around post-Darwinian evolutionary theory, but almost invariably with regard to the possibility of moulding the future development of the human species. (44-45)

Lawrence would have been exposed to a number of different eugenic theories via *The New Age*, though his supposed preference for a more timely eugenics program does correspond, however, with his more shocking statements in support of negative eugenics, such as the one used at the start of the chapter. Wiping out the eugenically unfit is certainly a more time-saving means of dealing with the "problem" than the careful breeding of a population over the course of hundreds of years or more. Eugenics is a complicated business, and any way of simplifying the matter must certainly have been tempting to a man as frustrated with his fellows as Lawrence, given his minimal tolerance

for those he viewed as inferior in spirit or intellect to himself.

Regardless of their theoretical underpinnings, eugenic programs were advocated by a wide spectrum of political groups, from right-wing politicians to members of the socialist Fabian Society, including George Bernard Shaw, and were promoted throughout much of the popular literature of the time. Yet even among those who advocated eugenics of one form or another, many remained critical of the methods popularly discussed in Britain for implementing a eugenics program there, seeing too much evidence of class prejudices in these arguments rather than a real and defensible biological argument, even one based on the vague, socially-constructed notion of "race". One such critic, also a prominent advocate of eugenics for many years, was Julian Huxley, who stated in the 1936 "Galton Lecture" to his fellow eugenicists entitled "Eugenics and Society":

> [...] we are in danger of mistaking for our eugenic ideal a mere glorification of our prejudices and our subjective wish-fulfilments. It is not eugenics but left-wing politics if we merely talk of favouring the survival and reproduction of the proletariat at the expense of the bourgeoisie. It

> is not eugenics but right-wing politics if we merely talk of favouring the breeding of the upper classes of our present social system at the expense of the lower. It is not eugenics but nationalist and imperialist politics if we speak in such terms as subject races or miscegenation. Our conclusions in any particular case *may* be on balance eugenically correct (though the correlation between broad social or ethnic divisions and genetic values can never be high), yet they will not be based primarily upon eugenic considerations, but upon social or national bias (197, emphasis in original).

Huxley's thoughtfully worded statement, warning against the inclusion of prejudice into the goals of a British eugenics program, probably expresses the concerns of many of his fellow eugenicists. Julian Huxley was a famous author in his own time, and the fact that such a word of warning came from both a very vocal advocate of eugenics and also a prominent popular science writer, so well known by the public, must have given this warning a great deal of weight. What makes this statement even more remarkable, though, is Huxley's concession that carrying out a eugenics

program based solely on "social or national bias" might be the right move, eugenically speaking. At first reading, Huxley's text seems to offer a stern warning to advocates of eugenics to steer clear of ethnic or class-motivated prejudices in their endorsement of eugenic goals. Huxley's belief that there might be a "correlation" between degeneracy and class, however, makes that warning substantially less potent. While such a correlation may "never be high," making educated guesses about such a relationship might still produce a eugenically profitable result—a pregnancy, an abortion, a sterilization or murder—that is, as stated in the above passage, "on balance, eugenically correct."

Obviously Huxley shared some of the prejudices of his peers. His willingness, though, to offer up those prejudices for scrutiny, scientific or otherwise, and as a word of warning to his fellow eugenicists is certainly commendable. His admissions also illustrate the complicated relationship that Huxley and many of his contemporaries had with eugenics, complications based on class, ethnicity, and prejudice.

Unlike Huxley, D.H. Lawrence had another, more personal complication in his support for eugenics: his own

lack of Darwinian fitness. Lawrence's lifelong health problems, culminating in his untimely death at the age of forty-four, indicate that he himself might one day, had advocates of British eugenics had their way, been targeted for eugenic cleansing. Biographer Jeffrey Meyers illustrates this, stating "The legacy of Lawrence's childhood was poor health, which led to a lifelong invalidism [...] But poor health made him value time and use every moment of the day" (Meyers 29). Lawrence was a eugenic misfit, and indeed his terrible susceptibility to seemingly any and every illness to which he was exposed makes him a most improbable supporter of eugenics.[3] How could the same man who advocated the murder of "the sick, the halt, and the maimed," a man who was himself so sick for so much of his short life, justify his support of eugenics? Granofsky theorizes:

> What turned Lawrence away from Darwinism in the end, I think, was the frightening idea that by Darwinian standards of natural selection,

[3] James Boulton notes that, along with less substantial episodes, Lawrence was seriously ill from Nov. 1911 - Jan. 1912, Feb. 1925, and regularly from 1927 until his death on March 2, 1930. During World War I, Lawrence was granted three exemptions from military service due to poor health (*Selected Letters 2,62,140-141,214,272,342,418*).

> Lawrence himself was expendable. […] But just as an abused child will unconsciously identify with the aggressor as a coping mechanism so Lawrence accepted aspects of Darwinian doctrine and applied them to his own writing. (Granofsky 18)

Did Lawrence actually believe in eugenics as a force for societal change, or were his shocking comments merely the results of a bad day—just frustrated, impotent examples of eugenic caprice, what Paul Sheehan terms "D.H. Lawrence's perorations of misanthropy" (Sheehan x)?

The fact that he expressed such thinking in both his private and public writing certainly points to an extremely complex relationship between Lawrence and his eugenic beliefs. In *Modernist Writing and Reactionary Politics*, Charles Ferrall considers a passage from Lawrence's novel *The Plumed Serpent*, where a ritual killing has just taken place:

> [T]his truly depraved moment in Lawrence's writing career demonstrates that this violence is a projection of his own murderous fantasies. We should read, I think, the incessant anti-humanist sentiments… the repeated calls to exterminate the swarms of insect-like modern men and women

> crowding his mental space, not as the kind of cranky individualism so beloved by his many enamoured critics, but as the genocidal fantasies of a deeply wounded narcissistic personality. (130)

While Ferrall refers to one of Lawrence's public works, his words could easily apply to Lawrence's private sentiments as well, specifically, his desire for a "lethal chamber as big as the Crystal Palace." Whether Lawrence was a cranky individualist or a wounded narcissist, however, murderous fantasies are not the same as murderous acts. Yet the essential question seems to be this: are these merely fantasies? Is Lawrence a serious advocate of eugenics, or are his eugenic depictions just so much bluster? It is this question I hope to examine in further detail as I chart the extent of eugenic discourse in Lawrence's work. The following chapter will present a close reading of Lawrence's novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, providing textual evidence of Lawrence's public stance toward eugenics. The third chapter presents eugenic discourse found in Lawrence's collected letters, in an effort to determine what discrepancies and similarities there are to be found

between Lawrence's advocacy of eugenics as a public, literary figure and as a private citizen.

Lawrence's work, both public and private, is saturated with reproductive discourse, and with disturbing, often homicidal language as well—language that is often rhetorically similar to the "positive" and "negative" elements of eugenics. Previous inquiries into this rhetoric have dismissed it as merely misanthropic, the angry musings of a frustrated man desperate for the world to recognize his genius. As James T. Boulton argues, "Lawrence [is] revelling in his linguistic creativity. He is not venting mere spleen; it is execration but increasingly jocular" (*Selected Letters xxx*). This investigation of Lawrence's rhetoric will attempt to go further, establishing Lawrence's familiarity with eugenic concepts and discourse, and revealing a man who is convinced of humanity's need for regeneration, eugenic or otherwise.

CHAPTER TWO

EUGENIC DISCOURSE IN *LADY CHATTERLEY'S LOVER*

Whether Lawrence was a serious advocate of eugenics or merely a sadistic daydreamer, evidence of eugenic discourse undeniably pervades much of his work. In this chapter, I will examine what is arguably Lawrence's most controversial work, his novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. This novel was one Lawrence was particularly proud of, rewriting the novel three times and even going to extreme lengths to publish it privately. *LCL* was written toward the end of Lawrence's life, at a time in which he was often nearly bedridden by chronic illness. Biographer David Ellis notes how fervently Lawrence worked on the first draft of the novel despite his battle with tuberculosis:

> [W]hen he did feel like it, he was capable of unusually sustained creative efforts, of the kind (for example) which had allowed him to write *Kangaroo* in six weeks. These periods of intense writing activity punctuate his career; but none is more remarkable than the six weeks in which he completed the almost 120,000 words of *Lady Chatterley's Lover* because during none of the

> others was he so debilitated by illness, and forced so often (as the letters and other documents attest) to retreat to his bed. (Ellis 388)

Clearly, the novel is one that Lawrence felt compelled to write, even at the expense of his health. This may also explain Lawrence's use of eugenic discourse in the novel, as Lawrence's own dawning sense of mortality must have made him particularly keen on imagining a work of rebirth and regeneration. As I demonstrate the eugenic discourse of the novel, a number of critical voices will also be examined, as I chart the ways in which others have made sense of the complex eugenic language present in the work. These voices compliment my own investigation, yet I posit alternative explanations for the eugenic discourse of *LCL*, viewing the contradictory class politics and eugenic discourse of the novel as a mirror for Lawrence's personal attempts to grapple with eugenics as a means to better humanity, an assertion that comes into clearer focus only after assessing both public and private examples of Lawrence's eugenics. The novel provides a wealth of eugenic discourse: the subtly eugenic musings of the narrator, and the shockingly explicit, and indeed prescient, discussion of

controlled reproduction later in the novel. There is even evidence suggesting that Lawrence's inspiration for the novel was based upon the writing of an eugenics advocate. Jo-Ann Wallace, in her article "The Very First Lady Chatterley? Mrs. Havelock Ellis's *Seaweed*", suggests that Lawrence's novel, eugenic discourse included, might very well be inspired by Ellis' novel *Seaweed*:

> The novel is of interest not only for its accidental implication in one of the famous censorship trials of the period and its subsequently volatile publishing history (described in more detail below), but for its subject matter which in many ways anticipates, and quite possibly inspired, D.H. Lawrence's *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. (Jo-Ann Wallace 123-124).

Indeed, the evidence pointing to a connection is tantalizing; Jo-Ann Wallace notes that the Lawrences had friends in common with Ellis, lived in Cornwall at the same time as Ellis, and that Lawrence would have been aware of Ellis' novel through his subscription to *The New Age* (Jo-Ann Wallace 131-134). Wallace remarks that Ellis was an outspoken advocate of eugenics as well, giving lectures on the subject during two tours of the United States (Jo-Ann

Wallace 125). If this connection was, in fact, a real one, and if Lawrence's novel is actually the inspired product of Ellis' novel, then *Lady Chatterley's Lover* is indeed a work of eugenic discourse from its very start.

Much of the eugenic discourse present in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* can be categorized as either corporal or reproductive in nature. These categories are artificial, to be sure, and more often than not, one dovetails into the next. These categories do, however, function as a convenient means of grappling with a novel that discusses human sexuality in candid, often graphic ways, and to provide a close reading of discourse that is often insidiously subtle in its treatment of eugenic themes. Charles M. Burack, author of "Revitalizing the Reader: Literary Technique and the Language of Sacred Experience in D. H. Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover," sees a similar binary working in the novel:

> The narrator of Lady Chatterley also implies that novels should have a two-phased initiatory structure [I]n the destruction phase, Lawrence tries to dissolve and expunge the reader's deadening sexual ideas and inclinations. In the sacralization phase, which focuses on the erotic

> encounters between Connie and Mellors, Lawrence attempts to vitalize, expand, and unify the reader's consciousness and thereby engender a sacred experience. The disintegration stage dominates the first half of the novel, while the vitalization stage governs the second half. As one stage wanes, the other waxes. (Burack "Revitalizing")

Burack argues that Lawrence works at the reader in two ways throughout the novel. The first half of the novel, which Burack characterizes as the "destruction phase," treats sex and sexuality in candid and often clinical, terms. The second "phase," which Burack sees as the "vitalization" or "sacralization," has Lawrence attempting to reconnect readers (through the sexual relationship of Constance and Mellors) with their sexuality and indeed their spirituality. Burack's binary seems to compliment my own, as another means of exploring Lawrence's often startling sexual rhetoric. Yet Burack views Lawrence's motivations behind his rhetorical choices as in the interest of moving the reader to a religious experience. Burack claims that Lawrence, in the "destruction phase," employs a "narratorial consciousness [which] dissects the sexual

attitudes and actions […] The repeated dissections are intended to further the disintegration of the reader's own split consciousness--to mortify the reader's mindset", while the "vivification stage aims to instill ideas of sacred eroticism and evoke an experience of aliveness and connectedness" (Burack "Revitalizing"). Burack is indeed not the only one who views Lawrence's novel as intended to provoke a spiritual response. David J Gordon's "Sex and Language in D.H. Lawrence" similarly asserts that Lawrence attempts to reconnect readers, through the novel's unashamed sexuality, with a humanity that has been deadened by civilization:

> The idyllic interlude, like the idyllic moment almost always in Lawrence, is a rebirth following a painful spiritual death—rather different from the daydreams of popular fiction. And here […] the cleansing of the unwholesome civilized consciousness is understood as both a sexual and a linguistic process […] [Constance] and her gamekeeper must, so to speak, learn not only to fuck but also to say the word. (Gordon 370)

Gordon maintains that Lawrence's linguistic choices are carefully planned indeed: Lawrence's portrayal of sexual

acts, coupled with the candid, often coarse language used to refer to those acts, is meant to awaken readers to a healthier, less civilized, more natural existence. As Gordon writes, "[I]t is clear enough that, in Lawrentian, unlike popular, romance, natural love is not something merely apart from civilization but is profoundly corrupted by it" (Gordon 371). Like Burack and Gordon, I posit that Lawrence attempts to move his readers, to shock them, and (perhaps) to reconcile them to a healthier, more physical, and less cerebral sexuality. My inquiry into Lawrence's work also suggests a desire to "evoke… aliveness and connectedness," yet I view Lawrence's rhetorical choices in an entirely different way. I argue for an appraisal of Lawrence's language not in terms of demolition and renewal, or of shocking readers into a healthier, less civilized state, but as eugenic discourse, whether consciously or unconsciously on his part. His goal may have been to awaken a spiritual experience in his readers, but he uses uncannily eugenic language to do so. Burack recognizes some of this language, but again he views these rhetorical choices as meant to destroy readers' notions of sexuality and physicality in order to rebuild them:

> The narrator uses the language of science to satirize young Connie and Hilda and parody the omnipresent scientistic mindset. Scientific discourse emphasizes categorization, explanation, prediction and control. The overuse of abstract words, compound-terms and noun phrases suggests that the sisters' erotic experiences have been filtered, reduced and governed by their rational minds. […] Hyphenated phrases like "sex-thrill" and "love-making" resemble chemical compounds, and the hyphen accentuates the dualism built into scientific thought. The plethora of conjoined abstract nouns is precisely what George Orwell will later identify as one of the "mental vices" of writers living in an age wedded to scientific abstractions and political orthodoxy.[4] In Lady Chatterley, the continued repetition of these abstract phrases is intended to have an annoying effect on readers. This annoyance could intensify to anger or modulate to boredom. ("Mortifying" 496)

[4] As referenced in Burack's "Mortifying the Reader": George Orwell, "Politics and the English Language," *Horizon* (April 1946).

Burack views the scientific rhetoric of the novel as a conscious choice on Lawrence's part, one meant to irritate the reader. The motivation to irritate may be the case with some of the "scientistic" language in the novel. However, much of the novel's most explicitly eugenic rhetoric stems not from the hyphenated phrases Burack sees early in the novel, but from single words and extraordinary, often prescient passages throughout the novel. Still another binary view of the novel comes from Jeff Wallace, who writes in *D.H. Lawrence, Science and the Posthuman*:

> [*Lady Chatterley's Lover*] thus presents the ideological contest between two versions of the posthuman: one, a capitalist utopia-dystopia characterized by the gradual supercession of the body; and the other, a post-capitalist future in which our bodiliness is renewed and enhanced. The 'machine' haunts both versions. (Jeff Wallace 232)

Wallace's work is particularly interesting in that he posits a clear connection between eugenics and Lawrence, one based on a desire to fundamentally alter humanity at the spiritual, if not genetic, level. However, Wallace does not touch upon the eugenic discourse that is widespread

throughout the novel; he focuses on "Lawrentian narratives of the posthuman" (Jeff Wallace 229), viewing the novel as illustrative of "the principles of regeneration and resistance through the power of bodily instinct [...] Lawrence plots the possibility that creatureliness might be an understanding of bodily or creaturely complexity—a mode of the posthuman" (Jeff Wallace 227).

Wallace's examination of the posthuman in Lawrence's work—and *Lady Chatterley's Lover* in particular—is in essence a rationalization for the eugenic discourse present in the novel: the explicit use of eugenic discourse is, for Wallace, evidence of Lawrence's posthuman narrative. Wallace seeks to "explore areas of interconnection between contemporary theories of posthumanism and Lawrence's sustained investigation of what T.H. Huxley called the 'question of questions' for his generation, that of 'man's place in nature'" (8). Wallace's insights into the novel are a useful way of accounting for the language of the novel, but Wallace does not effect a sustained discussion of the novel as a work illustrative of eugenic discourse. My thesis does not posit Lawrence's work as evidence of posthuman narrative; the goal of this investigation is chiefly to demonstrate the use of eugenic discourse in

Lawrence's public and private works as he searches for a means of revitalizing humanity. Lawrence's life and work suggest a complicated and contradictory relationship with eugenics; at times he seems to advocate eugenics, yet he is generally critical of all fields of science. While Lawrence's stance toward eugenics may be in flux, much of what I label "corporal" or "reproductive" language used in the novel solidly demonstrates Lawrence's consciousness of eugenic discourse.

A close reading of the text will follow Constance Chatterley, as the narrator, supporting characters, and often Constance herself comment upon those physical features that make her eugenically exceptional. Discussion of Constance's bodily "fitness," in turn, suggests that she is a woman of unique reproductive ability, a choice candidate for "positive" eugenics.

Class distinction, yet another theme ripe for eugenic analysis, permeates the novel. The lower classes are unfailingly described as baser, coarser material than those of the upper classes. The suggestion that the working classes, Mellors included, were polluting the English gene pool certainly would fall in line with the fears and prejudices of the majority of the upper classes in

Lawrence's England, and was exactly the kind of thinking that motivated eugenicists like Sir Francis Galton. The heart of *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, Constance's scandalous affair with her husband's servant Mellors, is central to the novel's handling of class politics. Suzanne Diamond suggests an interesting link between Lawrence's use of reproductive discourse and his treatment of the working classes in Chapter Four of her dissertation, *Textual Eugenics in the Fictions of Thomas Hardy and D.H. Lawrence*:

> Like Francis Galton's, Lawrence's plots evince a need to contain the functions of reproductive and productive classes largely as they are, even while they pretend a generally progressive vision. Galton, for instance, reifies a contemporaneous class-structure when he asserts that "[t]he aim of Eugenics is to *represent each class or sect* by its best specimens; that done, to leave them to work out their common civilisation in their own way"[5] […] Lawrence's vision allows for the upward escape of a few

[5] Diamond's original citation, omitted above, reads "(Galton, 36)." The material quoted from Galton refers to his lecture "Eugenics: Its Definition, Scope, and Aims." *The American Journal of Sociology* X.1 (July 1904).

> "aristocrats," but recognizes that the price for this escape must be paid by an equally reified reproductive underclass. (Diamond 137)

While Diamond's assertion does not specifically reference *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, it can certainly be tested against this novel. Given Diamond's contention, why would the aristocratic Constance seek pregnancy, particularly by way of working-class Mellors? Perhaps this suggests that Constance was never meant for the aristocracy, given her heritage. Constance may also merely be excited by the possibility of reproduction itself: the physical changes of pregnancy, the vital, life-affirming act of creating new human life. Constance may have been enamored with the idea of child-bearing, not necessarily child-rearing. Diamond also suggests that Constance may be an "exception," a fate that Diamond argues Lawrence himself might have sought:

> Lawrence shares with eugenic discourse the distracting celebration of the "exception," thus his willingness to make concessions at the level of plot in order that he, like the man of science, might declare "I will live!" against a death-sentence imposed by an indifferent and maternalized nature. (Diamond 157)

Given Lawrence's potential relationship with eugenics, a relationship complicated by his working-class roots and his poor health, he may well have sought to be an "exception." Diamond essentially sees in Lawrence's plots (though again not *LCL* specifically) a eugenic discourse dominated by the notion that parenthood is fundamentally a task of the working class. Lawrence, according to Diamond, has an "implicit understanding that underclass parenthood--in some sense regardless of the sex of the parent--entailed a lifetime consignment to the laboring classes" (Diamond 131). Moreover, among the aristocracy child-rearing is the job of servants, a fact which "reifies a contemporaneous class-structure". Diamond's take on eugenic discourse in Lawrence's plots is intriguing, but in many respects is complicated by the eugenic discourse present in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. Diamond's contention is affirmed by the novel, but perversely: working-class figure Mrs. Bolton is placed in charge of an aristocratic child, for example, but only in the form of an infantilized Clifford. Finally, Diamond's critique focuses primarily on the reproductive element of Lawrence's eugenic discourse. While this element is perhaps the most readily apparent and explicit form of eugenics in the novel, I shall argue that Lawrence's

attention to physical detail is also a significant part of the eugenic discourse present in Lawrence's novel.

What I term "corporal" eugenic discourse relates to specific critiques made either by the narrator or the novel's characters in relation to another character's physical attributes, and how desirable or undesirable those attributes are—not merely in terms of attractiveness, but rather as a commentary on that character's "fitness" as a human specimen. This kind of discourse is often benign physical description at surface. However, when one views the novel as a work of eugenic discourse, these images cast a different, more insidious light. An example of this kind of description comes early in the novel, as the narrator portrays Mr. and Mrs. Chatterley. Crippled in the war, Clifford is described as

> [...] strange and bright and cheerful, almost, one might say, chirpy, with his ruddy, healthy-looking face, and his pale-blue, challenging bright eyes. His shoulders were broad and strong, his hands were very strong [...] Yet still in his face one saw the watchful look, the slight vacancy of a cripple [...] There was a blank of insentience. (Lawrence 2)

Eugenically speaking, Clifford serves as a study in contrasts: from the waist up, he is the picture of fitness, just the kind of man Galton might see as the savior of the English "race." Even his disability might not be such an issue if Clifford were physically able to mate; war wounds cannot injure one's inherent genetics, even if they have rendered Clifford "vacant" and "insentient." For the British eugenicist, then, Clifford is a tragedy. He is a man of good breeding (in the sense that he comes from a respected family, and is descended from nobility), and disability aside, he seems to be in good health. In *Constance Chatterley*, *Clifford* seems to have chosen the perfect vessel for any potential progeny. She is described as a "ruddy, country-looking girl with soft brown hair and sturdy body, and slow movements, full of unusual energy" (2). The eugenicist might well view Constance as quality breeding stock indeed, certainly a good match for Clifford. She has the health and vigor to match Clifford's, and is "sturdy" enough to handle child bearing and child rearing. Only the consequences of noblesse oblige prevent the Chatterleys from producing what Galton would likely see as fine young examples of English vigor. Later portrayals of Constance, though, may call her eugenic fitness into

question, by suggesting that Mrs. Chatterley hails from less than noble stock.

There is, perhaps, nothing explicitly eugenic about the narrator's descriptions of Clifford and Constance Chatterley. However, Lawrence's semantic choices, seen time and time again in the narrator's physical descriptions of characters, do suggest a eugenically based motivation. Of all the ways, for example, to suggest that a woman is strong, healthy, vibrant, why choose "sturdy?" Surely there are other, more titillating ways to depict the novel's protagonist, a woman who spends so much of the novel as an almost completely sexualized creature—an object of sexual appeal for Mellors and others. Lawrence finds these words a bit later, but they are themselves complicated choices. In addition to being "sturdy," Constance is

> […] a soft, ruddy, country-looking girl, inclined to freckles, with big blue eyes, and curling, brown hair, and a soft voice, and rather strong, female loins […] considered a little old-fashioned and "womanly." She was not a "little pilchard sort of fish," like a boy, with a boy's flat breast and little buttocks. She was too feminine to be quite smart. (16)

This depiction of Constance makes direct reference to her reproductive potential. She is more than "sturdy:" her loins are "strong," and "womanly." She is in no way shaped "like a boy," a fact emphasized by both the narrator and Constance's father. Indeed, throughout the novel it is stated that Constance's body type no longer reflects the ideal in British culture. Constance remarks upon her physique: "She had been supposed to have a rather good figure, but now she was out of fashion: a little too female, not enough like an adolescent boy" (69).

The narrator often suggests that Constance has ample hips and buttocks, the kind of fertile feminine body that evokes the archetypal mother goddess, a body so generous that it apparently retards her intelligence. That Constance is "too feminine to be quite smart" reinforces her role as a mere instrument of reproduction, rather than a thinking, intelligent individual. Further, in a time when the feminine ideal calls for leaner, less curvaceous forms, Constance's body shape stands out even more for its fullness and supposed fertility. These oft-repeated references to her anachronistic full figure serve to both sexualize Constance, and also illustrate her capacity to bear offspring, a much more explicitly eugenic portrayal.

Such a description also complicates her eugenic "fitness," as her questionable intelligence, combined with Constance being "sturdy," and "country-looking," implies a more humble ancestry than her husband's. If Connie is a product of working class stock, it would, in the eyes of the eugenicist, jeopardize her standing as a suitable mate for Clifford. In a more explicitly racist turn, the narrator describes Constance as "[…] not very tall, a bit Scottish and short" (69). In addition to the possibility of her lower class genetics, Constance is not entirely English, as well. She may be too Scottish and too lower class to be a eugenically perfect match for Clifford, but Constance has, by all accounts, a body made for reproducing. Regardless of other eugenic considerations, Constance is a prime candidate for reproduction.

Throughout the novel, Constance is burdened by the need to bear children. A number of characters suggest that she is near-obligated to have a child, if only for no other reason than her body appears well-suited to pregnancy. Constance herself believes that her life, and indeed her body as well, hold less meaning if she never becomes a mother. Constance is diminished by this determination of her as more walking womb than an individual possessed of

intelligence and free will. At times, she resents this reproductive destiny. Throughout the novel, her husband suggests that she might get discreetly get pregnant by another man. One instance in particular leaves her particularly vexed:

> Connie heard it all with deepening dismay and repulsion. It was one of the ghastly half-truths that poison human existence. What man in his senses would say such things to a woman! But men aren't in their senses. What man with a spark of honour would put this ghastly burden of life-responsibility upon a woman, and leave her there, in the void? (112)

The "life-responsibility" placed upon Constance is great indeed, as Clifford desires not only a child, a means of continuing his own family. He also seeks to make a contribution to England itself; a genetic preservation of the best stock Britannia has to offer. Clifford has a duty, as a Chatterley and a member of the nobility, "to keep up the level of the race" (152). This obligation to preserve the race, an obligation which subjugates Constance's reproductive rights, is profoundly eugenic. As Katie Gramich notes in "Stripping Off the 'Civilized Body':

Lawrence's *nostalgie de la boue* in *Lady Chatterley's Lover,"*:

> A concern with reproductive health and with the composition of the nation's population is also in evidence in the novel, at times with a chilling echo of the discourses of eugenics which were prevalent at the time of its composition. A concern with degeneration is clearly evident in the novel […] Mellors's diatribe against modern man has echoes of the disgust which underlies eugenics and ethnic cleansing.[6] (Gramich 151-152).

Gramich's assertion reinforces my own; the reproductive and degenerative discourse of the novel confirms Lawrence's familiarity with eugenics and illustrates his belief in the need for a work of regenerative power.

---

[6] Gramich refers to the following passage from *LCL*: Their spunk's gone dead—motor-cars and cinemas and aeroplanes suck the last bit out of them I tell you, every generation breeds a more rabbit generation, with indiarubber tubing for guts and tin legs and tin faces. Tin people! … All the modern lot get their real kick out of killing off the old human feeling out of man, making mincemeat out of the old Adam and the old Eve…. Pay 'em money to cut off the world's cock…. The root of sanity is in the balls. (217:17-37) [In the edition of *LCL* I cite here, pg. 223]

Early in the novel, Clifford's conversation with Constance about the value of preserving forestlands turns into something more overtly eugenic:

> "If some of the old England isn't preserved, there'll be no England at all," said Clifford. "And we who have this kind of property, and the feeling for it, must preserve it."
>
> There was a sad pause.
>
> "Yes, for a little while," said Connie.
>
> "For a little while! It's all we can do. We can only do our bit. I feel every man of my family has done his bit here, since we've had the place. One may go against convention, but one must keep up tradition." Again there was a pause.
>
> "What tradition?" asked Connie.
>
> "The tradition of England! of this!"
>
> "Yes," she said slowly.
>
> "That's why having a son helps; one is only a link in a chain," he said.
>
> (Lawrence 42-43, emphasis in original).

Clifford is apparently ready to go against the "convention" of monogamy; his desire to maintain "tradition" allows him the moral flexibility to encourage his wife to look

elsewhere for a sperm donor. "Every man of [Clifford's] family has done his bit," and if Clifford has to find a surrogate to do his "bit," then so be it. Not merely a family, but even England itself, must be preserved. Clifford's England, however, does not reside in the genetics of coal miners and others of the working class, but with those of "property," the landed gentry. Those of this class are worth preserving, and, as is seen throughout the rest of the novel, those of the lower classes (Mellors certainly included) are not.

Clifford confirms this sentiment in his reaction to the news, late in the novel, that Constance bears Mellors' child:

> "And you mean to say you want to have a child to a cad like that?"
>
> "Yes, I'm going to."
>
> "You're going to! You mean you're sure! How long have you been sure?"
>
> "Since June."
>
> He was speechless, and the queer blank look of a child came over him again.
>
> "You'd wonder," he said at last, "that such beings were ever allowed to be born."

"What beings," she asked.

He looked at her weirdly, without an answer. It was obvious he couldn't accept the fact of the existence of Mellors, in any connection with his own life. It was sheer, unspeakable, impotent hate. (306-307)

Constance should have chosen more carefully, then, if she was to give Clifford a son whose combined genetic heritage is enough to measure up to both the illustrious Chatterley name and of England itself. As both a product of the working class, and indeed a servant of Sir Chatterley himself, Mellors seems to be the last choice for a eugenically suitable mate for Constance. Whether she chooses "correctly" or not, however, Constance is bound by body and by obligation to reproduce.

"Reproductive" discourse, as I define it for the purposes of this inquiry, illustrates characters' reproductive abilities and chances for reproduction, as well as the quality of offspring and the reproductive act itself—whether, for example, there might be a more efficient, less messy way of creating babies than the current system. Constance Chatterley, according to nearly everyone in the novel, herself included, would make an

excellent breeder—she has a strong, womanly body. Even her own father suggests that she seems built to bear children, discussing the matter with an affronted Clifford:

> "I'm afraid it doesn't quite suit Connie to be a *demi-vierge*."
>
> "A half-virgin!" replied Clifford, translating the phrase to be sure of it.
>
> He thought for a moment, then flushed very red. He was angry and offended.
>
> "In what way doesn't it suit her?" He asked stiffly.
>
> "She's getting thin… angular. It's not her style. She's not the pilchard sort of a little slip of a girl, she's a bonny Scotch trout." (15, emphasis in original)

Constance's father implies that not only is she the kind of woman who is meant to bear children, the fact that she is not seems to be a detriment to her health. Her curves, so symbolic of her femininity and fertility, are in decline, dwindling for want of use and need. All the men that surround Constance—her husband, her father, the narrator, (should we suppose to apply a gender to the narrator based on that of the author), and later, her lover Mellors, agree

that she is uniquely physically fit to bear children. Constance herself begins to worry that her body is deteriorating because she has not given birth to a child:

> Still she thought the most beautiful part of her was the long-sloping fall of the haunches from the socket of the back, and the slumberous, round stillness of the buttocks. Like hillocks of sand the Arabs say, soft and downward-slipping with a long slope. Here the life still lingered hoping. But here too she was thinner, and going unripe, astringent. But the front of her body made her miserable. It was already beginning to slacken, with a slack sort of thinness, almost withered, going old before it had ever really lived. She thought of the child she might somehow bear. Was she fit, anyhow? (70)

The final line of the passage, Constance's worry over whether she is "fit" to bear children, provides a good case for Lawrence's familiarity with Darwinian theory on at least a basic level. The question of her fitness is essentially eugenic: what might make her suitable to bear a child? Would it be responsible of her to do so? Perhaps most importantly, to whom is she accountable: her

hypothetical child, the Chatterley ancestry, or perhaps Britain at large? Certainly, these questions illustrate that Constance's question might be interpreted a number of ways, but all of these readings have intrinsically eugenic underpinnings. Each of the questions above assumes that Constance must take responsibility for her genetics, regardless of whether she feels she must answer to her child, her husband's line, or her society.

Constance also believes her body is aging before she has "ever really lived," suggesting that Constance herself believes that she has a unique obligation or physical compulsion to bear children. Her body will only really live, it seems, once she conceives. In the absence of that conception, those parts of her body most relative to reproduction wither away. Though "life still lingered hoping," Constance's hips and buttocks are thinning, and she believes her lack of reproduction is the cause: her body is becoming "unripe:"

> Instead of ripening its firm, down-running curves, her body was flattening and going a little harsh. It was as if it had not had enough sun and warmth; it was a little greyish and sapless. Disappointed of its real womanhood, it

had not succeeded in becoming boyish, and unsubstantial, and transparent; instead it had gone opaque. Her breasts were rather small, and dropping pear-shaped. But they were unripe, a little bitter, without meaning hanging there. (69)

Constance's body appears to be entering an unseasonable winter: deprived of "sun and warmth," she is becoming "greyish and sapless." She sees her own body as "unsubstantial," as her breasts hang "without meaning" from her chest. Indeed, since Constance has never reproduced, she has never experienced "real womanhood." Her body is a fraud; childless, Constance believes that she does not deserve her breasts, hips, or buttocks, the signifiers of a "real" woman's body. Only a mother, Constance must suppose, can give these parts meaning.

Such an opinion stands in strong contrast to another woman in the novel, who eagerly anticipates a time when womanhood might remain distinct from motherhood. Olive Strangeways opens a discussion on reproduction that stands as the most explicit, and indeed prescient, example of eugenic discourse in the novel:

> Olive was reading a book about the future, when babies would be bred in bottles, and women would be "immunised."
>
> "Jolly good thing too!" she said. "Then a woman can live her own life." Strangeways wanted children, and she didn't.
>
> "How'd you like to be immunised?" Winterslow asked her, with an ugly smile.
>
> "I hope I am; naturally," she said. "Anyhow the future's going to have more sense, and a woman needn't be dragged down by her *functions*."
>
> "Perhaps she'll float off into space altogether," said Dukes.
>
> "I do think sufficient civilization ought to eliminate a lot of the physical disabilities," said Clifford. "All the love-business for example, it might just as well go. I suppose it would if we could breed babies in bottles."
>
> (73, emphasis in original)

For Constance, it seems, a woman's life is inextricably connected to motherhood, yet Olive yearns for a time when "a woman can live her own life," apart from the concerns of reproduction. Reproduction, for Olive, is a disease to be

of such a position; in a nation full of genetically advanced English supermen, there would be little room for the frail and sickly. What, then, might be learned from Lawrence's private views on eugenics? In the following chapter, I will examine Lawrence's private letters in an attempt to cast light on his very complicated relationship with the British eugenics movement. Much of the language used throughout the novel suggests Lawrence's familiarity with eugenic discourse, but the contradictory character of Mellors—a working-class hero, a man of seemingly little eugenic worth yet arguably the most likable character in the novel—suggests that Lawrence's advocacy of eugenics, at least in his public work, is uncertain. In *D.H. Lawrence: A Biography*, author Jeffrey Meyers argues a connection between Mellors and Lawrence himself:

> Many aspects of Mellors' life are autobiographical. Like the young Lawrence, Mellors was a clever lad who had learned French and won a scholarship to an urban grammar school […] Mellors' description of his early love affairs is clearly based on Lawrence's relations. (Meyers 357)

Perhaps the most important similarity between character and author, though, is the coal-mining heritage shared by both. Arguably the hero of the novel, Mellors' working-class heritage and current occupation as servant to the Chatterleys allows Lawrence to have it both ways: he "attacks the upper-class, intellectual, materialistic and mechanical civilization that thwarts [...] regeneration" (358), by championing the working-class Mellors, who as a man of the proletariat is in a unique position to criticize that class as well. Mellors becomes a complicated version of Suzanne Diamond's "exception." Peter Scheckner, author of *Class, Politics, and the Individual: A Study of the Major Works of D.H. Lawrence*, also sees Mellors as an exception, a man outside of class and exceptionally qualified to deliver Lawrence's brand of social regeneration:

> [Lawrence] chose Mellors as his proponent of 'the basic physical realities' because he owned no property, had no material aspirations, and his class identity was ambiguous. The gamekeeper had a mixed class background. He was the son of a blacksmith who worked in the mines. Mellors had been to Sheffield Grammar School, became a junior

> clerk, and was an officer in India during World War I. He was more bourgeois […] and had certain middle-class aspirations. (Scheckner 160-161)

Assuming that Mellors' "class identity was ambiguous" is perhaps too generous. While Mellors "might almost be a gentleman" (Lawrence 68), his class status is reified: he is a servant, and later a field-hand. He never rises to the aristocracy—to be sure, the enigmatic ending of the novel suggests that if indeed Mellors and Constance live happily ever after it shall always be on a working man's wage—but the sexual relationship between the two has allowed for a regeneration that allows them to transcend class to the extent that they have recovered humanity in place of caste. This regeneration is supremely eugenic: a reproductive act that has improved the humanity of two people, but one which depended not on genetics or gentility. This is eugenics solely on Lawrence's terms.

CHAPTER THREE

EUGENIC DISCOURSE IN LAWRENCE'S PRIVATE LETTERS

Little in Lawrence's private correspondence can match the disturbing, often graphic incidences of eugenic discourse found in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. In the novel, a public work, Lawrence writes explicitly about Connie Chatterley's reproductive fitness and the future of human reproduction. The novel also illustrates Lawrence's complex and often contradictory relationship with eugenics: the novel suggests disdain for the working classes as being poor reproductive material for breeding purposes, yet working-class Mellors is viewed as the only real choice over the impotent Clifford Chatterley as a mate for Constance. This complicated and often contradictory view of the British class system pervades the eugenic discourse found throughout Lawrence's private letters, discourse that reaches its peak with the quotation that began my inquiry:

> Concerning Daisy Lord, I am entirely in accord with you. If I had my way, I would build a lethal chamber as big as the Crystal Palace, with a military band playing softly, and a Cinematograph working brightly; then I'd go out in the back

> streets and main streets and bring them in, all the sick, the halt, and the maimed; I would lead them gently, and they would smile me a weary thanks; and the band would softly bubble out the 'Hallelujah Chorus'. (*The Letters* 81)

Daisy Lord, according to a footnote from James T. Boulton, editor of *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence, Vol. I*, had been convicted of the murder of her illegitimate child and sentenced to death; suffragists of the time protested for her release, unsuccessfully (81). Clearly, Lawrence was in the majority of those who had little sympathy for Lord or those of her social strata. Indeed, much of the eugenic discourse found in Lawrence's private letters explicitly condemns the working class. While the upper classes in Lawrence's England found a myriad of reasons to blame the proletariat for Britain's woes, Lawrence may have had a more idiosyncratic motivation. Lifelong issues with his father, a coal miner, and an uncannily intense relationship and sympathy with his mother, may well have fostered in Lawrence a fervent dislike of the working class.

Lawrence's relationship with his father was strained at best; he often writes in his letters of his mother's bad luck in ending up with Arthur Lawrence, considering their

relationship a "mis marriage" (*The Letters* 191). Lawrence's rapport with his mother was, by contrast, near-ideal: "This has been a kind of bond between me and my mother. We have loved each other, almost with a husband and wife love, as well as filial and maternal. We knew each other by instinct" (190). His comments come in a letter dated a few days before his mother's death from cancer—a long and painful decline that saw Lawrence constantly at his mother's side. Clearly, Lawrence pitied his mother that she had married the man that she had; he looked back at a life he must have known was filled with regrets. Lawrence acted in deference to his father when the situation required, and in his father's later years, Lawrence sent what money he could to his sister Ada for his father's use and comfort. However, there was little between the two men one might consider love, at least from the son's point of view:

> My mother was a clever, ironical delicately moulded woman, of good old burgher descent. She married below her. My father was dark, ruddy, with a fine laugh. He is a coal miner. He was one of the sanguine temperament, warm and hearty, but unstable: he lacked principle, as my mother would have said. He deceived her and he lied to her.

> She despised him—he drank. Their marriage life has been one carnal, bloody fight. I was born hating my father: as early as ever I can remember, I shivered with horror when he touched me. He was very bad before I was born. (190)

Since he made these comments only days before his mother's death, and was quite possibly writing this letter only feet away from her bed, close enough to listen to her labored breaths, Lawrence must have been profoundly moved, with love, regret, and sadness for his mother, and an intense dislike for a distant, seemingly uncaring father. His father's faults aside, Lawrence's remarks are strongly evocative of the kind of classism that Julian Huxley and others warned against. His mother's background, "burgher descent," was among the merchant class, and provided middle class respectability. His father represented exactly the kind of human flotsam Clifford Chatterley despised, and Lawrence himself apparently felt the same way. Throughout his private letters, Lawrence makes mention of the lower class of Britain, often viewing them as decidedly sub-human. At one point, Lawrence expresses his relief at living in London, where he finds, apparently, some distance between himself and the mob:

> Since writing you I have been to Stockport and Manchester, vile, hateful, immense, tangled, filthy places both, seething with strangers […] The people in London do not feel so strange; they are folk who have come down the four winds of Heaven to this center of convergence of the Universe; people in Manchester and Stockport and the awful undignified provincial towns are like races of insects running over some foul body; one naturally gravitates to London; one naturally flees from the cotton centres. (*The Letters* 80)

The above passage, it should be noted, comes from the same 1908 letter wherein Lawrence suggests euthanizing the poor and infirm as a means of preserving Britain, and was written to Blanche Jennings, an associate with whom Lawrence had broached the subject of race before.[7] The extract above evidently marks a point in Lawrence's life where he is either virulently prejudiced against the poor, or an extreme advocate of negative eugenics, or both.

---

[7] Jennings, according to Boulton, was "Post office counter-clerk in Liverpool; socialist and suffragist" (*Selected Letters xvii*). Lawrence began an earlier letter to Jennings as follows: "Since you belong to a class which I conceive of as scorning conventional politeness—don't ask me 'what class?'—I am going to be just natural, which is to be rude" (*The Letters* 43).

Lawrence has a good deal more to say about the insignificance of the lower classes in his private letters. At seemingly every point when Lawrence has occasion to deal with the lower class, he has something disparaging to say about them:

> I went in the afternoon to Hornsey, to see George Hill. On the Sunday he took me to the Alexandra Palace […] The organ is big and good; but the gathering! There were some three or four hundred people, all that respectable class of poor city people such as one never sees in Croydon. All unhealthy, weedy, impoverished specimens. (*The Letters* 116)

The language of the above passage, from a letter written while Lawrence was teaching near London, is particularly interesting given Lawrence's use of such markedly eugenic discourse. At the time, Lawrence was struck by the distinction between "poor city people" and the working class of the more suburban Croydon. Lawrence's condemnation of these "respectable" people—one must suppose this is an attempt at sarcasm—is strikingly clinical in its description. Lawrence's fellow concertgoers are mere "specimens," rather than human beings. They are sapien

"weeds," too "unhealthy" to be considered worthy of full-fledged human status, exactly the kind of eugenically inferior stock that Lawrence would usher into his euthanasia chamber. Drawing a eugenic distinction between the city poor and the suburban and rural poor was not peculiar to Lawrence, either. As Donald MacKensie, author of "Eugenics in Britain" observes:

> All eugenicists were agreed that manual workers were socially necessary. What they wanted was to improve the discipline, physique and intelligence of the working class by eradicating the 'lowest' elements of it. The eugenicists attempted to draw a line between socially useful and socially dangerous elements of the lower orders […] Characteristically, the urban slum dweller was compared with the healthy and strong agricultural labourer. It was widely believed that urban conditions caused the degeneration of immigrants from the country, whether by the direct effect of environment or by selection of the worst types. (MacKensie 515)

Lawrence has little difficulty in switching allegiances depending on which elements of the lower classes he is

suffering at the time, city or country. Mellors? His depiction of the city poor as "unhealthy, weedy, impoverished specimens" does distinctly smack, though, of the kind of eugenic distrust of the urban poor that was a common attitude of many eugenicists of the time.

This stance toward the proletariat was not peculiar to Lawrence's youth, either. A little over a year before his death, Lawrence was still speaking out on the inferiority of the working class. From James T. Boulton's *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*: "The Working man is not much of a British Bulldog any more—he's rather a shivering cur—one has to try slowly to rouse the old spirit in him" (*Selected Letters* 437). Writing to publisher P.R. Stephensen, Lawrence was once again railing against the inadequacies of the Western world: "I *hate* our civilization, our ideals, our money, our machines, our intellectuals, our upper classes. But I hate them because I've tried them and given them a long chance" (436, emphasis in original). Lawrence manages a condemnation of the upper classes here, but only superficially; he reserves the bulk of his scorn—and his most florid turns of phrase—for the working man. As noted earlier, eugenics advocate and popular science author Julian Huxley warned against exactly this kind of language,

railing against those who would encourage the eugenic persecution of the lower classes in favor of those deemed more favorable.

Lawrence's bias against his father, and the lower classes his father was a product of, make Lawrence an outspoken supporter of middle- and upper-class superiority. However, his advocacy of eugenics in any substantive and serious way may still be questionable: what appears to be eugenic discourse may very well just be a case of fierce classism and a desire to distance himself from his father. Nor does Lawrence ever explicitly speak of the proletariat's inferiority as genetic in its deficiency. Lawrence often comes close to this, questioning the working man's ability to breed, referring to the proletariat as insects, but he never speaks in terms that might be considered overtly eugenic. It can be said, with some degree of certainty, that Lawrence was aware of the eugenics movement in Britain. Though he never specifically mentions eugenics as a discipline, Lawrence does discuss scientific matters with Aldous Huxley, a close friend and Julian Huxley's brother. In a November 1927 letter written while Lawrence was in Italy recuperating from a serious illness that had developed in July:

> Dear Aldous, Many thanks for *Proper Studies*.[8] I have read 70 pages, with a little astonishment that you are so serious and professional. You are not your grandfather's *Enkel* [grandson] for nothing—that funny dry-mindedness and underneath social morality […] I just read Darwin's *Beagle* again. (*Selected Letters* 367-368)

If Huxley and Lawrence discussed topics ranging from sociology to "social morality" and biology (given Lawrence's knowledge of Darwin's works), surely eugenics, as an emerging scientific discipline, must have been discussed at some point in their conversations and letters. Apparently, however, Lawrence apparently put little stock in science, describing it as "childish piffle" at one point (*Selected Letters* 180). If the inherent physical inferiority of some people over others was the basis of eugenics, Lawrence may well have not been interested. Lawrence was, after all, rejected for military service on a number of occasions during World War One on account of his health.[9] Lawrence may well have felt his body, his very

---

[8] Editor James Boulton's footnote explains that *Proper Studies* is "a collection of socio-psychological studies" (*Selected Letters* 367).

[9] See Footnote 2, pg. 18

genes, as betrayers. A physical, biological underpinning for "social morality" might have been unacceptable to Lawrence, who based on that criteria would have been viewed as sorely lacking. His physical failings do not, however, prevent Lawrence from believing unreservedly in his own superiority over the rest of humanity.

Lawrence's belief in the critical need to govern the lower class suggests that he was convinced of their inferiority, and if his belief does not guarantee upper class superiority, it certainly means Lawrence was confident in his own pre-eminence. Lawrence indeed suggests that the working class needs to be governed if it is to survive. A December, 1915 letter to a friend, Lady Ottoline Morrell, illustrates his belief:

> They are still so living, so vulnerable, so darkly passionate. I love them like brothers—but my God, I hate them too: I don't intend to own them as masters—not while the world stands. One must conquer them also—think beyond them, know beyond them, act beyond them. But there will be a big row after the war, with these working men. (*Selected Letters* 115)

Here, Lawrence seems to move past mere resentment of his father's class, confirming a complicated relationship with a caste he both sympathized with and loathed. Peter Scheckner highlights this:

> Lawrence is the one major figure on modern British literature whose social background is working class […] Throughout his life Lawrence anguished over the fact that he could not sustain a deeper attachment to his father's people. He continually agonized that the British miner was either too hypnotized by materialism—the Mammon of property and money—or too dead in spirit to revitalize English society. (Scheckner 9).

Rather, he appears convinced of his own superiority: he does not wish to be "master" over the working class, but he suggests that the proletariat needs conquering, if only for its own good. The working class, as inferior humanity, needs someone to think and act for it, and while Lawrence himself may not have wanted the job, he certainly sees himself capable of it. Lawrence's sense of superiority may have much to do with the timing of the above letter, as well: the daily terrors of life during World War One must have affected Lawrence, and only a few weeks earlier,

Lawrence's novel *The Rainbow* was ordered to be suppressed by a magistrate (*Selected Letters* 62). Surely, frustration over this act, regarding a book he was supremely proud of, may have convinced Lawrence that he was a man outside of his own culture, a culture that viewed him at best as controversial, at worst as a pornographer.

At the least, Lawrence is positive that someone must take control over the masses. Lawrence expands on the need for governance in a later letter to friend and former neighbor (before the Lawrences were forced out of Cornwall) Cecil Gray, dated July 1918: "One must view the species with contempt first and foremost, and find a few individuals, if possible […] to rule the species. It is proper ruling they need, and always have needed" (*Selected Letters* 160). Again, this language is not overtly eugenic, but Lawrence's choice of words is very suggestive. He sees the human species as deserving of "contempt," and advocates the selection of "a few individuals" to take primacy over the rest. This stance marks a change in Lawrence, one that based on his private correspondence seems to have occurred during the war. Chased out of his home in Cornwall only months previous to the letter above and accused of spying

for Germany,[10] he was understandably furious at the treatment he had received at the hands of his own country (*Selected Letters* 141). As Boulton asserts, "Isolated on the southwestern tip of England, and seemingly at the mercy of a malevolent society, his hatred of militarism was intensified by his and Frieda's expulsion" (141). Lawrence was undoubtedly still smarting from his expulsion from Cornwall; poverty, the war, the British military's suspicion of him, and the medical examinations Lawrence endured at the hands of the military (and he would be rejected by the military once more, after his third examination a few months after this letter was posted) surely contributed to Lawrence's misanthropy. Fed up with all of England, Lawrence no longer singles out the working class as the one inferior, corrupting element of the "race." The war had such an effect on Lawrence as to convince him of all humanity's inadequacy (though he would still continue to single out the working class as particularly inferior). Humankind as a species is reduced to a level of defectiveness, in Lawrence's view, that he once attributed solely to the working class. He heaps his

---

[10] Lawrence's wife, Frieda, was German, and the Lawrences spent a good deal of time in Germany before the war.

scorn upon all the peoples of the world, saving particular wrath for the English, the Germans, and Americans. His belief in the absurdity of the war and the accusations made against him, coupled with his frustrated attempts at literary success, take Lawrence back to his earliest eugenic fantasies.

Time and time again, Lawrence dreams of murder. He describes his hatred of the Germans in a May, 1915 letter, saying "I am mad with rage myself. I would like to kill a million Germans—two million" (*Selected Letters* 101). Lawrence's bloodlust likely stems not from any eugenic goal; here, he is probably just caught up in the times. He is collateral damage: a civilian casualty of the war, wounded not in any mean and physical way, but shaken to his moral foundations by the outrageous futility of the war. However, the example above is one of many murderous visions the Lawrence writes privately of throughout his lifetime, not only during the war but indeed long before it. Lawrence's inability to find a publisher willing to work with him produced, in July 1912, yet another extraordinarily shocking diatribe. Furious over his lack of commercial success and provoked by a publisher's rejection

of his novel *Paul Morel* (later, *Sons and Lovers*), Lawrence fumes:

> Why, why, why was I born an Englishman!—my cursed, rotten-boned, pappy hearted countrymen, *why* was I sent to *them* […] Curse the blasted, jelly-boned swines, the slimy, the belly-wriggling invertebrates, the miserable sodding rotters, the flaming sods, the sniveling, dribbling, dithering palsied pulse-less lot that make up England today. They've got white of egg in their veins, and their spunk is that watery its a marvel they can breed. They *can* nothing but frog-spawn—the gibberers! […] Exterminate them, slime. (*Selected Letters* 44-45, emphasis in original)

Clearly Lawrence was in a fit of frustration and anger, and not advocating mass murder as a means of improving humanity. Lawrence did not speak as a eugenicist here; far from it. What he does in this rant, once again, is fantasize about exterminating a large group of humanity, in this case, the entire English "race." His vision of an exterminated England is one he returns to constantly throughout his life. In late 1916, and likely increasingly

despondent over Britain's course in the war, he muses: "Oh, if one could but have a great box of insect powder, and shake it over them, in the heavens, and exterminate them […] If only there were not more than one hundred people in Great Britain!" (*Selected Letters* 134-135). Reducing humanity to the level of insects, Lawrence once again demonstrates a belief in his own vast superiority over the majority of humankind. Later that same year, Lawrence's fantasies turn biblical: "There ought to be a flood to drown mankind" (*Selected Letters* 143). Lawrence's "flood" is yet another example of his murderous desire to cleanse the world of all those he feels are beneath him: lesser beings in intellect and sensuality, if not as physical specimens. He loathes America, viewing it as culturally destitute, writing in June 1927 to friend (and Buddhist) Earl Brewster that "I could kill them dead" (*Selected Letters* 352). He dreams of a way to silence all those who oppose or criticize him. A painter as well as writer, Lawrence writes in March of 1927 to lifelong friend and fellow painter Hon. Dorothy Brett: "I could print a picture that would just *kill* every cowardly and ill-minded person that looked at it. My word, what a slaughter!—How are your radishes?" (*Selected Letters* 339, emphasis in original).

Lawrence airs these fantasies throughout his private letters. James Boulton notes that while many of Lawrence's letters "display the more obviously combative, even bellicose, types of energy" (*Selected Letters xl*), there is little to suggest that his intentions display real malice, only macabre fantasy born of frustration. At no point does Lawrence discuss euthanizing anyone for some greater eugenic good: his language is never explicitly eugenic enough to clearly identify him as an advocate of eugenics on the level of Julian Huxley.[11] These eugenic fantasies do, however, suggest that Lawrence had, at least in some form and on some level, similar goals to the eugenicist. Like the eugenics movement, Lawrence dreams of an England, and indeed a world, a whole human "race," that finally meets his exacting standards, which might not necessarily include those of the conventional eugenicist.

If D.H. Lawrence can in any sense be termed a eugenicist, it is because he desires a smarter, more feeling, less prudish, more sensual people: all goals that are difficult to meet at the genetic level. Lawrence's motivation is not to produce stronger physical specimens, but people who might actually appreciate his work, people

[11] See pg. 17

who do not wince at his sexual candor because they are comfortable enough with their bodies to appreciate and connect with his words. Like the Galtonian eugenicist, Lawrence sought a better humanity. Lawrence was certainly aware of and understood the science behind what friends like the Huxleys advocated, given the often explicitly eugenic discourse in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*, but his scorn for science as a poor substitute for feeling and sensuality, coupled with his own shortcomings as a physical specimen, led him to an entirely different conclusion. Lawrence's conception of eugenics replaced evolutionary theory with the spiritual and sensual. As Jeff Wallace argues:

> [A] broad eugenic dispensation gave Lawrence the conviction that the 'human' comprises no discrete, inviolable state or essence, but is subject to change […] Somewhat alarmingly perhaps, Lawrence early declared that his intention in writing was to make folks 'alter, and have more sense'; readers cannot fail to be aware that his work had designs upon them. This *alterability* can be understood in a eugenic context, the strong imperative behind it

> consisting in no less than the improvement of humans. (Jeff Wallace 155-156, emphasis in original)

Lawrence was a eugenicist *sans* genes, a man totally convinced of his own superiority, and totally frustrated with the intellectual, emotional, and sensual deficiencies of much of the rest of humanity. Frequently, this frustration manifested itself in murderous eugenic fancy, but at his core Lawrence did not believe in killing as a means of improving humanity. As Peter Scheckner argues:

> It is hardly possible to read Lawrence during any period of his life without *recognizing* how strongly he felt that a radical change in Western civilization had to occur before the individual could reach his potential in his private or social life. No sexual, psychological, or artistic growth seemed possible to him under modern industrialism with its fundamentally exploitative social, economic, and sexual relationships. (Scheckner 19)

Lawrence's frequent eugenic fantasies, from the "positive" reproductive eugenics present in much of his novel *Lady Chatterley's Lover* to the "negative" genocidal musings of

his private letters, may well have been his frustrated attempts to forecast what shape that "radical change in Western civilization" might look like. While these fantasies are shocking, they come from a man undoubtedly no less shocked at the spiritless, machinic inhumanity of the world he saw around him. Lawrence sought to improve the human species not through controlled breeding or gas chambers, but through the power of his work. He was convinced that his work, if read with the right pair of eyes and a working mind, really could regenerate humanity. As he states in his essay, *A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*:

> It is a question, practically, of relationship. We *must* get back into relation, vivid and nourishing relation to the cosmos and the universe. The way is through daily ritual, and the re-awakening […] To these rituals we must return: or we must evolve them to suit our needs. For the truth is, we are perishing for lack of fulfillment of our greater needs, we are cut off from the great sources of our inward nourishment and renewal, sources which flow eternally in the universe. Vitally, the human race is dying. It is

> like a great uprooted tree, with its roots in the air. We must plant ourselves again in the universe. (Lawrence "A Propos" 52-53, emphasis in original)

D.H. Lawrence's work shocked, it titillated, it made him the constant target of scorn, derision, and controversy. However, he still wrote unflinchingly of the power of human sensuality, of sexuality, as a means to reclaim a failing humanity. He cared not about the average height or strength of an Englishman. Lawrence asked only that we, all humanity, feel.

REFERENCES

Boulton, James T., ed. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. I (1901-13)*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.

---, ed. *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Burack, Charles M. "Mortifying the Reader: The Assault on Verbal and Visual Consciousness in D. H. Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover." *Studies in the Novel* 29.4 (Winter 1997): 491-511. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. CSUSB Pfau Lib., San Bernardino, CA. 21 Apr. 2008 <http://libproxy.lib.csusb.edu >.

---. "Revitalizing the Reader: Literary Technique and the Language of Sacred Experience in D. H. Lawrence's Lady Chatterley's Lover." *Style* 32.1 (Spring 1998). MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. CSUSB Pfau Lib., San Bernardino, CA. 21 Apr. 2008 <http://libproxy.lib.csusb.edu >.

Campbell, Neil A., Jane B. Reece, and Eric J. Simon. *Essential Biology*. 3rd ed. San Francisco: Pearson Benjamin Cummings, 2007.

Childs, Donald J. *Modernism and Eugenics: Woolf, Eliot, Yeats and the Culture of Degeneration*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Diamond, Suzanne. "Farming Out the Labor: Eugenic Ideology in D.H. Lawrence's Plots." *Textual Eugenics in the Fictions of Thomas Hardy and D.H. Lawrence*. Diss. Rutgers Univ., 1996.

Ellis, David. *D.H. Lawrence: Dying Game 1922-1930*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Ferrall, Charles. *Modernist Writing and Reactionary Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Galton, Sir Francis. *Inquiries Into Human Faculty and Its Development*. New York: Macmillan, 1883.

Gordon, David J. "Sex and Language in D. H. Lawrence." *Twentieth Century Literature: A Scholarly and Critical Journal* 27.4 (Winter 1981): 362-375. MLA International Bibliography. EBSCO. CSUSB Pfau Lib., San Bernardino, CA. 21 Apr. 2008 <http://libproxy.lib.csusb.edu >.

Gramich, Katie. "Stripping Off the 'Civilized Body': Lawrence's *nostalgie de la boue* in *Lady Chatterley's Lover*." *Writing the Body in D.H. Lawrence: Essays on Language, Representation, and Sexuality*. Ed. Paul Poplawski. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001. 149-161.

Granofsky, Ronald. *D.H. Lawrence and Survival: Darwinism in the Fiction of the Transitional Period*. Quebec City: McGill-Queen's UP, 2003.

Huxley, Julian. "Eugenics and Society." *Sexology Uncensored: The Documents of Sexual Science*. Ed. Lucy Bland and Laura Doan. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1998. 194-198.

Lawrence, D.H. *A Propos of Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: Haskell House, 1973.

---. *Lady Chatterley's Lover*. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1995.

---. *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence: Vol. I (1901-13)*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1979.

---. *The Selected Letters of D.H. Lawrence*. Ed. James T. Boulton. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

MacKensie, Donald. "Eugenics in Britain." *Social Studies of Science* 6.3/4 (Sept. 1976): 499-532. JSTOR. CSUSB Pfau Lib., San Bernardino, CA. 21 Apr. 2008 <http://libproxy.lib.csusb.edu >.

Meyers, Jeffrey. D.H. Lawrence: A Biography. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990.

Olsen, Kåre. "Under the Care of Lebensborn: Norwegian War Children and Their Mothers." *Children of World War II: The Hidden Enemy Legacy*. Ed. Kjersti Ericsson and Eva Simonsen. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2005. 15-34.

Richardson, Angelique. *Love and Eugenics in the Late Nineteenth Century: Rational Reproduction and the New Woman*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003.

Scheckner, Peter. *Class, Politics, and the Individual: A Study of the Major Works of D.H. Lawrence*. Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses, 1985.

Sheehan, Paul. *Modernism, Narrative, and Humanism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.

Squier, Susan M. *Babies in Bottles: Twentieth Century Visions of Reproductive Technology*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1994.

Wallace, Jeff. *D.H. Lawrence, Science and the Posthuman*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.

Wallace, Jo-Ann. *English Literature in Transition, 1880-1920* 51.2 (2008): 123-137. MUSE. CSUSB Pfau Lib., San Bernardino, CA. 29 Apr. 2008 <http://muse.jhu.edu.libproxy.lib.csusb.edu >.