“Only connect…”:
The Dilemma of Liberal Humanism
in E. M. Forster’s *Howards End*

2006년

서강대학교 대학원

영어영문학과

임희숙

“Only connect…”:
The Dilemma of Liberal Humanism in E. M. Forster’s *Howards End*

지도교수 김 영 주

이 논문을 문학석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2007년 7월 9일

서강대학교 대학원

영어영문학과

임희숙

논 문 인 준 서

임희숙의 영문학석사 학위논문을 인준함

2007년 7월

주심 박 상 기 ○

부심 김 영 주 ○

부심 장 영 희 ○

“Only connect…”:
The Dilemma of Liberal Humanism
in E. M. Forster’s *Howards End*

by

Heesook Lim

A Thesis presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
(English Literature)

at

SOGANG UNIVERSIT
Seoul, Korea

2007

Acknowledgement

While working on my thesis, I really enjoyed walking and also working around Loyola Hill at Sogang University. It gave great strength and joy to my academic life.

On completing the thesis, I would first like to express my deepest gratitude to my advisor, Prof. Kim Young-joo, for her patience with my poor writing and for her experienced guidance for improving it with constructive comments and relevant references. I also owe many thanks to Prof. Park Sang-kee and Prof. Chang Young-hee, who read and reviewed my thesis, and helped produce what I have now as a completed work. I thank my colleagues, too, for their assistance and friendship during those memorable days at Sogang.

I thank my parents for waiting so long for the completion of my graduate studies that I started rather late in my life. I thus dedicate this thesis with love and gratitude to my family, especially to my husband. I would not have completed my studies without their understanding, support and love.

Table of Contents

국 문 초 록

본 논문은 E. M. 포스터의 대표적인 작품으로 그를 주목 받는 작가의 대열에 들게 한『하워즈 엔드』의 마지막 장면을 그 동안 논의되어왔던 이상적인 화합의 실현인가 아니면 유토피아적 환상인가의 관점과는 다르게, 작가가 제1차 세계대전이 일어나기 전 영국의 위기를 어떻게 진단하고 처방하였는지를 분석하고 마지막 장면에서 작위적으로 조화를 이루도록 한 뜻은 무엇인지를 파악하는 데 그 의미를 지닌다. 20세기와 함께 번영의 시대였던 빅토리아 조가 끝나고 에드워드 조가 시작된 영국은 산업화에 의해 물질주의가 팽배했던 시기로 중상류층은 번영하였으나 하류층은 극도의 빈곤에 시달렸다. 이러한 상황은 자연스럽게 영국사회의 계층간 단절로 이어졌고 포스터는 이렇듯 파편화 되어가는 영국의 사회를 안타까워하며 그 간극을 메워보려는 시도를 한다. 여주인공 마가렛의 염원인 “결합하라. 다만 결합하라” 라는 단호한 요구는 책 머리에 제사로 쓰이기도 했는데 인간관계에 의한 화합만이 영국사회의 벌어진 틈을 메워 갈등을 해소하고 조화로운 미래를 가능케 한다는 작가의 믿음을 나타낸다.

포스터가 영국의 심각한 사회적인 병폐에 대한 해결책으로 제시하는 “전통적인 도덕적 가치”와 “새로운 경제 대책”을 병행, 조화시키는 일은 작품 안에서 중류층 세 가문 사이의 갈등으로 나타나는데 윌콕스 家로 대변되는 기업가, 자본가와 슐레겔 家로 대변되는 세련된 문화적 감수성을 지닌 자유주의자들이 서로 이해하고 소통 함으로써 중류사회에 속하지만 금

세 나락에 떨어질 위기에 놓인 바스트 家가 표상하는 억눌린 자, 가난한 자들을 위해 무언가 실질적인 일을 할 때 비로소 실현 가능하다. 포스터는 이를 위해 사회 각 계층의 사람들이 인격적으로 소통하고 결합해야 한다는 굳건한 믿음을 지니고 있으면서도 근본적으로 현실에서 인간사이의 이상적인 화해와 조화는 불가능하다는 부정적 인식을 가지고 있기 때문에 작품 속에서 윌콕스 가의 외적인 삶은 슐레겔 가의 내면의 삶과 조화를 이루지 못한다. 또한 슐레겔 가의 이상주의는 바스트 가와의 계급의 벽을 넘지 못하고 좌절한다. 따라서 그의 제사는 “결합할 수 있다면, 우리가 단지 결합할 수만 있다면…”이라는 회한 어린 탄식으로 읽혀지기도 한다.

그러나 『하워즈 엔드』는 좌절된 관계 맺기에서 이야기를 끝내지 않고 아담하고 유서 깊은 하워즈 엔드를 영국의 내적 분열이 치유되고 모든 계급이 화합하여 조화를 이루는 유토피아로 제시하며 끝맺는다. 하지만 이러한 결말은 예기치 않은 사건에 기대거나 현대사회에서 다시 전원주의로 회귀하게 하는 등 작위적인 플롯이 이루어낸 작가의 의도적인 화해의 장면일 뿐 에드워드 조 영국의 문제점에 대한 이상적인 해결책이라고 볼 수 없다. 본 논문은 포스터가 마지막에 무리하게 계층 간의 인위적인 조화를 이루어 제시하는 이유를 상속 받은 재산을 자본으로 지닌 불로 소득의 연금생활자인 그가 가지는 죄의식에서 비롯된 억압 받는 자들에 대한 위로이자 속죄의식임을 연구하여 밝히고자 한다.

Abstract

This thesis examines the last scene of *Howards End* not as an attempt at the ideal reconciliation among classes that presents a solution to the problem of Edwardian England but as a dedication to console the very poor of his ages and to remit himself from the burden of guilt which is due to his parasitic status as a rentier. Forster emphasizes that individuals should connect with each other across the restrictions of society to tackle the crisis of the early twentieth century England, in particular, class differentiation.

Forster describes the real aspects of separate England through the life of industrialists, the Wilcoxes, who are predominantly practical, predatory, expansionist, and liberal-humanists, the Schlegels, who can break up the great Wilcoxes' barrier to allow them to live a harmonious life and have community spirit for the future of England. Temperance, tolerance, and sexual equality are the Schlegels' doctrines. On the other hand, Forster presents another type of modern English society through Leonard Bast, a young clerk of lower middle class, who stands at the extreme verge of gentility and exceedingly adores culture. Leonard and his wife are described as victims of the industrialists, the Wilcoxes.

Forster intends to enforce the Schlegel values into the Wilcox spirit to connect them with the Basts and thus to project compelling vision of what

Britain’s destiny might and should be. Forster sacrifices Margaret to the industrialists Wilcoxes and Helen to the Leonard Bast, a poor clerk, who suffers from continuous threats of poverty. This relation takes a form of union, the genealogy of connections, Margaret-Henry, Helen-Leonard, and the solid unity of Margaret and Helen to combine 'the new economy' and 'the old morality.' Forster dispatches the liberalist Margaret armed with ‘the old morality’ to enlighten the industrialists Wilcoxes who are prepared for economic power, while details Helen to establish ‘the new economy’ taking care of the lower Bast who is endowed with ‘the old morality.’ Since Forster has a desperate view of the possibility of connection, connection between classes in particular, the Schlegels’ sacrifice is proved to be frustrated and we can read the epigraph "Only connect...," as his regret for the impossibility of its realization.

Though Forster realizes an ideal connection among the classes is unattainable in reality, he, as a writer, cannot help urging his contemporaries to make a compromise with each other and do something practical for the oppressed. He wants to dedicate an accomplished connection as wishful thinking to the very poor of his ages. He directly shows the aspect of unity using his authorial power; yet Leonard Bast’s death shows the fact that the connection is intentional, and in consequence, depends on an accident. Forster also dedicated the pastoral life as an alternative to the failed connection.

Returning to the agrarian life is somewhat anachronistic and unrealistic

in a capitalistic era. The ending of *Howards End* is an intentional, artificial happy picture as Forster's atonement for being a liberalist who depends on financial stability and capitalism emphasizing profit-making and the acquisition of property.

Introduction

E. M. Forster wrote five novels in his life time. His first novel, *Where Angels Fear to Tread* (1905), traced the themes of cultural collision and the sterility of the English middle class that he would develop in *A Room with a View* (1908) and *A Passage to India* (1924). In *The Longest Journey* (1907), Forster explored the idea of rural England and the problems of urban society he would later develop in *Howards End* (1910).

Through these novels, Forster emphasized that individuals should connect “the prose” with “the passion” within themselves and often featured characters attempting to connect with each other across the restrictions of society of the time (187). He tried to find a solution to the problems of “the poor that troubled the conscience of the nations” and “the emergence of the great cities" (John Colmer 87). Yet except his lightest and most optimistic novel, *A Room with a View* (1908), the novels take a desperate view of the possibility of connection, connection between classes in particular.

As Lionel Trilling asserts, *Howards End* is “undoubtedly Forster's masterpiece” (85). This novel establishes Forster as an important writer in English literature. *Howards End* is more than a match for his previous novels for “it develops to their full the themes and attitudes of the early books and throws back upon them a new and enhancing light” (Trilling 85). The writing

materials which are limited to more personal or a family issues in his preceding novels, now turn to the social and political conditions in Edwardian England, in particular, class consciousness and the struggles they face. The works by degree mature and become complex, and above all his view of society in general grows more complicated in *Howards End*. He emphasizes human connection more clearly to destroy the barriers of prejudice in a gradually depersonalized society.

Forster is much influenced by the philosopher G. E. Moore, during his King's College, Cambridge days. He advocates the enjoyment of beauty and the cultivation of personal relations as most important and a spiritual antidote to the rootless, mechanistic ethos of his age. 'Personal relations' is a concept at the center of the individualism explained in Forster's essay, "What I Believe." It implies a regard for love, tolerance, liberty, and the full development of what Forster calls the inner life, the life of passion and poetry in *Howards End*.

His father was an architect who died before he was two years old. He was raised by two women, his widowed mother and his paternal great-aunt Marianne Thornton, who left him a legacy of eight thousand pounds when he was eight. This was a significant sum at that time, when we remember the fact that Margaret Schlegel in *Howards End* inherited six hundred pounds a year. As his mother had the same amount of money, he was blessed to live in a comfortable home and to have received a Public School and Cambridge education. Forster had a lifelong preoccupation with "the morality of living on

unearned income" (Delany 67).

Forster's sense of morality and awareness of social injustice allow him to embrace the social issues in depth, in particular, the discord amongst and between classes. Forster diagnoses the important determinant of the disconnection between classes in England as an economic problem resulting from the industrializing process and endeavors to reconcile the classes. He is concerned with not only mutual emotional understanding but also "subtle connection between a class's mentality and how it gets its means of life" (Delany 67). Particularly in *Howards End* he is tenacious in attempting to connect the empire-builders (Wilcoxes) to the liberalists (Schlegels) to turn the Wilcox way of thinking into being concerned with the oppressed (Basts) and offering them a means of living.

Yet, it is hard to say *Howards End* is a successful attempt at the ideal reconciliation among classes that presents a solution to the problem of Edwardian England. In his age the rentier class produced "generous supporters of the arts, philanthropy, and such good causes as the abolition of slavery" (Delany 67). Forster seems to suffer from his "parasitic status" and want to remit himself by writing as other liberalists do such good activities (Delany 68). In *Howards End*, Forster shows the aspects of connection among the classes. At first, he presents an ideal connection but it ends frustrated because of his desperate view of the integral reconciliation. *Howards End* evinces Forster's

sense of frustration in possibility of true connections in reality. Judged from the fact that he still searches for the possible reconciliation in his next work, *A Passage to India,* published fourteen years later, in 1924, he takes a very serious view of personal relationship and hopes to realize inter-class or human harmony.

We can see his ardent wish to connect ambivalent elements in modern society as an answer to the crisis in England. He worried about a society which had been "depersonalized by materialism, philistinism" (Smith 106). Yet his suggestions of ideal relationships are, in consequence, frustrated and his conscience, as a writer, cannot help urging his contemporaries to make compromise with each other and 'do something practical for the oppressed.' Thus he dedicates the ending of *Howards End* to console the working class.

Forster clearly designates himself "an individualist" and a “liberal” who belongs to "the fag-end of Victorian liberalism" in his essay, "The Challenge of Our Time" (Forster “Challenge” 55, 56). Then, what is the meaning of "being a liberal" from Forster's view? In *The Condition of England*, C. F. G Masterman has referred to "tolerance, kindliness, sympathy, civilization" as fundamental humanist values (266). A political scientist Andrew Heywood enumerates the most important liberal values and beliefs: "the individual, freedom, justice, reason, and toleration" (27). Peter Widdowson puts these values of liberal humanism together: “tolerance, liberty, reason, generosity, freedom of speech, democracy, non-aggression, reform of public abuses, respect for civil rights,

personal relations, civilized discourse, the regard for art, the intellect and tradition" (39). Forster clearly supports these values as his thoughts in *Howards End* and his essays.

Liberalism is defined in diverse expressions; yet the common characteristic of liberalism is an ideology, philosophical view, and political tradition whose primary value is liberty. Classical liberalism (also called *laissez-faire* liberalism) is a term used to describe the philosophy developed by early liberals during the transition from feudalism to capitalism, and reached their high point during the early industrialization of the nineteenth century[1]. Classical liberalism adjusts the focuse on "individual freedom, reason, justice and tolerance" (Heywood 48). It is a modern idea which emphasizes each individual's unconditioned preciousness, freedom, and equality.

From the late 19th century onwards, the belief that industrial capitalism has brought general prosperity and liberty for all has no more force. Industrialization brought about a massive expansion of wealth for some, but it spread slums, poverty, ignorance and disease in England. Liberals like T. H.

[1] A phrase expressive of the principle that government should not interfere with the action of individuals, esp. in industrial affairs and in trade. (From O.E.D.) Classical liberals see the state to be at best a necessary evil. It embodies in the famous phrase from Thomas Paine "that government is best which governs least." It is a blend of political liberalism and economic liberalism.

Green, L. T. Hobhouse, and J. A. Hobbson revise their attitude towards the stage for they found the minimal state of classical theory to be incapable of rectifying the injustices and inequalities of civil society. Green sensed that "the unrestrained pursuit of profit, as advocated by classical liberalism, had given rise to new forms of poverty and injustice" (Heywood 57). As a result, modern liberals progressively take their departure from the principles of *laissez-faire* and converted to the interventionist but not abandoning basic liberal thinking[2]. Andrew Heywood argues, "Modern liberalism has drawn closer to socialism, but it has not placed society before the individual" (58). *Howards End* is written in this period and has six references to socialism. Margaret's thought is akin to socialism in saying that "consciousness is determined by its economic base" (Delany 69).

In his essay 'The Challenge of Our Time,' Forster emphasizes personal relationships and the private life. Forster has an understanding that his contemporary world is in a terrible mess, and knows starvation and frustration in other countries go beyond conception and are close at hand in his country. He

[2] New liberalism (also social liberalism, radical liberalism or sometimes modern liberalism) has been a label used by progressive liberal parties in order to differentiate themselves from classical liberal parties. They believe that lack of economic opportunity, education, health-care, and so on can be considered to be threats to their conception of liberty. (From Wikipedia)

sees a big black cloud appears on the horizon and looks back upon Victorian age as admirable one:

> It practiced benevolence and philanthropy was humane and intellectually curious, upheld speech, had little colour-prejudice, believed that individuals are and should be different, and entertained a sincere faith in the progress of society. The world was to become better and better, chiefly through the spread of parliamentary institutions. The education I received those far-off and fantastic days made me soft and I am very glad it did (Forster "Challenge" 56).

The age is described as it has lived up to the liberalists' values accurately and he recognizes all has changed in the twentieth century.

As a liberal, Forster's successful answer to 'The Challenge of Our Time' is that "we must manage to combine the new economy and the old morality" (Forster "Challenge" 59). This phrase is an arrangement of the main themes of *Howards End*. '[O]ld morality' signifies "life of tradition," that is, classical liberal values or idealism that he suggests as a prescription for England's critical moment: the real conflict between materialism and culture and the severe war between poor and rich (Forster "Challenge" 59). 'New economy' means modern liberalism, namely, the twentieth century liberalism. He perceives "the doctrine of *laissez-faire* will not work in the material world" but "seems to work in the

world of the spirit" thus he seems to have welfarism of modern liberalism in his mind (Forster “Challenge” 57).

Forster tries to seek the answer to make up the gaps among classes in English society and expects the traditional liberal values and ideals may get over the uncertainties and disease of modern English society. In fact, Margaret attempts to connect to the Wilcoxes with traditional liberal values, such as, proportion, sympathy, and tolerance, and Helen to the Basts with ideals. Forster is anxious about the collapse of the old morals from the perspective of a liberalist and “has prophetic sense of the crisis especially at the level of threatened values” (Widdowson 21). He has an eager desire to express his belief that the English should adhere to their tradition and keep the intrinsic liberal values. The rapid change in England makes people disregard culture and Forster thinks this situation as "very much the swan song of liberal-humanist civilization" (Widdowson 44).

At that time in England, enormous cultural, economic and social changes were going on by industrialization. Owing to social differentiation, it was a time of riots, bloody strikes, and violent clashes between capital and labor. Poverty and industrial troubles reached an unbearable pitch, and revolution seemed drawing near. There appeared a trend of novels criticizing the conditions created by the industrial development called Condition-of-England novels, in other words, industrial novels or social problem novels. They often

depict the living condition of society, in particular, of working class.

Critics often consider Forster's *Howards End* as one of the Condition-of- England novels. Anne Wright regards it as "an Edwardian 'Condition of England novel'" which "aims at defining and rejecting what is wrong with England, and establishing a positive configuration" (23). Colmer defines it as a novel which has concerned about "the problem of the poor that troubled the conscience of the nations" and "the emergence of the great cities" (87). Forster, also, must have recognized the significance of the miserable life of the very poor as "only to be approached by the statistician or the poet" (58). Foster describes the change of England in his essay. He writes, "The dividends have shrunk to decent proportions and have in some cases disappeared"; "The poor have kicked" and "the backward races are kicking" (Forster "Challenge" 56)

Forster also recognizes the real war between materialism and culture all over Europe. He apprehends England "as radically split" "between Wilcox capitalist imperialism and Schlegel humanitarianism" and unreservedly describes the real aspects of separate England through the life of industrialists, the Wilcoxes, and liberal-humanists, the Schlegels. The Wilcoxes is a typically English family, "predominantly practical, predatory, expansionist." Their political and economic philosophy is *laissez faire*. They represent "aspects of Victorian and Edwardian materialism at its most successful" (Widdowson 68).

Forster needs someone to break up the great Wilcoxes' barrier to allow

them to live a harmonious life and have community spirit for the future of England. Forster thinks the Schlegels' liberal values can achieve the task and relieve his country. They are described as such characters who believe in 'people', 'friends', and 'personal relations'. “Temperance, tolerance, and sexual equality” are their doctrines and they desire that public life should mirror whatever is good in the life within (41).

On the other hand, Forster presents another type of modern English society through Leonard Bast, a young clerk of lower middle class, who stands "at the extreme verge of gentility" and exceedingly adores culture (58). Leonard and his wife are described as victims of the industrialists, the Wilcoxes. Forster intends to enforce the Schlegel values into the Wilcox spirit to connect them with the Basts “to project compelling vision of what Britain’s destiny might and should be” (Delany 69).

Yet *Howards End* lacks a few characteristics common in the Condition-of-England novels. Though Forster does not overlook the fact that the rich exploit the poor and the backward races abroad, there is no description of a miserable life of the very poor in *Howards End*. It is “incredible dismissal of one of the most vital parts of the community” at this period of 1910 (Cox 77). The three families all belong to the middle class society and the Wilcox and the Basts are both extremes of it. The narrator says, "We are not concerned with the very poor" (58). In my opinion, it is due to his strategy to seek civilization for

his ideal England; consequently he deals with only the middle class society in which culture is a very important requisite. It is also Forster's choice of irony as a literary device. Leonard Bast's pitiable life is well depicted sufficiently to cause the readers' sympathy. Forster shows a little part of a lower middle-class young man's agony, making it possible to guess the tragic and unimaginable situation of the very poor. Therefore the phrase ‘only to be approached by the statistician or the poet’ is rather an emphasizing technique. Another lacking point preventing this novel from being defined as a Condition-of-England novel is Margaret’s too much defense of the industrialist.

Chapter 1 of this thesis deals with Forster’s spiritual sacrifice as a liberal humanist’s atonement that makes an effort to unite 'new economy' with 'old morality' to connect the capitalistic industrialists with the poor in his contemporary England. It traces two aspects of connection: One is Margaret Schlegel’s attempt to imbue the industrialists Wilcoxes with the liberal values through her virtue of proportion. It pursues the progress of personal relationships between Margaret and Henry. The other is Helen Schlegel’s ideal but impulsive footsteps to rescue the Basts from the ‘abyss.’ It follows Helen and Leonard’s personal relationships. The Schlegels’ sacrifice is proved to be frustrated.

Chapter 2 examines the reconciliation of the classes, focusing the discussion on the last scenes of *Howards End.* Though Forster realizes an ideal

connection among the classes is unattainable in reality, he does not abandon his desire to connect. As atonement, he wants to dedicate an accomplished connection as wishful thinking to the very poor of his ages. He directly shows the aspect of unity using his authorial power to display what connection means. At first, Leonard Bast's death will be dealt with to show the connection is intentional, and in consequence, depends on an accident. Then this thesis studies the connection, pursuing the Schlegel sister's attitude to compromise and tolerate other classes and the meaning of Henry's fall. And then the agents of ideal reconciliation will be dealt with: why pastoralism is Forster's alternative plan and why Forster lays emphasis on female power for the reconciliation. Lastly, Ruth Wilcox will be illuminated as the incarnation of ideal harmony. These are all Forster's presents to the Edwardian English society, in particular, to the very poor, as a comfort and his atonement.

Chapter 1
The Frustrated Connection: A Liberal Humanist as a Sacrifice

Forster strived to solve the problems arisen from the gap between the poor and the rich and thus desired to reconcile the industrialists with the lower class. As a rentier class who lived on the labor of others, he suffered from a sense of guilt derived from morality for only some individuals who are wealthy "can achieve the culture of the 'whole man'," and the majority "remains in a material and spiritual outer darkness" (Widdowson 40). At the same time, drawing his special attention was the fading out of the liberal values in the industrial or capitalist society. It was a critical situation just before the First World War broke out.

Under these circumstances, *Howards End* is quite suggestive when the resolution is expected to be capable. Rukun Advani thinks the conflicts that mar a unified world can be settled "through individual effort"; the effort means "the empire-builders (Wilcoxes) and the aesthetics (Schlegels) get to understand each other and do something practical for the oppressed (Basts)" (1). For the reconciliation of the industrialists with the working class, Forster splits himself into Helen and Margaret. Colmer claims that Margaret and Helen "represent two sides of his own character" (107).

Forster sacrifices Margaret to the industrialists Wilcoxes and Helen to the Leonard Bast, a poor clerk, who suffers from continuous threats of poverty.

This relation takes a form of union, the genealogy of connections, Margaret-Henry, Helen-Leonard and the solid unity of Margaret and Helen to combine 'the new economy' and 'the old morality.' Forster dispatches the liberalist Margaret armed with ‘the old morality’ to enlighten the industrialists Wilcoxes who are prepared for economic power, while details Helen to establish ‘the new economy’ taking care of the lower Bast who is endowed with ‘the old morality’.’

Money is an important factor in *Howards End*. In his interview with Wilfred Stone in 1957, Forster says, *"Howards End* is an attempt to master money" (Stone 71). When Margaret’s aunt asks her whether she is for the rich or for the poor, Margaret answers that she is for riches. Then she says, “Money forever” (73). She also emphasizes that they (the Schlegels) and the Wilcoxes "stand upon money as upon islands" while "most of the others are down below the surface of the sea" (72). It is so firm beneath their feet that they easily forget it. Forster knows and underscores the importance of economy related to the upper class' “independent thoughts” (134). Paul Delany's statement is lucid in this standpoint: "*Howards End* starts from the principle stated by its heroine, Margaret Schlegel: 'independent thoughts are in nine cases out of ten the results of independent means (134)'" (Delany 68).

Forster's awareness of the paradox that at the heart of the liberalism its values rely on a secure economic base puts him into a dilemma. For the liberal

values, liberalists depend on financial stability and capitalism emphasizing profit-making and the acquisition of property. Widdowson asserts, “The civilization of liberal-humanism necessarily rests on the fact that other people produce goods and remove the garbage” (40). Since capitalism, inevitably, rests on the exploitation and the ascendancy over the working class, there is a conflict between the capitalist and the laborer caused by the inequality of wealth. Moreover, since the hungry and the homeless “don't care about liberty any more than they care about cultural heritage,” educating the people without the material base to support the values of liberal civilization is of no use. Forster says, “To pretend that they do care is cant” (Forster *Abinger H*arvest 63).

This realization and conscience about the poor are revealed in his essay. Forster argues, "in came the nice fat dividends, up rose the lofty thoughts, and we did not realize that all the time we were exploiting the poor of our own country and the backward races abroad, and getting bigger profits from our investments than we should" (Forster “Challenge” 56). His awareness of social injustice and sense of morality made him worry about the recovery of the relationship between classes.

Yet the liberal intellectuals has dubious attitude to the class. Lionel Trilling indicates exactly that the intellectual, who is the freest of men, consciously the most liberated from class, but is actually the most class-marked and class-bound of all men. He has obscure admiration for the powers of the

business-man. Trilling continues to claim:

> The relation of the intellectual to the lower classes is no less confused. There is a whole mass of mankind, the enormous majority, indeed, which he considers his duty to "protect." To these people he vaguely supposes himself to be in a benevolent superior relation, paternal, pedagogic, even priestlike. (Trilling 93)

The intellectual's behavior which Trilling points out is not different from the Schlegel attitude to the both extremes of middle class in *Howards End*. Even though Margaret is in the position of modern liberalism in the material side, and so she cares about the poor and believes individuals' sympathy for one another, she recognizes the effort of industrialists and their importance. Since she rates it high that the Wilcoxes have built the Empire, she persuades Helen: "If Wilcoxes hadn't worked and died in England for thousands of years, you and I couldn't sit there without having our throats cut" (177).

Margaret regards labor as important virtue from the view of the modern liberals and tells her idle brother Tibby that the desire for work is a new desire; that for women, too, "not to work" will become as shocking as "not to be married" was a hundred years ago. She shouts, "Work, work, work if you'd save your soul and your body" (117-8). She also says that an Empire makes her bored but she can appreciate the heroism that builds it up: London makes her bored but she is thankful to thousands of splendid people for they are laboring

to make London. *Howards End* is the product of this dilemma.

In this novel, economy and class play important roles, and Forster's ‘new economy’ can be viewed in the conditions of England of that time. Classical liberalism opposes factory legislation which modern liberalists maintain with reference to labour, and education, and health. The free market allows each individual human being to do what they want and to pursue their own interests. Therefore those who have ability and a willingness to work will prosper, while the incompetent or the lazy will not. Consequently, the conditions of the working class should be improved through their own efforts and self-reliance, rather than from law. Forster is obviously one of the classical liberal humanists in pure philosophical ideas; yet, like other liberalists in the twentieth century, he criticizes the doctrine of *laissez-faire*, the free market ideas that Henry Wilcox stands for.

In *Howards End*, Henry Wilcox declares that if wealth is divided up equally, there will be the rich and the poor again just the same way in a few years. He says, "The hard working man would come to the top, the wastrel sink to the bottom" (160). When Helen directly confronts Henry Wilcox with their shared responsibility for Leonard, she quivers with indignation "in the face of Henry's *laissez-faire* concept of 'great impersonal forces', which discounts individual blame" (Wright 47). This impersonal view of Henry Wilcox to poverty and social equality is enough to be criticized by the modern liberals.

Forster exposes the violence of capitalistic imperialists that Henry Wilcox symbolizes in relation to Leonard Bast, the lower middle-class young man, who develops the Schlegel sisters' sympathy.

In attempting to unite the Wilcoxes with the Schlegels, Forster thinks the key is personal relations which are supreme, real life. He clarifies that his books emphasize "the importance of personal relationships and the private life," for he "believes in" them (Forster "Challenge" 55). From his first novel *Where Angels Fear to Tread* to *A Passage to India*, Forster always creates a character who tries to reconcile sharply conflicting relations. Forster constantly suggests the importance of personal relations and also worries about their reverse; Margaret asks, "Do personal relations lead to sloppiness in the end?" (41).

Margaret, as a spokesperson of Forster, speaks of the secret of getting to harmony, consequently, ideal life. When she visits Mrs. Wilcox in her flat in London and has a talk, she explains her attitude to overcome the great practical concerns of life: it is to live by proportion; it does not mean to begin with proportion but let it come in as a last resource:

> ...truth, being alive, was not half way between anything. It was only to be found by continuous excursions into either realm, and though proportion is the final secret, to espouse it at the outset is to ensure sterility. (195-6)

In *Howards End* proportion is described as a means "to connect the ideals of the

Schlegels to the business world that supplies them with their independence" in order to lead the Wilcoxes to be concerned about the poor (Cox 78). When Margaret makes up her mind to marry Henry Wilcox, she resolves to carry her future, the rough process of struggles, off with proportion.

To know how much Forster wants to unite 'new economy' with 'old morality' and how much he wants Margaret to compromise and tolerate, it will be worthwhile to trace the process of Margaret and Henry's marriage and adjustment to each other as a married couple as well as Helen's one time love affair, too. This chapter will analyze Margaret's heroic walking and process of her sacrificing her 'self' to achieve her mission. Three events will be dealt with in relation to Margaret: the process of her obtaining sexual equality, her resolution to marry Henry, in particular, her toleration of Henry Wilcox's past infidelity to Ruth, and her strife to stay one night in Howards End with Helen. Undergoing this chain of events, Margaret always maintains her liberal virtues of ‘old morality.’

At first, the Schlegel sisters are attracted towards the Wilcoxes because of their "positive qualities": their "energy," their "power to command" and their "talents for honest hard work" (Colmer 101). As time goes by, however, Margaret confronts Mr. Wilcox's weak points by turns: first of all, his obtuseness on 'personal relations.' In fact Helen recognizes it earlier when she sees the frightened Paul at the breakfast table after they have become engaged.

She is disillusioned about their "panic and emptiness" behind the wall of newspapers, motor-cars and golf-clubs (40). Margaret experiences a similar situation after her first kiss with Henry. It occurs in Aunt's dark garden the day when Henry came to Aunt Juley's, bearing the engagement ring. When Henry takes her in his arms, Margaret is startled, nearly screamed, but recovers herself at once and kisses him with genuine love. However, after that, Henry sees her safely to the door and rang the bell for her, but has hurried away before the maid answers as if ashamed. Nothing in their previous conversation has heralded it; no tenderness has ensued though she has hoped for some interchange of gentle words thus she feels disconnected. The isolated incident is truly descriptive of Henry's lack of relationships.

Henry’s clumsiness in personal relationships is one of specific characters of the Wilcoxes. When Helen hears from Margaret that Henry Wilcox proposed a marriage to her sister, she disapproves Margaret's engagement upon the spot, indicating the Wilcoxes' 'panic and emptiness.' Helen's episode with Paul in Howards End explicitly compares the Schlegels with the Wilcoxes. Colmer mentions that Mrs. Munt's expedition to rescue Helen Schlegel from Paul Wilcox is mainly a means of launching the reader into the major contrast between the Schlegels and Wilcoxes (85). One is cultured humane liberalists and the other is obtuse, egotistic and unscrupulous industrial imperialists. The Schlegels think 'personal relations' is the important

thing 'for ever and ever' and the Wilcoxes' 'outer life of telegrams and anger' is far apart from their world.

Though she knows all the Wilcoxes' faults, Margaret consents Henry's proposal with pleasure. She clearly recognizes their virtues. She accounts for Helen that it is wonderful knowing that "a real man" cares for a lady (176). The two sisters' diverging point lies on Margaret's high valuation on the Wilcox qualities and her realization of Mr. Wilcox as a 'real man'. Forster thinks that the recognition is quite important for his liberal dilemma starts from the awakening of his reliance on Wilcoxes' stable economy. Therefore he splits the liberal being in him into two, Margaret and Helen, and has one persuade the other. If he lets Margaret succeed in persuading Helen and improving Mr. Wilcox, we may say Forster's ideal to be realized.

To make her marry Henry plausible, Forster creates Margaret as being in an unstable state: Wickham Place is going to be pulled down and she is going to be homeless; Evie Wilcox's engagement leaves Margaret feeling solitary and old-maidish; aged thirty-one, she feels inclined to patronize herself as the more foolish virgin. Under such circumstances, "a man of any standing should take her seriously" (169).

Outwardly, Margaret's marriage with Henry Wilcox seems to be an ideal union. Above all, she realizes her love has existed as a "central radiance" which "touches" "her personality" (168, 169). Her respect and love for Henry is

verified again during her first visit to Howards End which Henry had saved as a deliverer. Henry can get out of a widower and Margaret of a spinster. Since they have weathered the storm, they may get along in peace. Henry, as an instinctive polygamy, feels morally braced by the change. Moreover, as a result of the marriage, Helen, who has suffered from her impulsive love affair caused by an act of sympathy, is saved. Though the sisters plan to leave for Germany, Leonard's unexpected death and Charles' imprisonment ruin Henry. Consequently they settle down in Howards End with Helen's child who will inherit the house. Thus the novel can be settled with a new hope of happy future.

Nevertheless Margaret and Henry are an ill-matched couple. After she agrees to Margaret's matrimony, Helen says like a prophet, "One would lose something" (178). Since the Wilcoxes are unbearable for Helen, she cannot help offering opposition to their marriage. She regards the marriage "as deeply compromising, a betrayal of the values the sisters have inherited from their father" (Leslie White 57). For Helen Margaret's marriage symbolizes nothing but the liberalists' dependence on the industrialists' money.

Another evidence of their ill-assorted marriage is Wilcoxes' discriminative treatment of women which causes Margaret's feeling of indisposition. When Margaret settles to marry Mr. Wilcox and persuades Helen, she declares that she doesn't intend him or any man or any woman to be all her life; she will keep her independent more than most women as yet do; she tries

to remain herself for Henry’s sake as well as her own; she thinks a shadowy wife degrades the husband whom she accompanies with. Margaret empathizes that Helen’s love-making with Paul is romance but hers will be a very good kind of prose for she considers well and knows all of Mr. Wilcox’s faults.

She challenges Wilcoxes' male superiority when they journey to Oniton for the wedding of Evie, Mr. Wilcox's daughter. After the railroad trip, during which the arbitrary and annoying distinctions of sexual roles almost choke her, is over, and when the car approaching Oniton hits a child's cat, she jumps out of the moving car to intervene between the harmer and the victim. She wonders to herself: "Why should the chauffeurs tackle the girl? Ladies sheltering behind men, men sheltering behind servants - the whole system's wrong." She bravely challenges it, and the sight is "too strange to leave any room for anger" for Charles Wilcox since he, a man of authority, had never been in such a position before (213). The happening was her "first attempt to challenge the Wilcox theories of sexual roles and class barriers" (Bonnie B. Finkelstein 106). After the action she felt their whole journey from London had been unreal: "They had no part with earth and its emotions" (213).

Yet Margaret manages her husband. She "negates her heroic jump by demeaning herself," by telling Henry she has been so naughty (Finkelstein 106). If she decides to bring disgrace on herself, Henry never knows her artful dissimulation. Though Margaret feels ashamed of her own diplomacy, she deals

with Mr. Wilcox deceitfully to behave as if she is "the kind of woman that he desired!" (227). Margaret is so lively and intelligent, nonetheless so submissive. She always is ready to do what Henry wishes: “he had only to call, and she clapped the book up” (255). They argue so jollily and even if she has him in the corner, Margaret gives in as soon as he grows really serious. Foster feels sorry for Margaret's ceaseless self renunciation and their fundamental disagreement:

> He mistook her fertility for weakness. He supposed her "as clever as they make 'em," but no more, not realizing that she was penetrating to the depths of his soul, and approving of what she found there.
>
> And if insight were sufficient, if the inner life were the whole of life, their happiness has been assured. (185)

Margaret's independent temperament regards it annoying for others to treat her with too much kindness only because she is a woman. In Oniton, Margaret says to Henry Wilcox thoughtfully, "You Man shouldn’t be so chivalrous, (219)" but when Henry asks why not she answers dishonestly she does not know. She dissimulates her intention: though she yearns to help Henry, she can always respond without contempt. Margaret “temporarily sells out to the patronizing Wilcox views of 'feminine Nature' (214)" (Finkelstein 106). Finkelstein accurately indicates: "But a feminist Margaret in love with an antifeminist Henry does not find it easy to continue to move forward" (105).

Though Margaret is disappointed a hundred times, she still hopes the chance she can help him with love to set Henry's soul in order. She hopes to manipulate Henry Wilcox with her head as well as her heart and wishes to surpass the sexual barrier to attain sexual equality. Of course this process shows her heroic aspect and reflects her toleration but it has the other side: maintaining this attitude, she rather fosters Henry's faults to behave as he pleases. She feels remorse for she has "spoilt" him long enough (300).

Forster seems to deem tolerance as most important to solve the problem of that period. "Only connect…," the most important theme of *Howards End,* can be accomplished by the core of the liberal value, tolerance. When the Schlegel sisters are connected to each man—the liberal humanist, Margaret, to a businessman, Henry, and the idealist, Helen, to a lower middle class, Leonard Bast－they receive each person into their sphere without a biased view. C. B. Cox claims, "Throughout his career, Forster has been the advocate of tolerance and respect for the individual, and these beliefs demand the highest praise" (76).

Since the Schlegel sisters have inherited their father's basic values, they can tolerate other's differences. On Evie's wedding day at Oniton, Margaret meets Mrs. Bast with Henry and gets to know their affair taken place ten years ago. When she realizes the affair, Margaret concludes this problem is for Mrs. Wilcox's tragedy. In her letter to Helen, who is in a rage against Henry, she stresses the need of charity in sexual matters: "so little is known about them; it

is hard enough for those who are personally touched to judge; then how futile must be the verdict of Society" (254). She seems to tolerate the matter with a gallant attitude.

Margaret's tolerance develops into her sense of proportion. Anne Wright asserts that we are to gauge the success of 'connection' in *Howards End* by Margaret's marriage, in particular her progress towards 'thinking conjugally,' with its blend of maturity and compromise (40). This opinion seems to be appropriate. For example, despite Henry's amour with Jacky, Margaret learns to adapt to Henry and to marry by submission and devotion. In the process of forgiving Henry, Margaret preserves the manner of her proportion.

She perceives the gulf between Henry as he is and Henry as he ought to be. "Hovering between the two" she seems to be exhausted to tolerate. "Love and Truth," to her "their warfare seems eternal" (228). To reach the proportion she ceaselessly struggles in spite of her deep bruise originated in the strong sense of Henry's degradation. In her revising the letter to Henry, we can see the process of her concession graphically; "she progressively deletes her own judgments (because 'comment is unfeminine'), thereby deleting herself" (Wright 42).

Passing through this crisis, Margaret has concentrated on her tenacious purpose to connect. She thinks nothing else mattered but Henry must be forgiven and made better by her love. Now naturally she asks herself whether

he is worth in spite of all this bother. The answer is "Yes" for she thinks she loves him, and some day she will use her love to make him a better man. This part raises the most important question to evoke the readers' sympathies. I wholly agree with Wright's claim: "These conditions - her love and his improvement - become the reader's criteria for consent to the marriage" (42).

Margaret thinks she can help Henry Wilcox. She thinks love is "the best" and love will "set his soul in order" (219).

> Mature as he was, she might yet be able to help him to the building of the rainbow bridge that should connect the prose in us with the passion. (187)

> It did not seem so difficult. She need trouble him with no gift of her own. She would only point out the salvation that was latent in his own soul, and in the soul of every man. Only connect! That was the whole of her sermon. Only connect the prose and the passion, and both will be exalted, and human love will be seen at its height. Live in fragments no longer. Only connect, and the beast and the monk, robbed of the isolation that is life to either, will die. (188)

Margaret is too innocent to believe that both extremes will be exalted, and human love will be seen at its highest. She tries on endlessly.

Obviously Margaret is a heroic woman to dream to point out the salvation that is latent in Henry Wilcox's soul, and in the soul of every man. Even so, Henry is able to neither face facts as they are nor repent his past affair truly. After his brief confession, he feels a clean breast, believing that he has been forgiven. For his sake he regards this affair as one of his unsuccessful investments and Jacky becomes past. He even begs, "On no account mention it to anybody" (245). Henry is fundamentally different from Margaret and has one quality for which she is never prepared: "his obtuseness" (188).

The couple faces another crisis to be evidence that their marriage is unsuccessful. During her married life, Margaret has waited in anxious suspense for Helen's arrival and after all they meet each other in Howards End. (It is the product of Henry's ability of business and a trick which never questions the means.) As soon as Margaret finds Helen's pregnancy, she extends to her sister the same tolerance she has given her husband. Yet Henry shows no sympathy to Helen or Margaret, and moreover, refuses Margaret's request to permit Helen to sleep the night at Howards End. Finkelstein says, "Henry's great fault is his inability to do the same, to connect" (109).

Henry weighs the sisters as business propositions and thinks if he permits them he should be false to his position in society. Margaret feels frustrated confronting Henry with "his double moral standards" (Wright 42). Margaret criticizes Henry for his antinomy. In spite of his debauchery she has

forgiven him generously but now he drives Helen from the house because she has a lover. It is reasonable that Margaret rages. She attacks him: "You have betrayed Mrs. Wilcox, Helen only herself. You remain in society, Helen can't" (301). Margaret attempts to force on Henry moral connections, the equivalence of the sexual facts of his own liaison with Jacky and Helen's unmarried pregnancy. Can 'her love and his improvement' be accomplished and show their successful relationship? The answer to this question can be the touchstone of their condition of the union.

Helen Schlegel, in contrast to Margaret, sacrifices herself for the depressed middle class young man, Leonard Bast. Helen's mission is to achieve "new economy" for the poor on the foundation of old morality and it is the other branch of the answer to Forster's dilemma. She resembles her sister and also considers personal relations very important. However Helen is more passionate and impetuous than Margaret; consequently, she is more irresponsible and "in some respects purer than her sister." She is "idealistic, theoretic and abstract" (Widdowson 74). Dissimilar from Margaret, Helen is "less dangerously tempted by the 'virtues' of Wilcoxism" and "by the attractions of compromise" (Widdowson 74). When she approves of Margaret's marriage with Henry, she clearly declares, "You mean to keep proportion and that's heroic," and continues, "I'm going my own way. I mean to be thorough, because thoroughness is easy" (195). Helen advances her own way thoroughly and

drives herself, even Leonard, into catastrophe.

Helen’s counterpart, Leonard's pitiful living condition is well depicted in Chapter 6 of *Howards End*. Leonard Bast represents the ‘loser,’ one of the sad products of modern industrialization which “London and Wilcoxism are destroying” (Widdowson 70). Forster shows the miserable life of the poor young man through his residing: He lives in a "dark" and "stuffy" cellar which "strikes" that "shallow makeshift note that is so often heard in the modern dwelling-place" (62, 60). He lives with a woman, Jacky, who is much older than him and too burdensome; thus, at times he wants to revenge her. Leonard pursues culture but always suffers from severe poverty and cannot possess himself of culture without anxiety.

Forster describes Leonard’s spirit of freedom through his adventure. He walks once all the Saturday night through the forest and achieves “nobility” and wins the Schlegel sisters' sympathy (Finkelstein 95). Leonard reappears in Helen’s life two years after the concert at the Queen’s Hall. One day Jacky visits Wickham Place with Margaret’s card to seek Leonard in her misunderstanding and then Leonard visits to apologize it. Leonard wants to keep some secret but Helen, with the cruelty of youth, asks inquisitively till he answers that he wanted to get back to the earth so walked. The narrator says, “A thrill of approval ran through the sisters” (125). When he tells about the Pole Star Helen is “becoming interested” (125). When Leonard explains the

difficulty of going off the road and finding one's way, Margaret is full of praise for his being "a born adventurer" (126). Helen satirizes professional athletes on their never moving without lanterns and compasses; "Besides, they can't walk. It tires them" (126). Yet Helen rejects Leonard's literary references.

The sisters are thrilled by Leonard's adventure. He pushes back the boundaries and gets "beyond books to the real thing, 'to England'", to the "spirit" and to the "moment of true culture" (Widdowson 71). Leonard thinks his doing comes about from reading something and Helen makes him aware that it comes from something far greater. "Excuse me, Mr. Bast, but you're wrong there. It didn't" (127). Here Forster, as a writer, enlightens the readers standing their side:

> The fault is ours, not theirs. They mean us to use them for sign-posts, and are not to blame if, in our weakness, we mistake the sign-post for the destination. And Leonard had reached the destination. He had visited the county of Surrey when darkness covered its amenities, and its cosy villas had re-entered ancient night. Every twelve hours this miracle happens, but he had troubled to go and see for himself. (127)

They have agreed that there is something beyond life's daily gray. Leonard feels that "the barriers of wealth had fallen" (131). Helen encourages him for his free spirit and it revives him. It is the first description Leonard has achieved

connection in this novel. The ladies invite him over but he declines for the reason that “it is better not to risk a second interview” (128).

Though Leonard is very poor, he belongs to the lower middle class society. The description of Leonard leaving the Schlegels and walking down the Regent Street is “half-comic and half-pathetic” (Page 23): His top-hat confirms his middle class position yet when he puts his hat on, “It was too big; his head disappeared like a pudding into a basin, the ears bending outwards at the touch of the curly brim” (131). The figure of his aspiration for culture is similarly: “he felt that he was being done good to, and that if he kept on with Ruskin, and the Queen’s Hall concerts, and some pictures by Watts, he would one day push his head out of the gray waters and see the universe” (62). His hat as well as his umbrella symbolizes “respectability” and this scene shows that the middle class society is undeserved to Leonard, in other words, beyond his capacity (Mike Edwards 84).

The Schlegel sisters are modest and mature to recognize the privilege that money renders, and, as Elizabeth Langland points out, they can "look beneath the social surface of a poor individual like Leonard Bast to the real man, who cared for adventure and beauty" (84). On the day Leonard visits them, they attend the women’s debating club and discusses on how one ought to leave one’s money. After the meeting, the sisters feel more sympathy for Leonard and take his penury earnestly. The sisters talk over whether they get acquainted with

Leonard or not and conclude that they “mustn’t play at friendship” because “it’s no good” (136). The sisters may be deliberate but class barrier must be too high in that period.

Mr. Wilcox casually remarks to the sisters the confidential advice that Leonard should get out of the Porphyrion Insurance Company which will smash. The sisters invite him to tea to give him a tip about his company and Leonard walks out of the tea party got enraged because of misunderstanding. Helen follows him and returns a little later feeling sympathy for him: “Poor creature….Such a muddle of a man, and yet so worth pulling through. I like him extraordinarily” (153). Later, the advice strikes Leonard a fatal blow; after all, he loses his job and the office is proved to be sound. Since Mr. Wilcox and the sisters offer the immediate cause of Leonard's destruction, Helen, as an idealist, suffers from a sense of responsibility. When she visits Oniton on Evie's wedding day, dominated by the tense, wounding excitement, Helen protests Henry furiously against his irresponsible and apathetic attitude. Since Henry’s “economics and social philosophy are *laissez faire*,” Helen, as Forster’s other self, criticizes his manner (Bradbury 132).

Helen starts on the point that they, upper classes, have ruined Leonard Bast. Forster's sense of debt to the working class for the 'exploitation and ascendancy' is expressed through Helen's words: "I'll stand injustice no longer. I'll show up the wretchedness that lies under this luxury, this talk of impersonal

forces, this cant about God doing what we're too slack to do ourselves" (223). Helen's attitude to the Basts is the same with modern liberalists, like T. H. Green, who endeavor to abolish poverty, disease and ignorance. It is also Forster's 'new economy.' The new liberalists believe that lack of economic opportunity, education, health-care, and so on can be considered to threat to their conception of liberty. Helen finds out the Basts starving and brings them from London to Shropshire. Leonard's wife is ill, and moreover faints in the train to Oniton. Practically Helen pays the rent for the Basts, redeems the furniture, provides them with a dinner and breakfast, and orders them to go together to Oniton (224).

Helen, opposed to Margaret, is characterized as impulsive and lacking proportion. The night in Oniton, after they ask Margaret (Henry) a new job for Leonard, Helen and Leonard talk in the empty coffee-room of the George Hotel at a late hour after Jacky has gone to bed. Then she receives Margaret's curt notes, not only rejecting Leonard a job but also mentioning "The Basts are not at all the type we should trouble about" (239). Treating it as Henry's thought, Helen "is full of guilt at the way her class has treated Leonard" (Page 30). She impulsively has one night love affair with Leonard Bast. Helen gives herself, "joylessly, out of a hysterical sense of justice" (Trilling 98).

From the view point of the framework of the story, Paul's betrayal has a bad effect on Helen and she hates all the Wilcoxes. In the beginning of the

novel, Helen's letters from Howards End to Margaret show her excited state. She is fascinated by the Wilcoxes' masculine energy enough to abandon the Schlegel ideas which they have adhered preciously. However this frenzy is inverted quickly to disillusion when Helen sees Paul be anxious about their secret engagement to be known. She recognizes the whole Wilcox family is a fraud, nothing but panic and emptiness. These two romances show Helen's passionate and impetuous temperament plainly.

Like Margaret's marriage, Helen's intercourse with Leonard is a byproduct of Forster's intention. Forster sacrifices Helen as a sin offering to make an apology to the working class. Cox keenly indicates the nature of the affair: "Helen spends a night with Bast partly because she knows he is her provider" (78). She gives herself to Leonard from pity and guilt; “not in the spirit of instinctive joy, but 'heroically,'” as “a sacrificial victim from the class responsible for his ruin" (Colmer 100). The narrator explains Helen’s state at the moment eight months after the affair: “She could pity, or sacrifice herself, or have instincts.” The narrator says, “Leonard seemed not a man, but a cause” (303). It indicates Forster's intent acutely. Leonard becomes ‘a cause’ of the baby who inherits Howards End and ‘a cause’ of the reconciliation of the Schlegels and the Wilcoxes. Helen tells Margaret that she is less enthusiastic about justice now; she shall never rave against Wilcoxes anymore.

Helen wants never to see him again. Helen loved "the absolute" so "she

loved Leonard absolutely perhaps for half an hour," and he "had been ruined absolutely" (308). Due to her strong sense of justice, she becomes passionate but ultimately it proves to be sentimentalism. She wants to give him money and feel finished. Colmer indicates this feeling exactly: "since their sexual union does nothing to alleviate her guilt, she offers the 5,000£ that Leonard proudly refuses (100). This secret, particular redistribution of wealth, which Leonard refuses, is "sufficient to dispel her hysterical sense of guilt" (Wright 47).

Forster seems to maintain that either good will or sympathy is not enough to break down the deep rooted barriers between Helen and Leonard; liberalists' attempt to realize harmony or let the capitalists practice good will is vain: it necessarily ends up in frustration. Presumably he "deliberately satirizes" those who "to try to force some order on the rich" (Cox 76). Or, according to Malcolm Bradbury, this is the view of Victorian intellectual who is obviously "the child of English middle-class liberalism, a liberalism that has an evident historical location in the heyday of the advanced, but wealthy, intellectual bourgeoisie" (Bradbury Intro 3).

Margaret enumerates Helen's losses. Most of all, she is anxious about her sister's way of falling in love. Margaret thinks Helen pitied Leonard and sacrificed herself; most of all, Helen never has loved "in the noblest way, where man and woman, having lost themselves in sex, desire to lose sex itself in comradeship" (303). Enough troubles lay ahead of Helen's life; she loses her

friends and social advantages; she will undergo delivery and the agony of lone mother. These are the prize for the sacrifice of an idealistic but impulsive lady of middle class who pities the poor.

In the night when the sisters encounter in Howards End, Forster ascertains his achievements. The scene, in which Margaret and Helen meet after their long separation and become reconciled, is the factual conclusion of Forster's pursuit of ideal connection in *Howards End*. It is the place of reckoning war results of the two losers dispatched to each class, to 'do something practical for the oppressed.' Margaret invaded the Wilcox fortress to transmit liberal values, and Helen marches to the lower class "to rescue" Leonard "from descent into the abyss of poverty and social degradation" and "to obtain social justice for the Basts" (Colmer 86). Leavis' analysis of the meaning of the two sisters' failure is quite cogent:

> In Margaret the author expresses his sense of the inadequacy of the culture she stands for - its lack of relation to the forces shaping the world and its practical impotence. Its weaknesses, dependent as it is on an economic security it cannot provide, are embodied in the quixotic Helen, who, acting uncompromisingly on her standards, brings nothing but disaster on herself and the objects of her concern. (F. R. Leavis 41)

In this novel, their reach out to the mysterious extremes of the middle class,

Margaret upward to the Wilcoxes, Helen downward to the Basts, is only their function as intellectuals (Trilling 91). Forster concludes that ideal personal relationships and connection is unattainable.

Since Margaret and Helen are Forster's other selves, their failure in *Howards End* is a kind of self-confession and self-acknowledgement of his limitations. Their planning to departure signifies that their mission is not accomplished. So to speak, to manage to combine ‘the new economy’ and ‘the old morality’ is a hard work to attain for the “powerful forces inimical to it” (Widdowson 85). They express the difficulty of realizing their ideal in reality and admit their incompetence and defeat in “the class war” (Trilling 88). Once Margaret believed she could overcome Henry’s obtuseness through love; however, Henry’s barrier is too solid and Margaret fails because they cannot connect with each other. Helen recognizes the discrepancy between ideal and reality; it is an irony that she is solved her guilty feeling not by her virtues, that is, old morality, but by money which she attempts to solve its problem.

Chapter 2

The Accomplished Connection: A Liberal Humanist as a Dedicator

E. M. Forster is ceaselessly anxious about destructive urbanization of London and its environment by industrialization. In particular, he worries about the advent of noticeable distinction between the rich and the poor. In the narrator's voice, he criticizes the imperial-industrialists as "a destroyer" (315). This concern makes him find a secure place to rest, like Howards End, as one's house which is "the future as well as the past" (329). The characters can restore peace, be reconciled to each other and recover themselves as human beings in Howards End. In her letter to Margaret, Helen depicts the house as "old and little, and altogether delightful" (19).

Howards End is an old house where the story begins and ends. There is a very big wych-elm leaning a little over the house, standing between the garden and meadow. With its Hertfordshire environment, it is always the background of the story. This house itself is "a sort of symbol of everything in England, old and new, changeless, yet amid flux" (Scott-James 136). Above all, it is a symbol of "deeper connections" "with the house and the earth, and with the air, sun and the moon" (Page 70). And the deeper connection is what Forster ardently hopes to attain. Forster's heroine Margaret seems to achieve the harmony in the end and her sister Helen says, "[Y]ou picked up the pieces and

made us a home" (328). Yet, fundamentally, Forster thinks the ideal reconciliation across the restrictions of society unattainable.

Even though Forster thinks it impossible to accomplish the connection between the social classes, he earnestly hopes that the new heirs of England harmonize with the traditional owners, with the best values and advantages of the traditional culture. Forster's decision to conclude Helen and Leonard's son as an heir to Howards End is due to his sympathy and tolerance to the lower class. It may reduce Forster's guilty feeling and relieve him from his liberal dilemma. Therefore the ending scene of *Howards End* may be labeled as his dedication to the Basts of his age as his atonement.

Consequently the final scenes of *Howards End* show the accomplished but intentional connection among the classes. Forster does know ideal connection is impossible in reality; nevertheless he does not give up hoping to connect. He confesses in an interview, "In *Howards End* I tried to strike a balance" (Stone 68). This means Forster enforces harmony in this novel. As atonement, he wants to find a solution for all to accept and show attained reconciliation "across the boundaries of the 'split' society" (Wright 39). As if 'all we must do were connection,' he directly displays the fruit of harmony using his authorial power to show what connection means in his contemporary England.

As a dedication he presents pastoralism to the Basts of his age since Leonard Bast is one of the third generation, grandson to the shepherd or ploughboy, a yeoman. In the farm of England, not in the city, with the traditional owners, modern Englishmen can share their ‘old morality.’ Yet Forster emphasizes female power in his ending scene. To some degree, the female characters in *Howards End* seem to be prepared for the last scene carefully. In the twenty century England, the government’s intervention and social welfare are gathering strength to practice ‘new economy’ and these movements, in the course of nature, need the feminine characteristics. Helen and Leonard’s child must be nurtured and cared about. Forster presents, above all things, an aristocrat figure, Ruth Wilcox as an incarnation of reconciliation. And he presents Howards End for them to reconcile.

The epigraph of *Howards End*, "Only connect...," shows how important Forster thinks personal relationships are. According to Widdowson, we can read this phrase by two ways: One is to define it as Forster’s command for us to connect; the other is as his regret for the impossibility of its realization. As well, Forster regards "Only connect...," as the structure of the novel goings through the order of connective, resolving, synthetic. Widdowson’s re-interpretation of it is quite accurate and interesting:

> Normally read as Forster's positive imperative: 'All we must do is connect,' it suggests too the plaintive, despairing tones of a fading

> faith: 'if only we could connect....' And, concurrent with such ideological connotations, the phrase also identifies the structural tendency of the novel: connective, resolving, synthetic. (Widdowson 12)

The novel can be divided into two parts. At first, in a large part, from chapter 1 to 40, the author features the way 'if only we could connect...' in 'the plaintive, despairing tones' through Margaret and Helen's works with a feeling of regret. Forster often pities and laments for the characters' discord. His view of whole connection is unachievable and critical. Next, in the remaining four chapters, Forster seems to show the accomplished connection that urges 'All we must do is connect,' and teaches us that connection is very valuable. He seems to show vision to his oppressed contemporaries.

Naturally, the structure of the novel can be characterized in two categories: frustrated connection and accomplished synthesis. Especially the latter is "conscious and intentional" (Widdowson 12). Accordingly I do not agree with Widdowson's analysis of the writer's structural tendency. He thinks the development of the novel as occurring in order: 'connective, resolving, synthetic.' There is no procedure of 'resolving' in both connections except the Schlegel sisters' reconciliation. The last scene appears to be synthetic but it occurs unexpectedly and, as a result, lacks natural course of resolving.

However, in this novel, the connection is attainable only when the

Schlegel sisters restore their relationship once broken from their attitude to rich and poor. Then, what is the secret of the two sisters' accordance? The elder sister, Margaret, tries to connect her cultured intrinsic values with the vitality of the Wilcoxes. She constantly tries to understand her husband, Henry Wilcox. Yet the married couple becomes divided: the young wife maintains "the primacy of the standard of personal sympathy," while the man, "the standard of social propriety" (Bradbury 131). Her lopsided concession turns out to be not worthwhile and she fails.

The younger, Helen, concentrates on understanding the lower class. She is a heroine of the "ideal part" as Margaret of the "practical life" (Trilling 100). Each sister takes her sympathy to the extremes of middle class men: Margaret's "willed and reasoned," sympathy to the class above her, and Helen's "impulsive" one to the class below (Delany 69). Helen has one night extramarital affair with Leonard and leaves him recognizing she cannot love him heartily. Even though she is an attractive woman and has many virtues, and also she has "force and articulate intelligence," "her impulsiveness upsets the balance" (Smith, 109).

At the meeting in Howards End, Margaret discovers that Helen is pregnant with Leonard's child. Helen has taken an active hand with sympathy in determining Leonard's destiny and it leads herself to a calamity. This time, Margaret also tolerates her sister's pregnancy in the same way she did Henry's

debauchery. Margaret dares neither blame nor assess her trespass of any moral code. In fact, being disappointed with Henry, she is also discouraged but tries to suppress her rage. When Margaret feels most tired, she concentrates upon the teeth that had been thrust into the tree's bark to medicate it, and this scene is very implicit in the Schlegel sisters' recovery of their comradeship.

At first, though the sisters feel themselves in hostility of each other, unconsciously they move toward union. Now Helen declares that her blind hate is over, and that she will never rave against Wilcoxes anymore. While she suffers a severe pain, she recognizes the limitation of her idealism, and her mental vision enlarges. Finally Helen gets modest and has already understood her elder sister. When they take a look around their furniture from Wickham Place, they gradually open their mind and remember the days of their childhood. The chair where Tibby spilt the soup leads their memory get together. The unconditional deep understanding "rooted in common things" makes them never part (292). Forster describes delicately the moment when the discord between Helen and Margaret gets resolved into a satisfactory settlement:

> And all the time their salvation was lying round them--the past sanctifying the present; the present, with wild heart-throb, declaring that there would after all be a future, with laughter and the voices of children. (292)

The sisters' reconciliation seems to facilitate the end of Margaret's relation with

Henry and her departure to Germany. When they are hard up for English life as German stock, they "draw on the international idealism of their father" (Bradbury 133) for he is "the countryman of Hegel and Kant, as the idealist, inclined to be dreamy" (42).

On the other hand, Henry is described as a person who is too obtuse to connect and lacks sympathy. Forster obviously starts the novel from the view that to connect the two different classes, the industrial imperialists and liberalists, is impossible, though he does sincerely want to. In his biography of Forster, P.N. Furbank reports the author's first sketch of *Howards End*, jotted down in his diary dated of June 28th 1908:

> Mrs. Wilcox dies, and some years later Margaret gets engaged to the widower, a man impeccable publicly. They are accosted by a prostitute. M. because she understands and is great, marries him. The wrong thing to do. He, because he is little, cannot bear to be understood, & goes to the bad. He is frank, kind, & attractive. But he dreads ideas. (qtd. in Furbank 165)

In this jotting we can confirm that Forster, from the first, thought Margaret's marriage to be the 'wrong thing to do.' In particular, his choice of the words, "great" for Margaret and "little" for Henry, manifests unsuitableness of their union.

In some places of the published novel, Forster notifies Margaret's failure

in her relationship with Henry, and it is always due to Henry's limitations. Forster pities Henry because he cannot realize Margaret's penetration to the depths of his soul and laments: "[I]f insight were sufficient, if the inner life were the whole of life, their happiness has been assured" (185). The narrator states definitely, "But she failed. For there was one quality in Henry...his obtuseness." If Henry is sensitive, "[b]y quiet indications the bridge would be built and span their lives with beauty" (188). Finally he breaks down and "their love must take the consequences" (322). He confesses, "I'm broken--I'm ended," and he "shambles up to Margaret" (325), being "pitiably tired" (332).

Connection is very difficult for Henry, for, from boyhood, he has neglected his inner life. He says, "I am not a fellow who bothers about my own inside" (187-8). The memorable epigraph and the recurrent theme of *Howards End*, "Only connect...," cannot be achieved by Henry Wilcox for that matter. To connect successfully with others, one should understand his own inner world. Yet Forster describes Henry's inner world as 'muddle': "all had reverted to chaos" (188). When he refuses the permission for the sisters' one night stay in Howards End, Margaret cries against Henry, "[Y]ou are muddled, criminally muddled" (300). To find "I," in other words, 'self,' is of deep importance to be prepared for connection: in chapter 27, enumerating Pierpont Morgan, Nietzsche and Napoleon, Helen says that "supermen can't say 'I'" "because their heads have no middle" (232). Presumably it means superman like Napoleon

concerns too much about the public interest, and as a result, he cannot cultivate his inner life. Helen thinks the Wilcoxes are not, either. After Leonard is dead, Charles Wilcox has a vague regret with "a wish...that he had taught to say 'I' in his youth" (319). Malcolm Page similarly asserts, "Henry's final collapse follows from his lack of an inner life" (81).

Consequently, the last chapter of *Howards End* displays an artificial connection accomplished not by the growth of personality -especially Henry's- or proportion or ideal but by Leonard's unexpected death. In the final scenes of the novel, Charles murders Leonard by mistake and is condemned. Henry declines in health and submits himself to Margaret. The Schlegels have the initiative and the Wilcoxes are displeasingly acquiescent. The Schlegel sisters are fully connected with each other and settle down in Howards End. Though Leonard dies from Charles's sudden attack, the child between Helen and Leonard is born and appears to inherit Howards End.

Showing an ideal unity in the last scene, Forster continuously concerns and hopes to realize inter-class or human harmony. As a rentier "who consumes" without producing anything, hence, is indebted to the working class, Forster wants to 'do something practical for the oppressed' (Delany 74). His suggestion of idealistic relationships is proved to be frustrated and his conscience, as a writer, cannot help urging his contemporaries to make a compromise with each other to let the poor "take the great chances of beauty

and adventure that the world offers” (321).

Many readers are satisfied with the ending of the novel in which the inimitable epigraph "Only connect..." becomes reality. In the final scenes, the readers may feel confident of harmony: ‘the prose’ and the ‘passion’ are truly both “exalted,” and “human love” is “seen at its height” (188). From the garden comes laughter; Helen rushes into the room, holding Tom by one hand and carrying her baby on the other; there are shouts of “infectious joy”; Henry, disengaging himself with a smile, claims, “Here they are at last!”; (332). Langland says, “Finally, in the novel's conclusion, Margaret looks towards an ultimate harmony” (90). As Wright assesses Margaret's marriage to Henry as "providing a 'solution' to the problem of the condition of England," her marriage enables Leonard Bast's son to inherit Howards End (39).

Nevertheless, the genuine connection between the Wilcoxes and the Schlegels is not wholly accomplished at the end of the novel. In spite of Margaret's struggle, Henry's spirit seems not to be "expanded" but merely "broken" (Widdowson 106). Margaret admits that she cannot love a child. Helen confesses that she cannot love a man. And the rust of London, melted down all over the world, creeps toward Howards End. It is a sign of further crisis, "even of lurking apocalypse" (Wright 61). Though Margaret hopes Howards End to be the future as well as the past, "the final idyll of rushing mother and child is suspect" (Wright 61) to see Helen cries excitedly, "it'll be

such a crop of hay as never!" and it means a failure of crops of grain (332).

To ‘manage to combine the new economy and the old morality’ is the Schlegels’ mission and needs the Wilcoxes’ change. To make the obstinate industrialist see actually the crisis of the period and so try to harmonize with other classes, Forster inevitably relies on a fictitious device, contingency. The situation, begun with Schlegel sisters' (as much as Forster's) failure of connection with other classes, abruptly converts to achieve the harmony. Therefore it is difficult to characterize this configuration simply as the sign that connection has been made, since there are many respects that are not quite satisfied as harmonious conclusion.

If the last scene is contrived, it is because the scene is the product of E. M. Forster's intention to provide a fantasy. The synthesis of artificial reconciliation is the author's dedication to the Edwardian English society, in particular, the oppressed poor. It is a kind of Forster's presentation of the course they should proceed to. At the end, Margaret connects "the prose and the passion eternally, Henry as the prose and Helen as the passion" (Finkelstein 92). At this point, it is necessary to examine the last scene of the text closely to prove it to be the author's intentional dedication.

Staying one night in Howards End, the sisters plan to leave for Germany. It means they defeat in the ‘class war.’ It also means they cannot be expected ‘to do something practical for the oppressed’ any more. Their culture and liberal

values are too weak to break down Henry's, in other words, materialism's solid barrier. If possible, they can regain their power in Germany, the country of Hegel and Kant, and look forward the future.

On the other hand, Leonard becomes aware of the fact that he has mistaken culture as an end; foolishly enough, he has sought to acquire culture. Finally, he confesses that the things he has pursued, poetry, money, books and night in the woods, are nothing "[b]ecause I (Leonard) see one must have money" (235). Torn by compunction over his relation with Helen, Leonard comes down to Howards End to confess his sin to Margaret. Knowing Leonard to be Helen's lover, Charles Wilcox, "[t]he dull moral blunderer," strikes down him with the flat of Mr. Schlegels' German sword.

The death of Leonard Bast committed by Charles stands for the fall-down of the poor. More ironically, the man who informs Leonard's name to Charles is Tibby Schlegel. He betrays his sister's confidence by revealing who Helen's lover is to Charles Wilcox. Leonard's death resulted from it and one of the Schlegels becomes involved in this murder case. H. A. Smith claims, "Tibby Schlegel betrays the Basts to the Wilcox wolf-pack" (108). Moreover the sword Charles uses to hit Leonard is Mr. Schlegel's. Charles, the son of an industrialist, is allegorical in the context of social positions. He represents industrialists' malicious character.

Forster bitterly denounces the irresponsibility of upper middle class

through Leonard's death. According to Friedrich Engels' bitter criticism of the attitude of the bourgeoisie towards the proletariat, the English bourgeoisie class is "so deeply demoralized, so incurably debased by selfishness, so corroded within, so incapable of progress" (275). In the beginning of *Howards End,* the young Charles Wilcox impudently yells at a bearded porter with his brows crinkled with anger near the railroad station. Charles is described as a young man and "[his] heart in particular is undeveloped" (Finkelstein, 96). He represents Wilcox materialism and his motor-car is emblematic of the Wilcox way of life. He associates everything with property. He ignores his mother's dying will leaving Howards End to Margaret and gets angry at the news of his Father's marriage with fear of losing Howards End. When he discovers a newly arrived and remorseful Leonard at the residence, he erupts in a fury and brandishes a sword. Charles' attack exposes Leonard's "vulnerability to a latently violent society" (Wright 56).

Reasonably Widdowson asserts that the only way to pull Henry-his important economic resources and the house- into connection, and so realize the vision, is to break him. And one way of achieving Henry's collapse is to send Charles to gaol on a manslaughter charge. It is necessary for the victory of Forster's vision, and thus it is necessary in the plot (106). Charles' imprisonment caused by Leonard's death is helpful to resolve problems successfully. Henry is broken down and thus becomes a dragging, enfeebled,

old man and entirely depends on Margaret. If Charles has not been given a decision of 'guilty,' Henry would never lose his vigor.

At first glance, this novel furnishes no answer to the problem of poverty. Moreover the fact that Charles has deprived Leonard of life with the confusion of stick and sword implies that the rich treat the poor "with no more care than swatting a fly" (Mike Edwards 114). It is a curious irony of fate that Leonard dies buried under the books for he has pursued culture, in particular, books. His death reminds us of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, "Fate," for moral integrity in his reasoning to come to Howards End and the conclusion of his 'battle of life' recall Forster's description of the Fifth Symphony: "colour and fragrance broadcast on the field of battle, magnificent death" (47).

However Leonard's death is very significant for the poor. Widdowson has a very particular view about Leonard's sudden death. He thinks Leonard should be removed as an obstacle for the child's future. He thinks Leonard's social position is not suitable for the owner of *Howards End*:

> Leonard has to die to clear the way for his son to be 'Liberal England's' heir untrammelled by the drab reality of his father's life and class; Leonard himself would not fit into 'Howards End/England' but the child brought up in the right environment, will. (Widdowson 104)

Judged from the framework of the story, Forster obviously needs Leonard's

death for the reversion of his plot. From the viewpoint of Forster's design, Leonard's tragic death is an essential tactic for industrialists' reform. The author uses Leonard's death as a retreat to take two steps forward; Forster makes a stepping stone to accuse both the industrialist and liberalists of their brutal nature and apathy; calling them to account, in consequence, he prepares the base that the Schlegel and the Bast' child can inherit 'Howards End/England.'

Another conclusion Forster dedicated to the oppressed of his age is the pastoral life as an altarnative to the Basts' problem. The theme of the destruction of the agricultural life and the sudden emergence of a new urban order is importantly dealt with in *Howards End*. The narrator presumes Leonard to be one of "the third generation, grandson to the shepherd or ploughboy whom civilization had sucked into the town and to be one of the thousands who have lost the life of the body and failed to reach the life of the spirit" (122). Accordingly, when he is almost suffocated by his painful life in the city, he wants to get back to the earth and once walked through the night in the woods indeed.

Forster's writing *Howards End* and his giving the present 'pastoralism' to Leonard Bast through his son seems to make Forster relieved from the burden of guilt. Through such efforts he resolves his liberal dilemma. Traveling to visit Margaret by train to Hilton, Leonard admires the rural people as England's hope and their role of throwing back to a nobler stock and breeding

yeomen. Forster expresses his hope of connected life and seeks the answer in the fields of Hilton: "In these English farms, if anywhere, one might see life steadily and see it whole, group in one vision its transitoriness and its eternal youth, connect--connect without bitterness until all men are brothers" (264). Though this passage is rhetorical and sentimental, as Delany asserts, Forster thinks "obvious candidate for an alterative British culture is pastoralism" (73). It is only Forster's best alternative plan of sincerity to comfort the Basts of England.

The boy, Tom, Miss Avery's grandnephew, is an important character who is expected to be a comrade of Helen and Leonard's son. Forster writes, "They're going to be lifelong friends" (325). The child playing in the hayfield with Tom is the synthesis of dialectic genealogy of classes. Helen's child is "the symbol of classless society" and "Only connect…" (Trilling 100, 101). Tom is seemingly named after Tom Howard, the last man of the Howards End, who asked Miss Avery to marry him. We can estimate from the words "life long friend," like Miss Avery, as a yeoman, he will contribute greatly to restore pastoral life in England.

When Margaret visits Howards End for the first time, the narrator makes very pregnant remark: Margaret "recaptured the sense of space which the motor had tried to rob from her" (201). Modern urban life, represented by motor cars, robs of human beings 'the sense of space' and they can restore it only in the

fields. In the city, for human beings, it is difficult to seek after his own life. In the anonymous life, one forgets his precious individuality and only floats. The yeomen, traditional owner of England, may possess and keep traditional morality. In the last chapter, the pastoral life is depicted in detail: A yeoman is cutting the big meadow. The readers also smell sweet odours of grass on the lawn while a boy plays with a baby on the hay field. A lady, knitting, hangs onto her sister for a while. The narrator describes a beautiful pastoral life on the farm near Howards End:

> The meadow was being recut, the great red poppies were reopening in the garden. July would follow with the little red poppies among the wheat, August with the cutting of the wheat. These little events would become part of her year after year. Every summer she would fear lest the well should give out, every winter lest the pipes should freeze; every westerly gale might blow the wych-elm down and bring the end of all things, and so she could not read or talk during a westerly gale. The air was tranquil now. She and her sister were sitting on the remains of Evie's mockery, where the lawn merged into the field. (325-6)

Margaret's daily life in the fields is well shown in this paragraph yet her life looks not so easy as in London. She must have worked hard as she had advised to Tibby before.

Forster endeavors to restore Leonard and his son to his ancestral right; nevertheless the ending scene impresses the reader as fancy rather than reality. That's because Forster himself does not follow his assertion: "We must combine the new economy and the old morality." When Forster writes *Howards End*, the economic reforms of the new liberalism have been made to deal with the lower class's problem. Thus the workman is no longer left to scramble about for fresh employment. Since the stream of capitalism has already swept all over the Europe, pastoralism seems somewhat goes out of the date. He emphasizes traditional values than new economy for pastoral life.

Forster maintains pastoralism for *Howards End* is his intentional presentation. Though Forster suggests pastoralism as a solution, he must have been aware of his conclusion to be unrealistic. Thus, his conscience as a writer gets him to give his contemporaries a warning of the crisis at that time. As Widdowson says, Forster has "a prophetic sense of the crisis, especially at the level of threatened values" and posits 'the earth' and the 'ancient sanities' of rural life as basic values" (21). A sense of insecurity coexists with hope for rural life at the ending scene of the novel. Therefore *Howards End* is controversial in its ending to be happy or not. At a glance it is a novel of hopeful happy ending but the last scene is not entirely a happy picture.

As Cox asserts, outwardly the last chapter shows us a "pure fantasy, a sentimental hope for the future" (93) but, in fact, the circumstances expressed in

this chapter display the symptom of the social unrest in Edwardian England. Like the people "who collapse when they do notice a thing," Henry becomes aware of "his part of the tangle" and gets eternally tired (326). Helen admits Margaret's life to be heroic for she has triumphed, conquered and picked up the pieces to make a home for all of them. Margaret looks like a winner but she feels "something uncanny in her triumph" for she never wants "to conquer" and break up the Wilcoxes' lives (331). In fact, Forster only wants to combine the two families.

Though at the ending scene of the novel Helen and Wilcox family seem to be reconciled and the connection is attained, the Wilcoxes are not changed at all. Charles Wilcox, the elder son of Henry Wilcox, represents the weak points of the Wilcoxes, inhuman, ‘undeveloped’ ‘heart.’ His activity is usually described with a motor car, the symbol of material civilization. His act, though unintentional, caused Leonard's death and it symbolizes the brutality of industrialists for the working class. Despite Leonard's death, he never finds out his mistake and the serious situation. His imprisonment expedites the Wilcoxes' collapse; nevertheless, they are not defeated like Leonard Bast.

The Wilcoxes are as indifferent to Margaret as ever. Forster says, "The Wilcoxes were not lacking in affection; they had it royally, but they did not know how to use it" (319). However Henry's family still doesn't like Margaret and consequently Henry's bequest of Howards End to Margaret does not go

smoothly. The response of the family is unpleasant and lacking in support. Henry's younger son Paul, "a competent colonial administrator" but "a weak and foolish man," deals with Margaret hostilely. Unavoidably he agrees to his father's plan with the frowning and ill-tempered face. Henry's daughter Evie, "a breeder of puppies, a dull and cruel girl," shows off an ostentatious attitude to Margaret (Trilling 89).

For the harmonious reconciliation, Forster demands much concession. Judging from the fabulous conclusion, both the Schlegels and Wilcoxes cost too much; "the values of the former have been severely compromised, those of the latter entirely broken up" (White 57). The two extreme persons' spirit has broken and accomplished the connection. Henry and Helen sigh out, "I'm ended" in common (304, 327). Still, if they don't undergo calamity presumably we cannot expect their change. Henry cannot droop without being broken down; Charles should be imprisoned for Henry to achieve connection. In case of Leonard and Helen's love affair, "[t]he motivation is sufficient, but based on plot and theme, rather than psychological" (Wright 55). Even Helen's impulsiveness is suspected to be a contrivance to find her love affair with Leonard. The readers may perhaps be moved if Margaret's attempt to expand Henry's spirit and connection is realized, if Helen and Leonard truly love each other. The rainbow of the last chapter is not a product of nature but Forster's painting.

Though the last scene is proved to be Forster’s artificial reconciliation, and the Schlegel sisters are severely compromised, it is obvious that Forster lays much weight on the female power for the harmonious world. If pastoralism looks away modern life, as a result, new economic elements, female power may complement it. Only authorial power, presumably, can fulfill Forster's ideal of what England's destiny might and should be. As Trilling says, Forster seems to argue that the Eternal Feminine should take complete control of the England which the masculine outer life has so sadly muddled (100). Liberal values maintain feminine quality. On occasion, liberalists miss masculine power such as Wilcox way of life. Once Margaret says, "I suppose that ours is a female house." It is "irrevocably feminine, even in father's time" (56).

It is presumably Forster’s concealed hope to combine the female’s old morality to new economy. The final configuration shows complete "female power" of the Schlegel sisters with all adult males "removed in a symbolic castration" (Widdowson 85). The person who cared for the sisters to settle down in Howards End is also female, Miss Avery. Three women alike see a hope from Helen's child. Margaret, as a prisoner, looks up and sees stars beckoning, and catches "glimpses of the diviner wheels from the turmoil and horror of those days." Helen, though dumb with fright at Leonard's death, tries to keep calm for the child's sake. They remind the readers that "horror is not the end" (320).

Actually, Miss Avery, "the heart of Howards End," does much to

connect Margaret to Mrs. Wilcox and Howards End. She offers many sources of the closing events. As a keeper of the keys, she arranges the Schlegels' furniture and books in Howards End. She places Mr. Schlegel's sword within easy reach of Charles, who kills Leonard with it. She sends milk to give the sisters the idea of staying the night; consequently it provides “the reason for Margaret defying Henry" (Widdowson 70). In the end, she declares Leonard's death to be murder. Above all, she may help to fit the Schlegel sisters for pastoral life.

Female power is important for its characteristics are relevance to the working class. Forster thinks that females are suitable to help the child of Helen and Leonard to achieve complete being which Leonard cannot acquire. The child should be cared and nurtured in order to become the owner of Howards End. In that period, modern liberalists should "reformulate liberalism in order to justify policies intended to create an equality of social or welfare rights" (Robert Eccleshall 45). Of course it is on the assumption that materialism is responsible for criticism.

Forster’s concern about the poor deserves admiration. As I already mentioned, Forster misses Victorian age as admirable one because of its practice of benevolence and philanthropy. He perceives the reaction that industrialization has brought about: massive expansion of wealth for some, but the spread of slums, poverty, ignorance and disease in England. These new forms of poverty and injustice made Forster’s liberal tendency converted. Like

other new liberalists, he believes in “new economy” and advocates the social welfare. Forster must have perceived the change in liberalism and thinks the government should intervene actively for the oppressed people with womanly tender morality.

Flowing through *Howards End*, "an androgynous Demeter figure" who "transcends feminism and sexual inequality" plays important role to connect the various classes in the split society (Finkelstein 101, 102). ‘Androgynous’ is already suggestive in harmony. Connection is a grave concern for Forster, and he suggests his ideal form of individuality that makes efforts 'to do something practical.' It corresponds with Ruth Wilcox, Henry Wilcox's late wife who is described as the incarnation of ideal reconciliation. She represents the “primary connection between the Schlegels and the Wilcoxes” (101). She reminds us *Howards End* and pastoral life. In Helen’s letter to Margaret we can meet her for the first time: “Trail, trail, went her long dress over the sopping grass, and she came back with her hands full of the hay” (20).

Mrs. Wilcox is not a main character on the first part of the novel but she becomes a significant figure on the later part. She dies suffering from a lingering illness without cause, and this incurable illness and her death stand for the critical condition of England at that time. Therefore Peter Widdowson's argument is valid. He says, "Mrs. Wilcox, the spirit of 'Liberal England' and of 'the past', inhabits Howards End/ England, but is about to leave it" (85). The

novel implies that the pure Englishness and original owners of England are being dispossessed and faded. She recognizes Margaret to be suitable for a new successor of Howards End and leaves it to her. As Trilling once asserts, Mrs. Wilcox “has wisdom which is traditional and ancestral" (89). Forster describes it definitely:

> She seemed to belong not to the young people and their motor, but to the house, and to the tree that overshadowed it. One knew that she worshipped the past, and that the instinctive wisdom the past can alone bestow had descended upon her - that wisdom to which we give the clumsy name of aristocracy. High born she might not be. But assuredly she cared about her ancestors, and let them help her. (36)

Margaret recognizes Ruth Wilcox to be the idea of greatness; at the little luncheon party that Margaret gives in Mrs. Wilcoxes' honour, zigzagging with her friends over Thought and Art, she is conscious of a personality that transcended their own and dwarfed their activities (86). Mrs. Wilcox represents not only 'old morality' but also ‘new economy’ that is Forster's ideal Englishness, which Howards End signifies. Moreover she possesses femininity of which characteristic is nurture and care. In her funeral, the working class men like a woodcutter and the gravediggers are connected to Mrs. Wilcox.

Mrs. Wilcox also represents the gentle conservatism of England.

Charles's retrospection on his mother shows it clearly: "How she had disliked improvements, yet how loyally she had accepted them when they made"(102). Forster represents the site of the flat-construction that may be observed all over London with mistrust and disgust: "bricks and mortar rising and falling with the restlessness" (59). When she hears that Wickham Place where the Schlegels dwell will be pulled down, Mrs. Wilcox laments: if people may not die in the room where they were born how the civilization can be really right (93).

Forster waits for someone to rescue his contemporary English society. He declares in his essay of 1939, "What I believe," that he believes in aristocracy: "Not an aristocracy of power...but an aristocracy of the sensitive" (73). He mentions three suitable qualities to be his aristocrats, "sensitive, considerate and plucky" (74). In early modern Europe and modern Europe, aristocracy means the nobility or the ruling classes of society. Forster depicts his ideal aristocrats in detail:

> Its members to be found in all nations and classes, and all through the ages, and there is a secret understanding between them when they meet. They represent the true human tradition, the one permanent victory of our queer race over cruelty and chaos. Thousands of them perish in obscurity, a few are great names. They are sensitive for others as well as for themselves, they are considerate without being fussy, their pluck is not swankiness but

the power of endure, and they can take a joke. (Forster “What.I.Believe “ 73)

Forster seems to suggest Mrs. Wilcox as an ideal aristocrat, using Helen's words in her letter from Howards End. Helen writes, "I never saw anything like her steady unselfishness, and the best of it is that others do not take advantage of her" (20-1). Of course Mrs. Wilcox is described as a woman who has the suitable qualities and the wisdom to which we give “the clumsy name of aristocracy” (36). Page asserts, "Mrs. Wilcox is an aristocrat in feeling, not breeding" (68). She recognizes Margaret as her "spiritual heir" and "she needs Margaret to complete her and realize her potentialities" (Finkelstein 102). Above all she keeps Howards End to survive. She saves the vine instead allowing the building of a garage. In my opinion, the Schlegel sisters have grounding in good will and gradually come to maturity of Mrs. Wilcox.

Forster himself seems to want to be an aristocrat, a philanthropist, to free himself from the sense of debt which he feels to the poor. He cannot accept the middle-class privileges "without qualms of conscience" (Cox 78). That is shown in his own theory of aristocracy: he says, even if "the Saviour" comes he will "not preach a new Gospel," he will "merely utilize" his aristocracy. "[H]e will make effective the good will and the good temper which already exist" (Forster “What I Believe” 75).

Forster wants to be the Saviour to unite ‘old morality’ with ‘new

economy' and consequently sacrifice himself to make effective the liberal values. In his real life, he "imitated his art" and "gave away much of what he had, either do charities or to his friends" (qtd. in Delany 76). He hopes to do "ordering and distributing" the native goodness "in the sphere of morals and politics" in the same technique of distribution in economics (Forster "What.I.Believe" 75). Since it is Forster's devout dedication, *Howards End* is valuable, only in its autotelic enough: as a history, it surely has influenced modern society and settled down contemporaries' conscience.

Conclusion

Howards End, like his other novels, is an attempt to connect up all the fragments of English society. As a liberal Forster has the “sense of the need for a radical programme,” to improve his State’s socio-political conditions and as a rentier he has “his underlying uncertainty about the security” (Widdowson 21). Forster sufficiently recognizes the side effects industrialization of his age has brought about. The gulf between the rich and the poor becomes wider, and consequently social and politico-economic problems of class conflict reach its climax. As a liberal humanist, to enlighten the capitalistic industrialists and make them do something practical for the poor, he attaches “high value” to “personal relationship and tolerance” (Lago 65).

However, Forster obviously has a sense of frustration in the possibility of true connections in reality. In *Howards End* he evinces the fact that ideal reconciliation is unattainable; thus he attempts to show an intentional harmony. We can see his ardent wish to connect ambivalent elements in modern society as an answer to the crisis in England. He worried about a society which had been "depersonalized by materialism, philistinism" (Smith 106). Yet his suggestions of ideal relationships are, consequently, frustrated and his conscience, as a writer, cannot help urging his contemporaries to make a compromise with each other and do something practical for the oppressed.

Being in a liberal dilemma and realizing the crisis draws to near, Foster

dreams an aristocrat to save his contemporary society, in particular the poor, as he makes it clear in his essay, “What I Believe.” He hopes the aristocrat should be a man sensitive, considerate and plucky, a man who can combine old morality with new economy. The temple of aristocrats is the “Holiness of the Heart’s Affection” and “their kingdom, though they never possess it, is the wide open world” (74). Thus Forster dreams again to mass-produce the aristocrat. His scheme of raising aristocrats is to unite the capitalistic industrialists with the liberals: The industrialists are the men of achievement and have economic power and the liberals are the men of intelligence who believes in old morality; therefore if they unite they should attain economical and moral growth. Naturally they can do something practical with their good will for the poor on the assumption that aristocrats are more moral and civilized than the rest of the population.

For Forster, writing *Howards End* is a work giving shape to his dream. To get out of his liberal dilemma, he sacrifices the Schlegel sisters as his other self to enlighten the Wilcoxes and to rescue the Basts. He suggests Margaret’s ideal way of connection, connection by proportion, to his contemporaries. The relationship between Margaret Schlegel and Henry Wilcox assumes the form of Margaret’s one sided exertion. She recognizes the need for “a solid material base” for the liberal values to thrive but the Wilcoxes do not possess any sort of inner life and so they fail. Henry Wilcox’s obtuseness, selfishness and his

double moral standards obstruct their real connection. What this failure signifies is that the liberals are defeated in the real war due to their incompetence. Thus they cannot help the “traditional owners of England” to inherit it because of powerful forces inimical to it. The forces mean, of course, materialism.

Unlike Margaret, Helen Schlegel and Leonard Bast’s union is the connection by ideal. Helen’s passion and idealism is united with Leonard’s spirit of adventure but the union is frustrated, running up against the class barrier. She refuses to acknowledge the virtues of Wilcoxism and to compromise and crashes. This failure indicates the intellectuals’ lack of sense of reality and irresponsibility. It is a kind of self criticism of E. M. Forster.

The last scene of *Howards End* is Forster’s dedication to the hopeless of his age as his atonement. He wants to comfort them and encourage their hope. Forster obviously recognizes that an ideal reconciliation among the classes is unattainable in reality and admits liberals’ defeat. Nevertheless he maintains attempting to connect and accomplishes it. As he himself confesses, he ‘tried to strike a balance,’ and consequently the ending of *Howards End* is an intentional, artificial happy picture.

To reverse the situation of the sisters’ frustration and to achieve a harmonious and happy union among the classes, Forster uses a contingency as a device. He designs Leonard's unexpected death: Charles, after receiving unconscious help from Tibby Schlegel, commits a blunder and Leonard is dead.

This accident brings about a considerable change. Charles is sentenced to imprisonment, and as a result, Henry collapses. Without Charles's imprisonment, Henry would never be dispirited. Leonard's death signifies the collapse of the working class due to the Wilcoxes and the Schlegels. Accusing both classes, Forster prepares the base that the child of Helen and Leonard can inherit Howards End.

In *Howards End*, Forster also dedicated the pastoral life as an alternative to the failed connection. Returning to the agrarian life is somewhat anachronistic and unrealistic in a capitalistic era. It is Forster's plan to relieve himself from the burden of guilty feeling. For the reconciliation Forster gets help of female power. Eternal Feminine should recover the England which the masculine outer life has so sadly ruined: the final configuration shows a joint production of three women: Miss Avery, Margaret and Helen. These women represent the feminine characteristics of culture opposed to the Wilcox materialism. For the baby to be cared and nurtured, and furthermore to abolish poverty, disease and ignorance in the society, there must be government intervention and social welfare which need feminine characteristics. Actually, Miss Avery is the representative female who takes care of Howards End/England.

Forster, who wants to preserve old morality and liberal values, advocates female peculiarities of new liberalism. In the twentieth century

liberal governments have usually championed the cause of social welfare. He suggests an Androgynous Demeter figure, Ruth Wilcox, Henry's late wife, who can accomplish an ideal reconciliation. She possesses the virtues Forster demands for his aristocrats: 'sensitive, considerate, and plucky.' Forster must have wanted to be his "aristocrat," and presumably wanted his novel *Howards End* to do the same role as his "aristocrat" does for the struggling working class.

Though he dreams to be an aristocrat, Forster recognizes "real life calls for compromises than may amount to a betrayal of liberal ideas" for the ideal reconciliation (qtd. in Page 58). The values of the Schlegels' undergo mutual concession and those of Wilcoxes break up. He demands each individual to be ready to suffer for harmony. In *Howards End,* the idea is presented well in the last chapter: Leonard Bast is murdered; Charles Wilcox is imprisoned; Henry Wilcox, broken down, becomes a disabled person; the rest of the Wilcoxes give up their property rights; Margaret relinquishes to have her own child; Helen declares never to marry.

Margaret's attitude to Henry in the last chapter is a good example of many compromises made in the novel. When she realizes the fact that the late Mrs. Wilcox intended Margaret to have Howards End, she means to bypass the problem and answers to Henry, "Nothing has been done wrong" (332). However the reconciliation between Margaret and Helen shows the only accomplished connection without compromise in this novel. It is possible because the sisters

have shared the same time, space and experiences mutually. Moreover they regard individuality as precious and tolerate each other's values.

As a rentier, Forster has his own limitation. Though he has worried about the gaps of the poor and the rich, to my regret, Forster has a biased view against the poor: his description of the Basts takes an unfriendly attitude. He shows his narrowness in the treatment of the Basts. Margaret's disgust at Leonard's “half-baked ideas” is realistic enough, but when he depicts Leonard Bast, "his art once more becomes too exclusive" (Cox 83). When the readers read Forster’s definition such as, "[H]e was inferior to most rich people, there is not the least doubt of it," they may be perplexed. When he judges, Leonard "was not as courteous as the average rich man, nor as intelligent, nor as healthy, nor as lovable," the readers may be uncomfortable, in particular of "nor as lovable" (58). His dominant attitude to the Basts is made up of the “distaste for the unattractive surfaces of working-class life” and “an amused superiority” at its bad taste (Maskell 229).

Besides, there are Forster's lacking points which prevent the readers from being touched. Most of all, it is due to the dialectic, perfect structure. This attitude dealing with incidents is perhaps Forster's weakest point: it is often compulsory, artificial and even violent. Duke Maskell's indication is even thrilling: "The intentions of *Howards End* are explicit and impeccable. It urges its readers to 'Only connect...' to build within themselves 'the rainbow bridge...'"

(224). Thus there is no inevitable advance in the development of the story. The author has main characters of *Howards End* awakened and changed only to connect. To achieve completion and harmony, contingency is needed: Leonard's death and Charles' confinement successfully operate to settle problems.

Nevertheless *Howards End* is the novel established Forster's reputation. The evaluation on *this novel* is chiefly centered on the last scene. The critics are broadly divided into two parts. Some critics estimate the ending of *Howards End* is generally regarded as showing harmonious formal and thematic answer and the epigraph "Only connect..." as having been realized. Trilling claims that it is Forster's masterpiece in which Euphorian (Helen's son) plays in the hayfield and suggests a hope (100). Bradbury declares, "'Live in fragment no longer' is undoubtedly part of the ideal proposed by the book" (130). Finkelstein concludes that the final vision is androgynous and it is crucially important that no one and no one sex control anything (92).

Others have criticized the factitious conclusion and unreasonable plot. F. R. Leavis argues that the values Forster appears to prefer to are not achieved in the marriage of Margaret and Henry Wilcox and we are driven to protest against the perversity of intention (41). Cox declares that the union of the child of liberal idealism and underprivileged effort, taking over the heritage of the earth, is a dream (93). Yet, in my opinion, if readers see the connection in two ways, ‘frustrated,’ presented from Chapter 1 to 40, and ‘accomplished,’ from Chapter

41 to 44, they can understand what Forster says far more clearly. While his writing the first part of the novel Forster may be pessimistic, but in the final scenes he may feel relieved taking down his burden of guilt feeling.

Works Cited

A. Primary source

Forster, E. M. *Howards End.* London: Penguin Books, 2000.

Forster, E. M. *Abinger Harvest*. London: Edward Arnold, 1936.

---. “The Challenge of Our Time.” *Two Cheers for Democracy*. London: Penguin Books, 1972. 55-60.

---. “What I Believe.” *Two Cheers for Democracy*. London: Penguin Books, 1972. 67-76.

B. Secondary source

Advani, Rukun. “Introduction.” *E. M. Forster as Critic.* London: Croomham, 1984. 1-21.

Bradbury, Malcolm. "*Howards End*" in *Forster: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury. N.J.: Prentice hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, 1966. 128-143.

---. "Introduction" in *Forster: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury. N.J.: Prentice hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, 1966. 1-14.

Colmer, John. “*Howards End.*” *E. M. Forster*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1975.

Cox, C. B. “E. M. Forster’s Island.” *The Free Spirit.* London: Oxford UP, 1963. 74-

102.

Delany, Paul. "'Islands of Money': Rentier Culture in *Howards End"* in *New Casebook E. M. Forster.* Ed. Jeremy Tambling. London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1995. 67-80.

Eccleshall, Robert. *British Liberalism: Liberal Thought from the 1640s to the 1980s*. New York: Longman, 1986.

Edwards, Mike. *E. M. Forster: The Novels*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.

Engels, Friedrich. *The Condition of the Working Class in England.* London: Penguin Books, 1987.

Finkelstein, Blumentha, Bonnie. *Forster's women: Eternal Differences*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1974.

Furbank, P.N. *E. M .Forster: A Life*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1978.

Heywood, Andrew. *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*. Hampshire: Macmillan Press, 1998.

Lago, Mary. *E. M. Forster: A Literary Life.* London: MaCmillan Press, 1995.

Langland, Elizabeth. "Gesturing towards an Open Space: Gender, Form and Language in *Howards End*" in *New casebook E. M. Forster.* Ed. Jeremy Tambling. London: Macmillan Press LTD, 1995. 81-99.

Leavis, F. R. "E. M. Forster" in *Forster: A Collection of Critical Essays.* Ed. Malcolm Bradbury. N.J.: Prentice hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, 1966. 34-47.

Maskell, Duke. "Mr. Forster's Fine Feelings." *The Cambridge Quarterly* (Spring,

1971). 222-35.

Masterman, Charles F. G. *The condition of England.* London: Methuen, 1911.

Page, Malcolm. *Howards End.* Hampshire: Macmillan, 1993.

Smith, H. A. "Forster's Humanism and the Nineteenth Century" in *Forster*: *A Collection of Critical Essays.* Ed. Malcolm Bradbury. N.J.: Prentice hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, 1966. 106-116.

Stone, Wilfred. “Some interviews with E. M. Forster, 1957-58, 1965.” *Twentieth Century Literature* 43.1 (Spring 1997): 57-74.

Thrilling, Lionel. "*Howards End*." *E. M. Forster.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1982. 84-101.

White, Leslie. “Vital Disconnection in *Howards End*.” *Twentieth Century Literature* 51.1 (Spring 2005): 44-63.

Widdowson, Peter. *E. M. Forster's 'Howards End': Fiction as History.* London: Susex University Press, 1977.

Wright, Anne. “*Howards End*.” *Literature of crisis, 1910-22.* London: Macmillan, 1984. 23-62.