

Primitivism, Empire, and a Personal Ideology: D.H. Lawrence's Travel Writings on the Indians of the American Southwest

Eva Yi Chen

We travel, perhaps, with a secret and absurd hope of setting foot on the Hesperides, of running our little boat up a creek and landing in the Garden of Eden. This hope is always defeated. There is no Garden of Eden, and the Hesperides never were. Yet, in our very search for them, we touch the coasts of illusion, and come into contact with other worlds. (*Phoenix*, p.343)

D.H. Lawrence's name does not usually come to mind when the subject concerned is travel writing. Those who do have a more than vague idea that he produced not one, but four, travel books have been wont, until quite recently, to pay only a passing thought to the idea. Naturally, his novels and stories have grabbed almost all the attention, and though interest has in recent years been raised over his achievements in other genres like poetry, drama and even painting, these genres all share an established claim to serious art. Such a claim, however, has traditionally been alien to travel writing whose very genre, to many, has been too elusive to determine, and whose motivation is viewed as often mercenary in nature, commissioned and written hastily to finance the very trip commemorated in the article. In recent years, only three critics have dealt at length with Lawrence's travel writings (Clark, Tracey and Hostettler), paling in comparison with the avalanche of scholarship on his fiction and other writings. However, the recent headway that post-colonialist discourse makes in the analysis of travel writings could provide new impetus and a new possibility to the subject. For

a modernist writer portraying exotic places and 'primitives' in a former colony, Lawrence's travel writings should prove an intellectually rewarding subject.¹

Lawrence left England in 1919 on a self-imposed and globe-trotting exile. Until his death in France in 1930, he returned to England only briefly in 1925; then, disillusioned and impatient, he had to leave again, never to return. Over the years his wanderings took him first to South Europe particularly rugged Italian Sicily, then to Australia, Southeastern Asia, North America and finally back to Italy and Southern France. Perhaps more than anything else, travel provides a form of attempted escape, or therapy to Lawrence: 'I feel sometimes, I shall go mad, because there is nowhere to go, no "new world"'.² Travel is for him an incitement to writing. He believes that 'a new place brings out a new thing in a man,' and his lifelong credo is 'when in doubt, move'.³ Travel really holds a special importance for Lawrence.

Altogether, Lawrence wrote four travel books. *Mornings in Mexico* (1927), on North American Indians, describes a literary and not a chronological journey. It records the experience of the Lawrences as they lived in Taos, New Mexico from 1922 to 1925, constantly travelling around the American Southwest and visiting Mexico three times. The first half of the book, describing the visits to Mexico, does not usually attract critical attention because of a seeming 'absence of interest' and 'coherence'.⁴ It is the latter half about the Southwestern American Indians, together with nine other essays posthumously collected in *Phoenix* (1936) and *Phoenix II* (1968), that really record a deeply-felt experience, and is thus the focus of this article.

Several issues are of concern here. The first is whether Lawrence's travel writing on the American Southwest transcends the colonialist discourse. Lawrence's interest in the American Indians seems to typify the modernist preoccupation with the 'primitive', the racially Other, which, to a

cultural critic like Torgovnick, especially reaches a climax as well as a crisis during the early years of the century. Yet Lawrence seems to reverse the conventional value system of colonialist travel writing. He believes that the Indians' celebration of 'life in the flesh' and of the individual's place in the 'living, incarnate cosmos'⁵ could offer a spiritual remedy for the European culture obsessed with reason/intellect. Furthermore, Lawrence seems to observe the Pueblo Indians with real sympathy and credible perception. Lawrence obviously departs from the usual white travel writing informed by a superficial curiosity over the native culture's exotic side, and a self-congratulatory confirmation of the superiority of white European civilisation.

This article seeks to point out that such an approach actually follows the Romantic tradition of idealising primitive people, a tradition that is more accurately termed cultural primitivism.⁶ However drastically different it may sound from the dismissive malediction characterising most white travel writings, these two types of writings revolve around 'one and the same axis' (Derrida) of ethnocentrism, and are two sides of the same coin affirming colonialist expansion.

Another key issue is the complicated feelings of alienation and identity that Lawrence harbours toward the white Americans, descendants of European colonisers of a former rebel colony that beat the motherland England in a war of independence. Like many other English travellers, Lawrence shares British condescension toward the white Americans, and finds himself an outsider, at a distance from both the 'red Indians' and the American whites. The white American attitude to the Indians is especially objectionable to him. My discussion of this issue here concerns not race, but nation.

Primitivism and the Colonial Experience

Primitivism, as a category used in criticism, is divided into 'chronological' and 'cultural' types.⁷ The former is histori-

ographic, and refers to the theory that the earliest stages in human history are better or wholly good because men live closer to the primal reality of nature and are thus free, perfect and uncorrupted. The latter, cultural primitivism, concerns the discontent of the civilised men with civilisation itself, and is an imagined belief that a more rustic, simple and natural life is more desirable. These two forms may be combined, but primitivism as reflected in literature often takes the form of the second type.

It is obvious from this definition that cultural primitivism seems always to be advanced with a political agenda in mind, a device for criticism, satire and imaginary escape from civilisation, when the writer, in the words of Spurr,⁸ takes an 'ethical stand' almost always in regard to his/her own culture. Out of disillusionment and criticism of their own culture, writers turn to the primitive as a contrasting ideal of purity and superiority, which would serve as a restorative model for their own society.

Montaigne is perhaps the first European to extol, in 1580, the Edenic purity and simplicity of primitive people. The idea of the 'primitive' is also closely related to the concept of the Noble Savage, advocated by Rousseau in 1750 in order to assist his own political platform of equality and liberty for eighteenth century French people. In the nineteenth century primitivism transforms itself into the Romantic movement that champions unspoiled nature, simple and rustic life over the yokes of materialism and machines. In other words, it becomes a state of mind, a Wordsworthian call to return to man's 'natural' and vitalistic self away from the mechanical and scientific influence. At the turn of the century, a disintegrating *fin-de-siecle* cultural scene and a looming sense of impending cultural transition accelerates an interest in the 'primitive', in order to search for the ills of modern society.⁹

Clearly this attention to the 'primitive' takes place always with the home culture in mind. The point of departure and destination is always the European civilization, and the timing is usually a moment of cultural crisis, when the need to invoke the 'primitive' is strong as a gesture of reinforcement. Thus cultural primitivism is basically constructed in nature, a set of representations 'whose reality is purely Western'.¹⁰ Despite their claims of the superiority of the 'primitive', primitivists do not quite seem to understand or care to see the other as a real and living presence. Lawrence could not have put it more directly: 'The American Indian in his behavior as an American citizen doesn't really concern me. What concerns me is what he is – or what he *seems to me* to be, in his ancient, ancient race-self and religious self'¹¹ (*italics added*). It is the savage as an abstract ideal, as a hypothetically constructed Other, that serves the purpose of contrasting with the European culture, his qualities appropriated to compensate for what is lost or missing in the home environment.

While the usual type of colonial writings denigrate the natives for crudity and backwardness, thus justifying their conquest in the name of progress and moral education, primitivism and the idealisation of the savage romanticise their constructed superior qualities. Despite this gaping difference in approach, primitivism's inherent links to colonialist discourse cannot be overlooked. Though probably as ancient as humankind itself because, since ancient times, racial differences have always been connected with cultural discontent,¹² primitivism is intrinsically relativistic, it has to involve another culture or race, and is dependent on the possibility of contact with other cultures. It is thus no coincidence that the prime time for European primitivism is closely linked to European imperialist expansion. Montaigne's extolling of the savage, for instance, is possible only after the French exploration of the Brazilian coast, resulting in the discovery of the

cannibals.¹³ Lovejoy also traces the first climax of cultural primitivism to the eighteenth century, to Rousseau's Noble Savage, precisely because the 'French voyages of exploration among the Polynesian peoples in the 1700s and 1770s' have made materials available for 'primitivistic uses'.¹⁴ English cultural primitivism flourished in the Romantic era of the nineteenth century, when England, having seriously checked arch-rival France in the Napoleonic Wars, built the most successful maritime Empire around the world.¹⁵ At the turn of the century, the modernist preoccupation with the 'primitive', driven by internal cultural impulses, is also made possible by the accelerated influx of primitive images provided by the maturing of academic anthropology and ethnography, themselves often attacked for conniving with imperialist expansion, with their exploratory fieldwork, demand for access to primitive sites, and confirmation of pre-existing constructions of the us-them divide.¹⁶ For modernist preoccupation with the 'primitive', see, for instance, Conrad, as discussed in Marianna Torgovnick,¹⁷ T.S. Eliot, as in Ronald Bush, 'The Presence of the Past: Ethnographic Thinking',¹⁸ and D.H. Lawrence, as in Michael Bell.¹⁹

Thus Western cultural primitivism is greatly facilitated by colonial expansion. It becomes in a way a sort of compensation to placate the possible sense of violence and brutality that expansion entails. Idealising the 'primitive' helps gloss over the brutal nature of the conquest that allows the European public to 'discover' the racially other. Thus in essence, it represents, together with malediction of the natives, but two opposing strains in the same colonialist discourse, affirming the colonialist expansion, appropriating the Other to reform the self, and transforming the Other into 'yet one more term of Western culture's dialogue with itself'.²⁰ By deflecting politics and idealising the natives, it serves to compensate for the great inequality between the Other and the colonizer, and enables a Western audience to see the poor

Other as living out the realisation of some of the West's most ancient ideals.

Lawrence and the Primitive Mind

Lawrence's belief in the uncontaminated good of earlier men is expressed explicitly in his expository book *Fantasia of the Unconscious* (1923). He believes that before the Flood, all civilisation lived in one great Utopia, in dynamic contact with each other, and sharing an awareness of the body/life. Then after the flood, only isolated forms of that type of life have survived in the so-called 'primitive' lands, which, to Lawrence, holds possibilities of an alternative social direction for the modern West, obsessed as it now is with the worship of reason and intellect and suppressing the body and intuition.²¹ The modern Indians in the American Southwest have kept such a mode of being, as he writes that 'there is a living tradition going back far beyond the birth of Christ, beyond the pyramids, beyond Moses. A vast old religion which once swayed the earth lingers in unbroken practice in New Mexico.'²²

For a better explication of Lawrence's ideas, a look at the early Greek thought about the nature of language is helpful. Language in its beginning is thought to be inherently symbolic, and only slowly does it evolve the capacity for abstraction, the clear distinction of particular from universal. Heraclitus, for instance, a thinker before Plato and Aristotle, represents the point of transition between the world of myth, and that of abstraction, the logos. Fire, to Heraclitus, conceived mythically like Zeus' thunderbolt, is at the same time the logos, the principle or reason by which the universe is ordered.²³ Lawrence, in *Apocalypse*, shows amply his awareness of the symbolic nature of 'pre-Greek' primitive or mythic thought, and quotes 'Herakleitos' as one of those early thinkers without the 'faintest inkling of the lengths to which mental activity' can be carried. Instead of being a

Southwest as a Garden of Eden, a place of pantheism and of personal fulfilment.

This idea of pantheism is picked up by Lawrence in 'Pan in America', one of his nine American essays not collected in *Mornings In Mexico*. Lawrence writes that Pan, the Great Pagan God, long dead since 'man learned to abstract', is now reborn in America, on the Rocky Mountains, because the Indians still 'keep the mystery', and live in harmony with the universe, not apart from it nor trying to conquer it.³⁸ Lawrence's fascination with the Indian as the Noble Savage can at least be traced earlier to 1917. After the government suppression of *The Rainbow* on grounds of obscenity, and the persecution of the Lawrences because of his wife's German origin and of Lawrence's own anti-war views, Lawrence abandoned all hope of achieving success in England and saw America as his potential hope. While unable to leave for America because his successive requests for passports, posted during the War, were rejected, he began to write a series of essays on American literature. These first got published in *The English Review* in 1918-19, and later appeared in book form, revised and enlarged as *Studies in American Literature* (1922).

In an earlier version of this book, published by Armin Arnold as *The Symbolic Meaning*, Lawrence wrote that America is a 'new earth', releasing 'new electricity' and 'savage air' to new arriviers whose 'blood' is 'suffused and burnt'.³⁹ To Lawrence, the freshness of this American spirit appeals greatly, especially now that it is contrasted with the stuffy conservatism of England. He urges America not to kneel in humble admiration of the dead 'monument' of European tradition, nor to turn to the 'seething White America' itself, but to the 'black Demon of savage America', the 'great aboriginal' spirit of Red America of the Red Indians. This is a spirit that was all but murdered by the arrival of white Europeans like 'Columbus', but must now be appropriated

again, because the white consciousness needs this confrontation with the Indian to result in a regeneration.⁴⁰ Lawrence examines the history of European settlement in the New World, and values white Americans on the strength of their appropriation of the Indian spirit. Benjamin Franklin, who dismissed Indians as drunken savages, fails to get outside the white consciousness to confront the Indian on any real level. Crèvecoeur fares better, in his glimpse and idealisation of the 'passional dark mystery' of the Noble Savage. But only in Cooper is there the 'true marriage with the aboriginal psyche', the sympathy between Natty and Chingachgook being the 'bridge over the chasm'.⁴¹

The Southwestern essays in *Mornings In Mexico* record in detail Lawrence's search for this 'aboriginal psyche'. Since it is the 'psyche', the mythical spirit that Lawrence is interested in, not the real Indian in his everyday life, naturally the Indian rituals become the ideal place to look for this mythic transcendence. Thus the Southwestern essays focus on the Indian dancing and drumming, which Lawrence attended as a member of the white audience.

During most of his three year stay in the New World, Lawrence believes that he really finds the living proof of what he has always advocated. 'I think New Mexico was the greatest experience from the outside world that I have ever had. It certainly changed me for ever, liberated me from the present era of civilisation, the great era of material and mechanical development.' In words full of awe and respect, he writes '[t]he moment I saw the brilliant, proud morning shine high up over the deserts of Santa Fe, something stood still in my soul, and I started to attend.'⁴² Lawrence seems to suggest that though always in the role of a critic, he himself is not free from the debilitating restrictions imposed by mechanical civilisation. The encounter with the Southwest amounts to a religious conversion, for 'a new part of the soul woke up suddenly, and the old world gave way to a new'.⁴³

Since his experience is intensely religious, his travel writings concentrate on the religion, the spirit he sees in the Indian dance rituals.

Lawrence finds proof that the Indians do possess superior qualities, and that the Indian mode of living is better than the white one. In 'Dance of the Sprouting Corn', Lawrence describes the Indians as losing themselves in the rhythm of the dance, 'mindless, without effort, under the hot sun, unceasing, yet never perspiring nor breathing heavily', suggesting a perfect harmony with nature, at ease with both the climate and place. The drums go 'thud-thud', the men and women hop and sway, long black hair streaming in the wind, faces 'noble' and 'strange'. The dance is not a bacchanal explosion nor the birth of tragedy, but a quiet ritual, part of the seasonal cycle. The corn dance is not a prayer, exploiting nature, but a means of becoming part of germination itself, a transcendence into the cosmos. A second trait that Lawrence admires is that the Indians still live their life as a sacrament. Eating retains a ritual significance. At the end of the corn dance, the Pueblo 'partakes in the springing of the corn, in the rising and budding and earing of the corn. And when he eats his bread at last, he recovers all he once set forth, and partakes again of the energies he called to the corn, from out of the wide universe.' Lawrence advocates that the white should reawaken his consciousness to the vital universe around him, so that he also can recognise eating as the ritualistic communion it once was.⁴⁴

The oneness with nature and the cosmos that Lawrence saw in the corn dance is further elaborated in 'The Hopi Snake Dance', written later. This essay exists in two versions, the first, included in *Letters*,⁴⁵ full of anger against the smelly Indians and the white visitors who are there because 'it's lots of fun'. The second is longer, and expunges any aggressive antagonism. Unlike the corn dance essay, which is primarily descriptive and focuses on the visual, this es-

say attempts to go further with much philosophical theorising. The tone is more dry and detached, almost scholarly, as he removes the shining and sensational surface details of the rattlesnake dance to get at the spirit. He finds that in the Indian's animistic perception of the cosmos, '[t]here is no Creator: there is strictly no God at all: because all is alive', and everything is part of continual creation. In terms that clearly reflect an influence of contemporary primitivist views of the 'mythic' phase of primitive culture (see Cassier earlier), Lawrence writes that Indians do not differentiate between Matter and Spirit, and sees no need for man/spirit to conquer nature/matter. Power exists in the way he overcomes his own fears (not the universe, as the whites do), so that he may let the snake 'go back into the earth with his own messages of tenderness, of request, and of power', thus reserving 'the flow of mystery'. The Indian way is thus more successful in achieving a pure relatedness to the vital cosmos.

'Indians and Entertainment' is typographically the first of the three Southwestern essays, but because of its summary of the basic ideas developed and illustrated in the other two essays, is here discussed last. This essay concludes that the basic difference between European and Indian minds is that the Indians are not plagued by self-consciousness. Whereas even the earliest form of Greek drama is meant as a presentation to the gods or at least to one god, there is 'no division between actor and audience. It is all one' with the Indian dance. The Europeans thus are divided into subject and object, whereas the Indians are in unison with nature. Lawrence does not employ the personal 'I', but the generalizing 'we', implying that he is not the personal traveller here, but speaking up for the white race as such. Because no attempt to exclude himself is made, this essay thus offers a great deal of soul-searching and self-analysis.

It is important to note that Lawrence's gaze at the Indian rituals is also accompanied now and then in these three essays by a reversal of gaze on the white audience, as Lawrence analyses the motivation and nature of the white gaze, himself included. 'The Hopi Snake Dance' differentiates three motives of the white audience. Lawrence mocks at the voyeuristic sensationalism of the average white Americans who come 'avidly' for the thrill of man handling rattlesnakes, just as to 'circus-performance', because 'it's lots of fun'. To them the Indian is just 'a sort of public pet'. This attack is furthered in other essays written during this time, when Lawrence complains that white America's commercial exploitation of Indian exoticism has reduced Indian culture to just 'a farce', 'a comic opera played with solemn intensity',⁴⁶ Parodying travel brochure language advertising New Mexico as a place to 'put on a sombrero and knot a red kerchief round your neck, and go out in the great free spaces!', Lawrence criticises the white travellers for 'superficially' thinking they've 'been everywhere and done everything', yet failing to transcend such an artificial construct wrapped in the 'absolutely hygienic and shiny mucus-paper' of 'our trite civilisation'.⁴⁷ Such American trivialisation of Indian culture seems just a part of the white approach worldwide. Barkan and Bush point out that starting from the 1851 London Crystal Palace Exhibition, but becoming increasingly popular in the early years of the twentieth century, 'primitives' are 'imported' to European lands where they are presented as almost zoological exhibits for curious white people to see (a practice still carried on in today's theme parks). Generations of Europeans are thus exposed to this kind of 'vulgar' primitivism which reduces primitive cultures to just 'a road show', or a 'public entertainment'.⁴⁸ Lawrence is probably not unfamiliar with this, and in his criticism of such white practice in America (where people need not go abroad or import 'prim-

itives' because of the proximity of Indians), is also implying a disapproval of such 'vulgar' primitivism in general.

Lawrence is equally dissatisfied with the second way of watching, the 'cultural' one, when people look for the artistic beauty of the Indian dance, just 'as one looks on while Anna Pavlova dances with the Russian Ballet'. This approach, though more highbrow, is also wrong-headed to Lawrence, because the Indian dance goes much deeper. It seems that here Lawrence is referring to the white community of bohemian artists and painters in Taos, who formed the Taos Society of Artists and were very active during Lawrence's stay there. These artists attempted to convey Indian culture and landscape in their works, but to Lawrence they are just 'artistic small beer',⁴⁹ for they are satisfied with just superficial appropriation of the Indian culture to refresh their own. A crucial point here is that Lawrence seems to recognise, self-reflectively, the superficiality of primitivist appropriation of native qualities, something that the very tradition he himself belongs to is and has been engaged in doing.

This idea is further elaborated in 'Indians and Entertainment'. Here Lawrence writes perceptively that when the white audience is riveted by the Indian dance, the observers are actually engaged in an unconscious act of self-reflection, of interpreting the self, so that this dialogic encounter with the other says more about the self than about anything of the other. The audience's fascination is derived from the fact that 'we see ourselves: we survey ourselves', and 'we want to become spectators at our own show'. The audience is 'creating' the characters 'according to [their] own fancy'. 'The Indian bunk is not the Indian's invention. It is ours.' In this moment of enlightenment, has Lawrence himself come to question his own earlier subscription to the Indian-as-noble-savage myth, and to see its constructed nature?

The affirmation is very probable, for he even comes to recognise the two typical white reactions toward the primitives – one of 'dislike' and one of 'sentimentality'. What is more unusual, is that he seems to get very near the post-colonial platform which posits that however different the two reactions seem to be, they both stem from the same source. 'Both reactions are due to the same feeling in the white man': the realisation of the Indians' basic difference and otherness, that they are 'not in line with us' nor 'coming our way', he writes. Thus the white people either 'detest' them for 'having an utterly different way from our own great way', or 'you can perform the mental trick, and fool yourself and others into believing that the [Indian] is nearer to the true ideal gods than we are'. This last sentence is significant, because it obviously suggests that at this stage, Lawrence himself seems to be aware of his own membership in this community of primitivists idolising Indians as noble savages, among whom he includes those 'anthropologists and myth-transcribers and all'. He recognises the falseness in trying to 'render the Indian in our own terms', and urges for the 'acceptance' of the basic 'difference' in white and Indian, and for that matter, white and 'Hindoos or Polynesians or Bantu' consciousness. This perception is nothing short of multi-cultural in nature, as Lawrence does not pass value judgments on the difference, but simply asks for acceptance.

In order to differentiate himself from these two white constructions, he advocates the third way of approaching the Indians, the 'religious' way, when 'you must have some spark of understanding of the sort of religion implied' by the Indian rituals. The religious way goes much deeper, and Lawrence insists that a fundamental psychic and artistic reordering must take place before a true engagement with the primitive can come into being. And this is not to be done by simply appropriating the qualities of the other because there are basic differences between the two: 'To pretend to express one

stream in terms of another, so as to identify the two, is false and sentimental.' Lawrence also seems aware of the traps that a cultural essentialism entails, the kind of belief that there is an intrinsic human nature or behavioural core that transcends race and culture.⁵⁰ Lawrence was reading E.M. Forster's *A Passage To India* for the first time whilst in New Mexico, and though applauding Forster's 'repudiation of our white bunk', complained that 'Forster doesn't "understand" his Hindu', for 'he doesn't go down to the root'. Forster's kind of essentialist humanism does not go anywhere, for '[t]o pretend that all is one stream is to cause chaos and nullity'. The way that Lawrence points out seems to be right along the path of cultural relativism. 'The only thing you can do is to have a little Ghost inside you which sees both ways, or even many ways.'

By the end of 'The Hopi Snake Dance', Lawrence compares the average white view of the Indians as 'wild', which denotes a value judgment of inferiority, with his understanding that they are just different: 'we say they look wild. But they have the remoteness of their religion, their animistic vision, in their eyes, they can't see as we see.' Then he experiences a moment of the so-called reverse or reciprocal othering,⁵¹ as he reverses the self-other divide, and imagines how the Indians/other gaze at the white/self, thus admitting the self as outsider and other to the Indians. 'And they cannot accept us. They stare at us as the coyotes stare at us: the gulf of mutual negation between us.' Typical white travellers either denigrate or romantically appropriate the other, but Lawrence, at least in these moments, accepts the difference without attempting to pass judgment. A capacity for self-examination is also demonstrated, as he now and then admits – '[t]his, of course, may just be the limitation of my European fancy', which points to his constant self-exploration and revision of his own travelling subjectivity.

However, after all has been demonstrated about Lawrence's moments of cultural relativism, this does not in any sense mean that the Indians Lawrence presents in his travel writings are free from constructions, nor that these moments are always typical of Lawrence. Even in the same essays, Lawrence shows the very cultural prejudices he wishes to be rid of. Despite his avowed mission to understand the Indian religion, he never learns any one of the Indian languages nor claims access to first-hand knowledge of the Indian beliefs. Apart from what he can see and thinks what he has seen with his own eyes from the Indian dance, the only source is secondary, from 'men who lived many years among the Indians say', or 'so I am told' – in short, white men, on whom he relies to write about the geographic area of the Hopi, and the architectural details of the Pueblos. His essays do not record his ever talking properly to any Indian, except for, as Templeton points out, a few brief conversations in English via a translator.⁵² Tony Luhan, the westernised Indian chief and husband of Lawrence's American sponsor, is of course constantly available, but to Lawrence, by marrying a white woman and driving a motor about, he is already losing the Indian spirit and corrupted by the white influence.⁵³ He remains a member of the silent white spectators, and at the one time of close physical encounter between an Indian tribesman and him, when during an Indian preaching in 'the unknown Apache speech', a young Indian 'shoved his face under my hat, in the night, and stared with his glittering eyes close to mine', his immediate reaction is one of fear – 'He'd have killed me then and there, had he dared.'⁵⁴ This really begs the question – how can a white foreigner, armed not with any understanding of any Indian language or native history except white constructions of Indian qualities and not caring to make any real contact with the Indians, find anything in these rituals that are not constructions by themselves, telling more about the author himself than

about the real Indians? The old Indian man preaches on in the 'unknown' Apache speech, 'apparently' about the traditions and legends of the tribe, but Lawrence persuades himself that the man's voice 'reechoes away back to before the Flood'. Because there is no Indian voice to talk back, there is no interaction, and the observation made by the centric 'I' fails to transcend the typical colonial discourse which, in Said's words, reflects the one-way linear power relationship between the observer/self and the observed/other.

Billy Tracey posits in his *D.H. Lawrence and the Literature of Travel* that Lawrence has indeed succeeded in understanding the Indian religion. Tracey argues that though what Lawrence describes about the Indians 'fits in so neatly' with his own pre-existing philosophy expounded in his *Fantasia of the Unconscious*, these are 'not Lawrentian Indians' created by Lawrence to prove his own theory, because the noted ethnologist, Ruth Benedict has proved that 'no one has conveyed the quality of Pueblo dancing more precisely than D.H. Lawrence'; and Frank Waters' *Book of the Hopi*, based on extensive interviews with Hopi elders, also confirms Lawrence's analysis. This essay does not seek to question the verdicts of the two sources (both whites) quoted by Tracey, but while acknowledging that Lawrence does go much deeper into the Indian spirit than most other white travellers, he still demonstrates much of the European prejudice toward the racially other. He shows, for instance, the typical tendency to generalise about the natives – really a failure to perceive difference – which often leads to invention. After watching the Hopi snake dance, Lawrence asserts sweepingly that '[t]his is the religion of all aboriginal America. Peruvian, Aztec, Athabaskan: perhaps the aboriginal religion of all the world'. Not only does he simplify the religions of Indians, who according to Templeton consist of a socially and linguistically diverse multiplicity of some two thousand cultures, but all other primitive beliefs, or non-

civilised (as opposed to European) ones, are reduced to just one single homogeneous belief. This demonstrates a lack of sincerity in trying to understand the real native people, not just types or even one type; all this generalising, obviously for convenience's sake, serves to show that the interest in the 'primitives' is not because of their own merit, but mainly for the purpose of contrast with the self, marking the boundary between self and non-self, and thus ultimately a means toward self-knowledge. Because the focus is finally on the self, naturally there is little need to differentiate between the innate differences within the other, as long as the other's general difference from the self is established.

Lawrence also shows other typical modernist prejudices against the 'primitive'. The Indians have no individuality to Lawrence, because they are all tribal, and everything is the product of the crowd. The Modernist imagination often associates crowds with savage barbarism, and with 'unconscious elements of human nature that had survived evolution'.⁵⁵ Crowds are identified with uncivilised 'primitives', and the latter are thus given an anonymity that denies any individuation. Some modernists, notably F.T. Marinetti of the Italian Futurists, who finds inspiration in the machine and the densely populated urban life, welcomes the immense energy of crowds, and what they call the 'modernity' of the 'primitives'. Others who oppose the machine age insist on the trait of individuality as marking modern civilised people from the crowd mentality of 'primitives'. T.S. Eliot's nightmarish presentation of modern crowds walking round in aimless and repetitive circles, reflects a modernist fear for the loss of individual self, and a lapse into the 'primitive' stage. As different as these two modernist approaches appear to be, they both underline the modernist image of 'primitives' as an anonymous crowd, a homogeneous mass. Lawrence also subscribes to this opinion. What he sees confirms his early belief that the Indians have a 'mythic' mode of

being that does not differentiate between subject and object and thus does not entail a sense of individual consciousness (such ethnological beliefs are pointed out earlier in this essay to be constructions). Interestingly, though this is what he has come for originally: after the encounter, he decides that he does not want to 'go back to these tribal fathers' and refuses to 'cluster at the drum any more' – 'I never want to deny them or break with them. But there is no going back. My way is my own, old red father.' The modernist urge for individuality in him finally takes the upper hand, and the demarcation between the individualistic self and the 'primitive' mass is reconfirmed.

Perhaps the strongest evidence of the constructed nature of his Indians is in his drastically different views of the real Indians in everyday life and the spiritualised Indians in religious dancing. Lawrence professes a total lack of interest in the 'Indians as an American citizen', precisely because the real Indians alienate his European 'civilised' self, and cannot serve the purpose of contrastive ideal. He finds himself disgusted with the 'unbearable sulphur-human smell' of the Indians, because they 'never wash flesh or rag'. The individual Indian who is not with his tribe, who 'sells you baskets' or 'slinks around Taos plaza' may be 'an utter waster and an indescribably low dog', 'only fit for rapid absorption into white civilization, which must make the best of him'.⁵⁶ Obviously to Lawrence, who is idealistically against the polluting influence of the West on the Indians, the ideals do not withstand the force of his residual European prejudices which find such an inferiority in the real Indians.

Lawrence seems to demonstrate here what Todorov has termed the 'schizophrenia' between idealisation of imagined Indians and denigration of the real ones he encounters.⁵⁷ Lawrence himself seems aware of this discrepancy in the perceived reality and imagination, and makes some attempt to disguise it. In 1927 he decides to include only the three long

essays in *Mornings In Mexico*, which focus on the positive aspects of the Indian life, and exclude the other nine essays that contain many of his reservations and even ridicule of the Indians.⁵⁸ This subjective selection of what conforms to his pre-existing ideas, rather than to reality, suggests that what he really wants to see is his self reconfirmed, not the real other. He wants to close his eyes to the discrepancy, so that he could go on constructing the Indians in a way that fits with his own pre-existing theories. Perhaps the two different versions of the Hopi snake dance, written within days of each other, could be the best proof. The first one, 'Just Back from the Snake Dance' – a letter written to friend Willard Johnson – sees no religious meaning in the Indian dance and ridicules it as a cheap circus trick, 'like a children's game', with the Indians all too willing to forget their religion if they could get hold of white money. '[P]ainted savages jabbering, and snakes and all that. As for the hopping Indian with his queer muttering gibberish and his dangling snake, he says he's dancing to make his corn grow. What price irrigation, Jimmy? What price a spell of work on the railway, Jimmy? Get all the corn-meal you want with two dollars a day, anyhow'.

Lawrence knows that Mabel, who has sponsored his American trip so that he could write about the Indians with perception and appreciation, is disgusted with this first version. 'I know you didn't like that article of mine. I'll try and do another one.'⁵⁹ So a few days later a drastically different version of the same snake dance, the one collected in *Mornings In Mexico*, is produced. The ridicule is still there, but now mostly reserved for the white American audience, whereas the Indians are now appreciated for their religious transcendence. It is difficult to explain this sudden change, accomplished within days, in terms of a fundamental conversion in Lawrence's outlook. It is more probable that after the shock and disillusion of first encounter have settled

down, Lawrence begins to recreate the Indian dance, partly to placate Mabel, but mostly to fit with his own ideals. As David Cavitch says, it is only when Lawrence writes about the Indians as 'symbols' that he feels able to praise instead of ridicule them.⁶⁰ The first version would mean another disappointment in Lawrence's search for the ideal mode of living, and this would be too hard for him to take after having just come such a long way.

Yet just as Lawrence's honesty and perception have allowed him to see for some moments the constructed nature of the white primitivist 'sentimentality' toward Indians, the same honesty means that such efforts at self-delusion as shown here cannot last long, either. He eventually sails away from New Mexico, disappointed that the Indians, like the Italian peasants before them, fail to live up to his expectations. Given the length of his stay in New Mexico, and the nature of mostly favourable response that stay produces, the American Southwest may indeed prove closer to his ideal than probably any other place. Yet as long as he never forgets his pre-existing ideals, he cannot really reach to the Indians and attain the status of multiple 'awareness'. Perhaps it is unreasonable to fault Lawrence for failing to transcend completely the limitations of his time, but it is equally unconvincing to say that he has none of these habits of construction in his encounter with the racially other.

White America versus England: rebel colony versus the motherland

Throughout Lawrence's travel writings on the American Southwest, apart from his dominant concern with the Indians, there is always a second current – the condescension toward white Americans. Admittedly Cooper and a few others like Melville are the exceptions. Melville's *Typee* (1846), a romantic idealisation of the South Pacific islanders as living in an earthly Paradise, in stark contrast to the utilitar-

ian white civilisation, is instrumental in attracting Lawrence to the South Pacific on his way from Ceylon, Australia to West America.⁶¹ It seems that the chief reason that makes Cooper and Melville commendable to Lawrence is their perceived ability to appreciate and get across to the natives. But the average white Americans fail, because they are only interested in seeking voyeuristic sensationalism. Although in 'America, Listen to Your Own', he has urged the New World not to turn to the dead European tradition but to its own Red Indians, now that he finds America has failed to treat its Indian heritage with due sympathy; even old Europe, by comparison, looks in better shape. The 'crude' side of America, its 'tense' grip on everything, the 'frenzied, keyed-up care', so 'characteristic' of the machine civilisation, becomes the more obtrusive 'worst' in America, without the redeeming Indian quality.⁶²

Such complaints against the white Americans actually go back to a venerable English tradition, when English travellers typically complained of the 'pushy' and 'aggressive' side of the rebel colony, its lack of culture and refinement compared unfavourably with the motherland. Charles Dickens, despite his lucrative book tours of America, returned with negative descriptions in *American Notes* (1842) and *Martin Chuzzlewit* (1843-44). H.G. Wells called New York a 'soulless gigantic force', and Arnold Bennett thought of America as 'enormous agglomerations in whose inmost dark recesses innumerable elevators are constantly ascending and descending'. Interestingly such a view is often subscribed to or internalised by Americans themselves. Henry James, for instance, though investing positive values in his characters' American innocence and energy, implicitly agrees to the divide or difference by setting it in contrast with European sophistication and decadence.

Running side by side with the idealisation of Indians as the Noble Savage, this English disapproval of white Amer-

ica emphasises the American obsession with the machine, by comparison with which old Europe at least is felt to be more humanistic. Small wonder that Lawrence, a lifelong attacker of the dehumanising machine, should be unfavourably influenced in his preconceptions of white America. Admittedly when Lawrence was writing in the 1920s, the memory of America as a rebel colony was already faint, for he wrote that after coming to West America from Ceylon and Australia, he found himself 'a lone lorn Englishman, tumbled out of the known world of the British Empire'. Obviously to him, America was a place outside the Empire, of which Ceylon and Australia were still member colonies. Yet the English prejudice shows anyway. Before setting sail for America, finally able to leave after the War, he wrote to his American sponsor Mabel Luhan that he wished not to meet 'the awful "cultured" Americans with their limited self-righteous ideals and their mechanical love-motion and their bullying, detestable negative creed of liberty and democracy'.⁶³ This negative view is confirmed after the real encounter, when he felt New Orleans to be 'a dead, steamy sort of place, a bit like Martin Chuzzlewit'; and 'America is more or less as I expected: shove or be shoved'.

Lawrence has always been an outsider even in his own society, a de-classed artist coming from the lower classes and moving among the highest, yet comfortable with neither. But in America, his self-consciously felt role of an 'outsider' at 'both ends of the game' between the white Americans and the Red Indians,⁶⁴ is not carved along class lines, but along those of nation and race. He cannot identify himself with the average white Americans of the same race but of a different nation, not just because of their outlook on the Indians, but also because of their 'American', non-European ways. His travelling subjectivity is that of a sensitive white artist, yet distinctly English. Lawrence has left England in despair and disgust with the English culture, but the travels in foreign

places reinforce rather than weaken his sense of being English. He consistently refers to himself as an Englishman, and two of the nine Southwestern essays are self-consciously entitled 'Indians and an Englishman', and 'Certain Americans and An Englishman'. Travel intensifies his sense of being British, at the same time as it removes him physically from England and allows him to see it more clearly. Finally returning to Europe in 1925, the realisation comes through to him that 'one may be sick of certain aspects of European civilisation', but 'I am [still] a European'.⁶⁵

If one is to look deeply into Lawrence's (or other Englishmen's) disapproval of white America, linking it with the simultaneous admiration of the native Indians, one should not simply arrive at the conclusion that his position is a questioning of the white colonisation of the New World and a rallying for the cause of the Indians, a position opposite to that of the typical colonialist discourse. The truth may turn out to be more complicated. At the source of the disapproval of the white settlers may be the same colonialist sense of the inferiority of the colony land, and by association its inhabitants. England, ethnocentrically the motherland, is always the refined centre of the British Empire, of which America is a former rebel colony. Eurocentric views hold that in remote parts of the world (namely non-European parts), often seen as wilderness as opposed to (European) civilisation, forces of nature reign unchecked, and the wild (i.e. unEuropean) growth of plants and animals is matched by that of *humans*. America is always seen in images of the wilderness, and the native Indians are emphasised for their 'barbarity'. In a similar vein, the white settlers, because of their association with the colony land as wilderness, are also affected, and lose the suaveness and refinement of the motherland.

Thus the complaint against white Americans may not have amounted to a fundamental critique of the colonisation enterprise *per se*. It may derive from a feeling that these

are simply not good enough, and that the author himself, or other like-minded Europeans, may be the better masters. Though Lawrence complains consistently about Indians being corrupted by this exposure to white civilisation, he has never once questioned his own right of access, as a white male, to the Indians. He wishes to get as far away as possible from the white Americans, and into deeper Indian territory, so that he could 'gaze' at the Indians. Lawrence is fascinated by the 'space' New Mexico offers, particularly the desert where few whites linger: 'I do like having the big, unbroken spaces around me. There is something savage unbreakable in the spirit of place out here.' He enjoys the view from his mountain-top ranch where he stands 'in the fierce, proud silence of the Rockies to look over the desert to the blue mountains away in Arizona with the sage-brush desert sweeping grey-blue'.⁶⁶ It's probable that his disgust with white Americans and the desire for space/desert derives from the feeling that, once free of white Americans, he is able to write whatever he wants on the blank space. The desert is, in Tompkins' view, 'a tabula rasa on which man can write, as if for the first time, the story he wants to live; the apparent emptiness makes the land desirable not only as a space to be filled but also as a stage on which to perform and as a territory to master'.⁶⁷

Lawrence longs to go to this open space/desert free from the white Americans, probably because he wants to start colonisation anew, in his own style. Long before he came to America, when still stuck in England, and in the middle of his first American essays full of anticipation of the merging between white and Indian consciousness, he was already busy planning to establish his utopia or Rananim, a small 'colony of 20' like-minded white intellectuals, in a suitable spot in America.⁶⁸ This nearly materialised in the shape of an American friend's orange groves in Florida, but finally came to nothing when the friend lacked enthusiasm.⁶⁹

However Lawrence never actually gives up this dream for a Utopia, whether envisioned in the east slopes of the Andes or the South Sea islands, all places of wilderness and blanks, so that Lawrence could in a way start his own colony. The natives are part of the landscape, their qualities to be appropriated for white use. Though Lawrence laments the fact that the Indian spirit is dying, due to the pollution of the white civilisation, he himself accepts without question the inevitability of the Indian extinction. He seeks the Indian pre-Christian mythic mode of being, but once this is passed on to him like, as to Cooper's Natty Bumppo, it seems that the Indians should naturally give way to better whites like himself. Thus rather than a fundamental questioning of the colonisation enterprise, Lawrence's discourse still revolves around the same 'axis' of ethnocentricity.

Conclusion

Lawrence's travel writings are sometimes criticised as too subjective, or not descriptive or objective enough. This complaint has perhaps to do with the claim to truthful representation and objective description that travel writing traditionally enjoys. But recent critics have pointed out that this genre is as much discursive as the novel and uses many of the novelistic conventions.⁷⁰ To Gerard Genette, travel writings are not simply mimesis, reporting or describing what is to be seen, but a diegesis – implied or direct discourse.⁷¹ Lawrence obviously belongs to this type of travel writer with a focus on writing not on travel: thus landscape gives way to mind-scape as the focus.

As a discourse, Lawrence's travel writing centres on the construction of the self through the dialogic encounter with the other. The shock from the external world of the other leads to retrospection and pondering over what constitutes the self and other, and through that to exploration and knowledge of the self. The subjectivity of Lawrence is never

a fixed thing, but always changing and capricious. He often contradicts himself with vacillating attitudes to different places. His travels are both flight and search – a search for new places to fulfil his ideals, and to escape from his own social problems. He has come to the American Southwest to find the Indian ‘mythic’ mode of being, but like other places he has been to, the pattern from initial enthrallment to eventual disillusion again applies here: ‘It [the Southwest] is all inwardly a hard stone and nothingness.’⁷²

But such encounters with the other also help Lawrence to see that the problems lie as much in the other (that the Indians fail to live up to his constructions) as in himself (that he himself bears the spiritual baggage of his European culture). Despite his condemnation of civilised man’s preoccupation with the mind, and admiration of what he sees as the primitive’s lack of self-consciousness, he himself embodies many of the attitudes from which he seeks to flee. This self-knowledge is brought home to him when he finally leaves America in September 1925: ‘One may be sick of certain aspects of European civilization. But they’re in ourselves, rather than in Europe...I’ve been a fool myself, saying: Europe is finished for me. It wasn’t Europe at all, it was myself, keeping a strangle-hold on myself. And that strangle-hold I carried over to America.’ Despite his unusual sensitivity and sincere wish to get to the Indians, he remains too much a product of his own culture and its limiting prejudices really to achieve a breakthrough.

Katherine Anne Porter’s words may be harsh, but they pinpoint the fundamental problem of Lawrence’s impasse. In her 1926 review of Lawrence’s Mexican novel *The Plumed Serpent*, she argues that Lawrence was too much a man of modern society to cross over to the Indians and that he could not see that the problems of modern people were also his own. Lawrence, she wrote, ‘is too involved in preconceptions

and simple human prejudice’, and he ‘remains a stranger gazing at a mystery he cannot share’.⁷³

Porter does injustice to Lawrence in that he does see, in his many moments of self-reflection, his own implication in the problem. But the search still continues, probably because Lawrence could not bring himself to face the ultimate reality. As long as the quest itself continues, the hope still lingers. In Lawrence’s experience with the American Southwest, he has been more successful with the place than with people – Indians. When he writes about the religious feeling coming over him in New Mexico, it is the landscape, the ‘brilliant, proud morning over the deserts’, that he focuses on. The Indian people disappoint or even repel him on real contact, and only receive praise when reinvented as symbols. Thus Lawrence’s travel writing on the American Southwest is still confined within the colonial discourse, which typically makes a point of eulogising the landscape but ignoring or denigrating the natives, thus justifying conquest or mastery over land as the Manifest Destiny sanctioned by God. The eulogy of the Indians is but another strain of the same discourse, because it is simply another form of construction by the West, and a different kind of exploitation and appropriation of native qualities to regenerate the self, and maintain the hegemony of the West.

Lawrence’s quest is for the spirit and idea constructed by his subjectivity. That is why all his efforts to find the primitive, body-orientated spirit either in the rustic Italians or even in the English working-class⁷⁴ culminate in the ‘earthy’ working-class gamekeeper of Lawrence’s *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, as a twentieth century example of the literary use of the term ‘primitivism’. Working-class men are always seen by Lawrence as embodying primitive qualities. His 1926 essay ‘Nottingham and the Mining Countryside’ speaks of the ‘physical awareness’ of his father and fellow miners working below ground in the dark mines.⁷⁵ However, the real work-

ing class people disappoint Lawrence in their lack of articulation and culture, and he has to make the gamekeeper in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* 'almost like a gentleman' while also retaining primitive qualities of body-awareness. He is unable to appreciate the working-class as living beings; that is why the real people always fail to live up to his constructions. It is small wonder that finally Lawrence's quest finds a home in the ancient and now vanished culture of the Etruscans in Italy. Only in them does Lawrence find a union of culture and landscape, both a civilisation and a terrain to praise,⁷⁶ precisely because this dead culture, now existing only in ancient paintings and other artefacts, offers memory not substantiated by immediate reality. Because it allows for infinite room for imagination and invention, it is forever unable to disappoint him.

After all that has been said, it must also be admitted that Lawrence does indeed succeed in getting closer than most other white travellers to the native spirit. His moments of self-knowledge and self-analysis raise him, if only for a while, above the limits of colonial discourse and to the level of multi-culturalism not usual for a white man of his time. To blame an early twentieth century modernist for failing to employ a politically neutral (as seen today), or 'right' vocabulary to describe the ethnographic encounter with non-Western societies could be ultimately self-defeating, for no such account can be free from its time and the culture. As James Clifford asks in a critique of Said's 1978 *Orientalism*, 'how can one ultimately escape procedures of dichotomising, restructuring, and textualising in the making of interpretive statements about foreign cultures and traditions?'⁷⁷ Said himself writes in reference to the Western understanding of Islam, 'the real issue is whether indeed there can be a true representation of anything, or whether any and all representations, because they are representations, are embedded first in the language and then in the culture, insti-

tutions, and political ambience of the representer'.⁷⁸ This observation is equally true of all transcultural representation. Human beings are perhaps incapable of knowing the racially other without using the language they use to know and define themselves. This realisation, applied in this essay, may help with a better appreciation of what Lawrence has achieved in his travel writings.

Endnotes

1. The term 'primitive' is given in quotation marks in order to show that this, along with other words like 'West' and 'savage', are all constructed.
2. George Zytaruk and James T. Boulton, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, vol II, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, 330.
3. Jeffrey Meyers, *D.H. Lawrence: A Biography*, New York: Macmillan, 1990, 83.
4. Billy Tracey, *D.H. Lawrence and the Literature of Travel*, 65.
5. D.H. Lawrence, *Apocalypse and the Writings on Revelation*, ed. Mara Kalnins, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980, 49.
6. For a detailed discussion of cultural primitivism, see James Baird, *Ishmael* (1956); for the issue of primitivism and modernism, see Marianna Torgovnick, *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990, and Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush, eds., *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*, 1995.
7. Lovejoy and Boas, *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, 1935; reprint, New York: Octagon Books, 1980, 3.
8. David Spurr, *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing and Imperial Administration*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1993, 125.
9. Elizabeth Barkan and Ronald Bush, *Prehistories of the Future: The Primitivist Project and the Culture of Modernism*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995, 2; 7.
10. *Ibid.*, 2.
11. D.H. Lawrence, 'New Mexico', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *Phoenix: The Posthumous Papers of D.H. Lawrence*, 1936; reprint London: Heinemann, 1961, 144.
12. Kristin Herzog, *Women, Ethics, and Exotics: Images of Power in Mid-Nineteenth-Century American Fiction*, Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1983, xiv.

13. David Spurr, *The Rhetoric of Empire: Colonial Discourse in Journalism, Travel Writing and Imperial Administration*, Durham: Duke University Press, 1993, 128.
14. Lovejoy and Boas, *op.cit.*, 'Foreword' XL.
15. Roman De La Campa, E. Ann Kaplan and Michael Sprinker (eds.), *Late Imperial Culture*, London: Verso, 1995, 4.
16. Marianna Torgovnick, *op.cit.*, 4-11; Elizabeth Barkan and Ronald Bush, *op.cit.*, 5, 17.
17. *Gone Primitive: Savage Intellectuals, Modern Lives*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990, pp.141-155.
18. *Ibid.*, pp.23-41.
19. Michael Bell, *D.H. Lawrence: Language and Being*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, pp.133-207.
20. David Spurr, *op.cit.*, 128.
21. *Ibid.*, 7.
22. D.H. Lawrence, 'New Mexico', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 145.
23. Robert E. Montgomery, *The Visionary D.H. Lawrence: Beyond Philosophy and Art*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, 143-147.
24. Michael Bell, *op.cit.*, 3.
25. Elizabeth Barkan and Ronald Bush, *op.cit.*, 5-6.
26. Eliot, T.S., *The Waste Land*, London: Faber and Faber, 1963, 80.
27. George Zytaruk and James T. Boulton, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, vol II, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981, 470-71.
28. Michael Bell, *op.cit.*, 3.
29. D.H. Lawrence, *Apocalypse and the Writings on Revelation*, *op.cit.*, 130.
30. Torgovnick, *op.cit.*, 22; Michael Bell, *op.cit.*, 231, n.10.
31. Warren Roberts, James T. Boulton and Elizabeth Mansfield, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, vol. IV, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 111.
32. William M. Hamlin, *The Image of America in Montaigne, Spenser, and Shakespeare: Renaissance Ethnography and Literary Reflection*, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1995, 4.
33. *Ibid.*, 7.
34. Robert F. Sayre, *Thoreau and the American Indians*, Princeton University Press, 1977, 11.
35. Paul A.W. Wallace, 'Cooper's Indians', in Mary E. Cunningham, ed., *James Fenimore Cooper: A Re-Appraisal*, New York: New York State Historical Association, 1954, 55-56.
36. 'Indians and an Englishman' in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 94.
37. Lawrence L. McDonald, *Eden Revisited: Reflections of the American West in Victorian Fiction*, Diss. Arizona State University, 1976, 5.

38. D.H. Lawrence, 'Pan In America', 22-32, Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 24, 29.
39. Armin Arnold, ed., *The Symbolic Meaning: The Uncollected Versions of Studies in Classic American Literature*, New York: Viking, 1963, 29-30.
40. D.H. Lawrence, 'America, Listen to Your Own', Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 90.
41. Armin Arnold, *op.cit.*, 54, 61, 96.
42. D.H. Lawrence, 'New Mexico', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 142.
43. *Ibid.*
44. Billy Tracey, *op.cit.*, 69.
45. Aldous Huxley, *The Letters*, London: Heinemann, 1932, 615-18.
46. 'Indians and an Englishman', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 93.
47. 'New Mexico', *ibid.*, 141-142.
48. Elizabeth Barkan and Ronald Bush, *op.cit.*, 9.
49. Warren Roberts, James T. Boulton and Elizabeth Mansfield, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, vol. IV, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 366.
50. Michel Foucault is one of the major twentieth century challengers of cultural essentialism, particularly its concept of a fundamentally unified humanity, when each human being is blessed with primary reality and a transhistorical core of being. See Foucault, *The Order of Things*, New York: Vintage, 1970, p.387.
51. Edward Said, *Orientalism*, New York: Vintage Books, 1979, 40.
52. Wayne Templeton, ' "Indians and an Englishman": Lawrence in the American Southwest', *The D.H. Lawrence Review*, vol. 25, nos. 1-3, Austin: University of Texas, 14-35, 20.
53. Harry T. Moore, *The Priest of Love: A Life of D.H. Lawrence*, London: Heinemann, 1974, 355. Wayne Templeton mentions that when Lawrence once asked Tony about his own (Taos) religion, Tony replied: 'Go to the Zunis if you want to know about religion'. See Templeton, 'Lawrence in the American Southwest', p.30.
54. D.H. Lawrence, 'New Mexico', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 146.
55. Elizabeth Barkan and Ronald Bush, *op.cit.*, 14.
56. D.H. Lawrence, 'New Mexico', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 144.
57. Tzvetan Todorov, *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other*, trans. Richard Howard, New York: Harper and Row, 1984, 42-3.
58. Billy Tracey, *op.cit.*, 89.
59. Keith Sagar, ed., *D. H. Lawrence and New Mexico*, New Mexico University Press, 1988, 64.

60. David Cavitch, *D.H. Lawrence and the New World*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1969, 136.
61. However, Lawrence was disillusioned with what he saw in Tahiti, because the place, with 'natives in European clothes, and fat', looked different from the 'earthly paradises' that Melville described. See *Letters IV*, p.289. Melville's *Typee* also turned out later to be a hoax, the idealised native way of life since revealed as largely a product of the author's own archetypal imagination. See David Spurr, *The Rhetoric of Empire*, p.138.
62. 'Europe V. America', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 118.
63. Warren Roberts, James T. Boulton and Elizabeth Mansfield, eds., *The Letters of D.H. Lawrence*, vol. IV, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987, 226.
64. 'Taos', in Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 101.
65. 'Europe V. America', Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 117.
66. D.H. Lawrence, 'New Mexico', Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, 143.
67. Jane Tompkins, *West of Everything: The Inner Life of Westerns*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1992, 74.
68. For Lawrence's ideas on Rananim, see *The Quest for Rananim: D.H. Lawrence's Letters to S.S. Koteliensky 1914-1930*, ed. George J. Zytaruk, McGill-Queen's, 1970.
69. Jeffrey Meyers, *D.H. Lawrence: A Biography*, New York: Macmillan, 1990, 172-3.
70. See, for instance, Dennis Porter, *Haunted Journeys: Desire and Transgression in European Travel Writing*, 1991.
71. Gerard Genette, *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*, trans. Jane E. Lewin, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1980, 166-167.
72. Aldous Huxley, *The Letters*, London: Heinemann, 1932, 562.
73. Katherine Anne Porter, *The Collected Essays and Occasional Writings of Katherine Anne Porter*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin/Seymour Lawrence, 1970, 422.
74. Karl Beckson and Arthur Ganz, in their *Literary Terms: A Dictionary*, 1989.
75. Edward D. McDonald, ed., *op.cit.*, p.136.
76. Billy Tracey, *op.cit.*, 3.
77. James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature and Art*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988, 261.
78. Edward Said, *op.cit.*, 272.

D.H. Lawrence and Nakedness

Jonathan Long

'Naked' (or 'nakedness') was one of Lawrence's favourite words and was frequently used by him. In the 'blind tasting' of a passage including other favourite words such as 'blood', 'dark', 'sun', 'quiver', 'flame' or 'moon' the additional word 'naked' will suggest the passage was almost certainly written by him. Even though particularly towards the end of his life nakedness was a preoccupation for Lawrence, as we shall see in his poetry, prose and painting, surprisingly little seems to have been written on the subject.

It is important first of all to establish what we mean by 'naked'. It should be contrasted with the word 'nude', which generally speaking is not synonymous and has a more limited meaning, principally referring to a person without clothing. The distinction is important, as Lawrence uses 'nude' much less frequently, mainly as a noun with reference to his pictures. It is rarely used to describe inanimate objects or animals but mainly for humans, although in the poem 'Bare Fig Trees'¹ Lawrence uses the words 'bare', 'nude' and 'naked' to emphasise the fact that the tree has no concealment.

The word 'naked' then is for Lawrence a more versatile term. It means unclothed, stripped to the skin and nude in the context of people but also, in the context of things it means exposed, without concealment, uncovered, devoid of something, open to attack or weak. One of the hallmarks of Lawrence's writing is that the word is so frequently applied to inanimate objects. Both 'naked' and 'nude' can be used figuratively but Lawrence rarely if ever uses the word 'naked' in its pejorative sense, such as in the phrase 'naked ambition'.