



Journal of

# STEPS

for Humanities and Social Sciences

Volume 1 | Issue 3

Article 38

## Collectivism VS Individualism in H. G. Wells's Kipps (1905) and Edith Wharton's the Age of Innocence (1920)

Amel M. Jasim

Tikrit University, Iraq, amel.mohammed@tu.edu.iq

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.steps-journal.com/jshss>



Part of the [Arts and Humanities Commons](#), [Business Commons](#), [Education Commons](#), [Law Commons](#), and the [Political Science Commons](#)



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 International License](#).

### Recommended Citation

Jasim, Amel M. (2022) "Collectivism VS Individualism in H. G. Wells's Kipps (1905) and Edith Wharton's the Age of Innocence (1920)," *Journal of STEPS for Humanities and Social Sciences*: Vol. 1 : Iss. 3 , Article 38.

Available at: <https://doi.org/10.55384/2790-4237.1100>

This Original Study is brought to you for free and open access by Journal of STEPS for Humanities and Social Sciences (STEPS). It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of STEPS for Humanities and Social Sciences by an authorized editor of Journal of STEPS for Humanities and Social Sciences (STEPS).

# Collectivism VS Individualism in H. G. Wells's *Kipps* (1905) and Edith Wharton's *the Age of Innocence* (1920)

\* **Amel M. Jasim**, English Department, College of Arts, *Tikrit University, Iraq*.

---

Received: 04/03/2022

Accepted: 12/08/2022

---

## Abstract

Individualistic and collectivistic cultures are both the controversial subjects that philosophers have no consensus agreement on which is superior and has the greater value. Whether it is the individual or the group? Ludwig Von Mises (1881-1973) is one of the most prolific philosophers of the twentieth century and a critique of collectivism. He showed a concern for defending individual freedoms, which are essential for lasting peace and prosperity, he is also concerned with combating collectivism. This paper uses this theory of individualism versus collectivism to explore two novels of the twentieth century; Herbert George Wells, (1866-1946) *Kipps* (1905) and Edith Wharton's (1862- 1937) *The Age of Innocence* (1920). This paper will study the critiques of both authors in this field. There would be protagonists confronting collectives. In that since, this paper will study the effect of the society on the individual and how a certain culture would be an obstacle for the goals of the individual.

**Keywords:** Individualism, Collectivism, individual, collective, Equilibrate.

## 1. Introduction

The main difference between collectivism and individualism is responsibilities. In individualistic culture a person is responsible for him/ her accountability, he and she are free to pursue their own lives with as little interference as possible from outside. Individual rights and equality in the law along with privacy are the essential features of this culture. Every single individual is sovereign to themselves, and they are only obstructed when there is an interference in their independence. While in collective culture the wellbeing of a group is given priority over the individual that belong to them. In collective culture the group is responsible for the act of the individual as well as their safety and welfare. Many debates have been made to know which culture is superior and more valuable, however these efforts have no consensus made to resolve this philosophical ideology. Mises showed a concern for defending individual freedoms as he saw them as essential for lasting peace and prosperity. Consequently, he is anxious with combating collectivism. This philosophical discourse is ambiguous as the apprehensive issue is whether the goals of the collective should be seen as more important than the goals of the individual or the opposite. The reality of the effects brought about by cooperation of individuals, cannot be denied. Thus, collectives come into being by the thought and acts of individuals. While the collectives are illogical process. It could be determined by race, religion, country or wealth. These facts make the collectives believe that their goals are superior to individuals as well as all rival collectives, due to that collectives have no ideology but doctrine. Therefore, individuals suffer when their culture stick to traditional outdated dogmas, when this group stands as an obstacle on their happiness and they cannot decide what to choose because of the old-style culture. In that case, these individuals are either going to seek their own aims or suppress all their dreams for the group. To be free in making decision. However, freedom is not licenses to do as mankind please, because the more people do as they please the less they are pleased with what they do, one of the hardest things in the world is to change one's mind, as prejudice could prevent anyone from doing so. However, sometimes even facts are going to be changed according to their nature, and so these facts are not going to be the same as a result of making new scientific discoveries. Therefore, learning how to change the mind is a requirement to connecting knowledge to wisdom.

Culture is usually described as the set of beliefs and values that the general public have regarding how society and nature are connected. Accordingly, culture is deliberated to affect the social norms and also economic conduct like the tendency to bank or to invent, work supply decisions, productiveness choices or the readiness to donate to public benefits. There is an emphasized contrast between limited and generalized morality. Generalized morality denotes that individual maintain a rigid of social norms which are usable for all people in an

assumed society, without discounting any specific group of people. It is based subliminally on the notion that all persons have equal duties and rights as well as share a set of common values. When cooperating with individuals external one's comprehensive family, these social norms do not relate and adaptable and amoral conduct is considered ethically suitable and defensible.

This study may look like a flat narrative, or it may resemble one dimension, but actually it is academic research which profoundly digs into unique analysis. And it includes distinctive exploration.

## **2. Individualism**

Individualism gives emphasis to personal achievement and freedom. Therefore, Individualist culture honors social rank to personal endeavors for instance; innovations, significant discoveries, terrific artistic or philanthropic achievements besides all activities that mark an individual stand out. While Collectivism lays emphasis on embeddedness of persons in a bigger group. It boosts conventionality and dispirits persons from disobedient and standing out. Although it is supposed that individuals are made-up to take care of themselves as opposite to remaining powerfully loyal and integrated to a unified group. A merit that is important to comprehend the relational dissimilarities between collectivism and individualism is the concept of ingroup versus outgroup. The liberated self will have a habit of to behave in the same way with everyone once cooperating but the dependent self will behave contrarily with significant, advantaged relations, the ingroup, then with others with whom interactions are less frequent or important, the outgroup. Therefore, the change in behavior with regard to the outgroup and the ingroup, elucidate the generalized reliance in individualist cultures than in collectivist cultures the difference between the outgroup and the ingroup likewise has effects with regard to relational flexibility that the advanced level of relational mobility in individualist cultures and a lower level of mobility in collectivist cultures. More over the individualist culture, stuff must be individual while in a collectivist, it ought to be more group-based. This difference has been made by MacFarlane, the English historian, the founder of individualism existing in England during the thirteenth century (Yuriy & Gerard, 2013, p.7-19).

In individualist cultures society vision themselves as devising an independent notion of self, but in the collectivists assessment, they are having an interdependent conception of self. Individualists' conception of self does not embrace other people (the self is independent of others) however collectivists' model of self holds other people, namely, friends, members of family, and individuals from the work. Thus, the individualism collectivism measurement is utilized to explain, describe, and forecast dissimilarities in behaviors, communication, attitudes, cognition, values, socialization attribution, and self-concepts. Accordingly, individualism is self-reliance, independence, uniqueness,

autonomy, orientation, competition and achievement. Individualist is represented as having dominance over and taking blame for their activities.

### **3. Collectivism**

In contrast collectivism is connected with a common sense of responsibility concerning one's group, a need for social harmony, interdependence with others, and conventionality with group standards. The reason behind the collectivists attitudes and behavior are determined by customs or norms of the ingroup. For example, close-knit community or extended family (Green et al. ,2005, p. 322-23). However, in eastern society Individualist characteristics have archetypally been connected with masculinity, but collectivist behaviors have been associated to femininity. Individualism is distinct as a circumstance in which persons are apprehensive with themselves and close members of the family only, whereas collectivism is demarcated as a condition in which individuals believe they belong to bigger in-groups. Human being's contribution in indigenous culture forms their personalities and minds, which in turn constructs their cultural atmosphere. Consequently, mind with culture is equally reinforcing. For that reason, a suitable understanding of human being psychology needs studies of cultural effect. The more individualist people have a tendency to be more coherent, collectivist kinds lean towards dependent. That leads to expect collectivists making long lasting choices lacking the participation of others in their group or individualists to heave aside the methodically investigated and reasonable decision to go with an impulsive judgment. There are cultural limitations that have an influence on the decision-making procedure. Subsequently, the wider statement often prepared in the culture that decision-making has general features must be moderated. The cultural characters of individuals besides the universal cultural traits of the social order in which they live aspect into the decision-making progression (Rebecca & Volker, 2013, p. 143). Both meanings of the two terms are quite ambiguous. However, when discussing showed the main issue which is; whether the goals of the collective should be seen as more important than the goal of the individual which would be the collectivist position or whether the goals of the individual should be viewed as a supreme individualist position.

### **4. Individualism or Collectivism**

For that reason, philosophers have long debated over whether it is the collective or the individual who should be viewed as superior and more value? Nonetheless rarely has a consensus being met this unresolved debate is important because the prevailing views on this issue often determined how a society organizes itself and thus the quality of life for its citizens. Ludwig Von Mises (1881-1973) is one of the most prolific philosophers of the twentieth century and a critique of collectivism. He has made many contributions to various fields ethics, social

theory, political philosophy, economy, epistemology and history. He showed a concern for defending individual freedoms, which is essential for lasting peace and prosperity, he also concerned with combating collectivism. Integral to Mises critique of collectivist position was methodological individualism a doctrine which holds that only individuals act and any action by a collective can ultimately be reduced to the actions of various individual (Eamonn, 2010, p.42). He furthermore indicates that what distinguishes only individual action from that of individuals performing as followers of a collective is the dissimilar meaning involved by the people complicated. A collective works always via the intermediary of one or numerous individuals. The connotation that the acting individuals besides all those who are affected by their act quality to an action, that controls its character. It is the sense that scripts one accomplishment as the action of the public or of the metropolis. The hangman, not the national, executes an illicit. It is the denotation of those related to that discriminates in the hangman's action an act of the state. A faction of armed men conquers a place. It is the meaning of those involve which attributes this occupation not to the soldiers and officers on the spot, but then to their nation (Mises,1949, p.42). Accordingly, Mises marked that “it is always single individuals who say We; even if they say it in chorus, it yet remains an utterance of single individuals” (Mises,1949., p.44). In that way clearly compelling an individualist standpoint. Collectivism, in fact, could be specified in no other way than as prejudiced doctrine in which the obligation to a certain ideal and the disapproval of all others are equally compulsory.

The purpose humans say that matters are determined is that every single existing must have an explicit existence. Everything should have a definite nature. Each existence, therefore, can perform or behave only in harmony with its nature, in addition any two selves can interact merely in consensus with their own natures. Nevertheless, while greatest things have no realization and so pursue no aims, it is a crucial attribute of fellow's nature that he/she holds consciousness, and as a result that his/her achievements are self-determined through the decisions his/her mind makes. Thus, the determinist, to support his doctrine, should place his theory and himself outside the supposedly collectively determined territory. That factual science judgments determinism for free will and physical nature for man. In addition to the same cause: that every existence should act in harmony with its particular nature. Then, since humans are free to approve ideas and to perform upon them. It is at no time events or spurs exterior to the mind that make its ideas; rather the mind spontaneously adopts notions about outside events (Murray, 1979, p.8). It is hard to choose in this sense the equality or freedom as each contrasts the other the more one is equal the less free and the free the less equal, however the theorist Balibar says that these two concepts could be combined together in a term called Egaliberte or Equalibrity, wherefore, freedom and

equality are both guaranteed in equal measure. Thus, to dependably petition equality collectively is to demand equality freely. Additionally, to authentically call liberty universally is to demand liberty equally, aiming each individual is to be given the equal freedom. In point of fact, each of them is the other's 'exact measure' (Balibar, 1994, p. 46). Whereas both principles must not be generalized absolutely and at the same time, both liberty and equality's remarkable demands for universalisation convert unavoidably compromised to a certain level. Equality requirements to come to an agreement with liberty at some point in time (Balibar, 1994, p. 48).

#### I. H. G. Wells's *Kipps* (1905):

Herbert George Wells, (1866-1946) was the third child of a small storekeeper. He trained biology before becoming a certified journalist and writer. He composed more than a hundred volumes. He has prophetic imagination, that displayed in revolutionary writings of science. By the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, he was established as a popular writer in England and America, plus his books were briskly being translated into German, French, Russian, Spanish and other European languages. He had grown into one of the leading authors of his day, for his style, themes and belief in global unity was needed for humanity, rather than it destroyed itself. His works, in total, one hundred and fifty pamphlets. However, his amusing comic romances is *Kipps* (1905) in which Kipps succeeds to escape from this enslavement as draper (Patrick, 2005, p.10-11).

The *Story of a Simple Soul* narrates the story of a young man who is bereaved his quiet life when he gloomily fails while trying to prepare himself to upper class life because of his new found fortune. The central character Kipps' struggles to move back to his old life and advancement towards circulating with his juvenile sweet furthermore fails. The novel ends up with Kipps discovering his comforted when he returns to his old life, despite fluctuations in his fortune which was gained, lost unpredictably and regained astonishingly through one of his small profile venture. *Kipps* transports the reader directly into contact with one of the most unique features of Wells's technique. Kipps, the hero, who gives his name to the book, has the wealth to come into the comparative warmth of twelve hundred a year, although still working as a draper's labor in a Folkston emporium. It must have been a wonderful release to him, enough to spin the head of such a simple soul. Miss Helen Walsingham, is Kipps's fiancé and Coote supports of her., she has shown a selfish desire for wealth and possessions, hence, their engagement will provide the same line of her cravings for money. Kipps is on the high road to snobbery as he is too vulgar for the Walsinghams. Kipps never comprehended how odd it would have really been if the remaining of the Walsinghams had not have just let him to blunder through. But Kipps was intended to breakdown from it all. It was a banquet at the Royal Grand Hotel that functioned the final hurt, under withdrawal all the sympathetic knowledge of Chester (R. Thurston, 2012, p.178-80). The apportioning of the thought behind

the assumed in the most comprehensive manner in this novel is merely a note volume of practical tests. The author only broadcasts the details of realistic experiments these are great words, places, atmosphere, and home, which stand for feelings. Besides deeply interfuse in the reader, and they are devoted to a sublime sense and an endless influence.

Wells creates a vague relationship with the engagement which should assure him steadying in Helen's social class, there emerges the dilemma expressed by Kipps's hesitancy between repairing his bond with his juvenile darling Ann – whom he encounters again after several years upon his arrival to New Romney to tell his uncles about his engagement- and remaining of his engagement with Helen. This emotional struggle concentrates the author's evaluating of the social values fundamental the traditional Bildungsroman: if the option of contravening social prospects and following Kipps's longing to coming back to his childhood darling matches to the prospect of self-determination. Once more, it is on the spatial reading that the comparison between the two extremities of the dialectic is articulated. With respect to the restricted connotations presumed by the protagonist's pathway of adjustment and modification in the new social class, the return to the realm of his origin is likewise conveyed from a spatial viewpoint in terms of vitality and an initial that suggests a lost freedom. Where the directness of the environment is echoed in increased social freedoms (Rthesis, 2019, p.16).

In New Romney social distinctions that are primary realities in Folkestone are absolutely nonexistent, and it seemed quite permissible for him to walk with Ann, for all that she was no more than a servant. They talked with remarkable ease to one another, they slipped into a vein of intimate reminiscence in the easiest manner. (Wells, 1993 [1905], p. 182)

The love triangle, which shapes Kipps's contradictions and dilemma, is an additional clue at the takeover of the topic of Bildungsroman, in which the situation of the protagonist between matrimony and the infidelity is usually clear.

He did not clearly know anything. It is the last achievement of the intelligence to get all of one's life into one coherent scheme, and Kipps was only in a measure more aware of himself as a whole than is a tree. His existence was an affair of dissolving and recurring moods. When he thought of Helen or Ann, or any of his friends, he thought sometimes of this aspect and sometimes of that – and often one aspect was finally incongruous with another. He loved Helen, he revered Helen. He was also beginning to hate her with some intensity. {...} he found himself rebelliously composing fierce and pungent insults, couched in the vernacular. (Wells, 1993 [1905], p. 190-191)

The earliest indication of Kipps's disgrace for being Helen's fiancée and of his uncertainties about their wedding and his subsequent approval into the upper class is a gap which can be built-in in the phenomenology of dishonor as it is the original clue at Kipps's aspiration to conceal his engagement: therefore, he did not inform his uncles about it, when he goes to New Romney. The significance of this interval is accentuated a few chapters later as soon as hearing about his uncles' call to Folkstone, he chooses to evade them by passing some days in London. The paradoxes intrinsic in Kipps's condition strengthen between the instant of the first meeting with Ann in New Romney and the second one in the home of Helen's acquaintance where Ann toils as a maid in Folkstone. Kipps's regression, the rejection of a social agreement, and accordingly the elimination from the life related with Helen, would put Kipps's impasse between the two emotional and social poles. What helps Kipps and liberates him from this fear, moreover it comforts him unmask and expose his origins, is Masterman's discourse:

'I'm talking of happiness,' [...] you want a world in order before money or property or any of those things have any real value, and this world, I tell you, is hopelessly out of joint. [...] a community cannot be happy in one part and unhappy in another [...] Consequently people think there is a class or order somewhere just above them or just below them, or a country or place somewhere that is really safe and happy... [...] All the way up and all the way down the scale there's the same discontent. No one is quite sure where they stand, and every one's fretting. The herd's uneasy and feverish. All the old tradition goes or has gone, and there's no one to make a new tradition. Where are your nobles now? Where are your gentlemen? They vanished directly the peasant found out he wasn't happy and ceased to be a peasant. There's big men and little men mixed up together, and that's all. None of us know where we are. (Wells, 1993 [1905], p. 207)

Not even the decision to leave Helen behind and ask for Ann's hand in matrimony directly creates for him the ultimate joyful ending or a complete overcoming of humiliation as it firstly appears. Breaking down the instructions of the psychological and moral growth of the protagonist, Wells demonstrates the bibliophiles what take place after the wedding, enlightening the social complications practiced by this cross twosome. The engagement with Ann establishes, in fact: both in sequential and communal terms the amalgamation with Ann signifies a reversion, a return to the fundamental circumstance. Being firmly connected to the hero's social ascent, disrepute implicates both the moral and social levels. As a societal emotion, it suggests social positions and an actual or exaggerated spectators, while as a moral sensation. It is critical to the characterization of the protagonist's individuality and to the gaining of self-awareness over the comparison with the others. Hence the difficulty of the socialisation procedure estimated by the traditional growth of the main character, morally and psychologically. Kipps has been able to overcome this situation,

which overlaps with his distancing from the traditional standard, from the refinement conventions that the book emphasizes. Wells would have an independent association of nations, indicted above all with the mission of global cleanliness in stopping the lethal world malady, the syndrome of war. Its signs and reasons are well identified, if humans would have nonetheless the bravery and the confidence to use the medication. The correspondent to clear rivalry among dealers is competing race among societies, but the compressed in the single case are merely bankrupt, while the crushed in the other are driven to pieces. In both comparable the burden to a well-balanced payment is the blasted legend of individualism and unbreakable independence. Wells has limited esteem for the concept of élite nationality. In the creation he desires to perceive no national would legitimate to preserve the international majors, any more than an inhabitant can so create his family his castle (Herbert L.,1920, p. 177). The storyline mislays its tension between amorousness and practicality. The characters have a deep flavour of romance. And the continuance of the human race and grounding for the healthier future. Nevertheless, the narrative manners concluding the stories concern about doubts of the upcoming is suitably detached from the contented and warm mid class domestic of Ann. Wells's unsatisfying position in deliberating realism, naturalism and romance in creative writing is due to the unique attitude of the literary market turn of the century in which numerous literary philosophies contest with each other. The closing incident of the book is also decipherable in these terms. After apprehension self-realization through his family and work, Kipps learns that he has unexpectedly acquired a new treasure. This time it is merited and not only expected, acknowledgements to the former share made in Chitterlow's play, which has lastly become profitable. The demand of morals grants therefore a double aspect: the social and the individual. It is found in two noticeably marked and contradictory ideas of education. On the one hand, there are those methods which seek for the improvement of individuality deliberated, in radical circumstances, separately from any other issues and with a parallel suspicion of all régime and governor, and getting much sustenance from the more progressive theories of the psychoanalysts. On the other hand, there are those schemes which have a tendency to consider education as a procedure of control in the benefits of a steadied social order, or in the benefits of any industrial, corporation, economic, religious and so forth, satisfactorily powerful to influence such regimentation. Wells' confidence in the coming World State, in the realism of a collective mind, that will swallow up all the trivial egoisms of humans in its one boundless purpose, there is no disagreement. Modern life is unquestionably much difficult, and gives an annoying form of a huge and worthless misperception, and to the superficial sorts of that confusion.

Wells has set the examining gaze of an important, methodically skilled mind. He, in that sense has been both an opponent and an exponent of this code; but on consideration will be established that the ambiguity recommended is purely due to the fact that he has used the word in two very dissimilar opinions. It means

mere unconventional behavior, the needed uniqueness of the individual man, or unrestrained and aggressive selfishness seen maybe most intensely advanced and most dynamic. Wells has moved towards individuality; so much as he is anxious with the re-shaping of the future along the lines of his prejudices and private tastes, and along lines of system, order, and progression to some predicted strategy. Wells' main statement is considered an up-to-date prophet of education. This response is a far diverse device from the inactive reaction of ideas. Run-through studied is preparation becoming liberal (Doughty, 1926, p.163-77). Researchers have put emphasis on Wells's socialism at the payment of his obligation to liberalism. Liberalism situates to socialism as the soul to the body. He frequently uttered a political policy of collaboration between liberalism and socialism. He assumed that socialists should not establish electorally outer the context of the enlightened alliance between Labour and Liberals. Drastic Liberals should be fortified in the course of socialism; however, they should not be provoked over socialist antagonism at the elections. Perfectly because he genuinely believed he was a Liberal. The central point is that he was by no means distinctive in philosophy without contradiction. This was in fact quite a public New Liberal trope (Richard, 2013, p.32).

The work could be described in relations of the ways in which not just articles, but further more about perception of materiality has been accurately organized to carry a full, accustomed situation in which an imaginary description could play out morality in fortitude on frank realty. The creation is a form of material. Concurrently this procedure could be described as audacious in that it Wells hypothesises a storyline that is polemical. But exploits materiality as a fixed of rare materials for reasoning engagement, besides separation up until Kipps makes his true decision. In the lack of agreement or harmony between him and Helen, when there is a real dissonance in chapter VI. Discords Kipps was definitely artless, but he was correspondingly pleasant. His growth in the realm conveyed diminutive modification in his charisma, also he tried courageously to create the change. One important purpose of Wells in composing his romances was to bring back this moral of chaotic and imprudent society, to clarify how misleading are the resistances set up for *laissez faire*, and in how changeable a manner human use in single matters a belief which shocks when its use is recommended in another.

Kipps is study in class differences a poverty to luxuriant. The dramatic interest of the book is how the protagonist transfers the moral, intellectual, and emotional complications that come with fortune and a modification of social station. Kipps, the protagonist, is the only character who is fully matured, plus all events are recounted from his point of view. He acquires that wealth does not guarantee respect, specifically if a man does not try to fit in with the other. The novel might be considered as a jolly story around *faux pas*, however, there is a little of Kipps in nearly everyone. Wells' book sponsor the metaphor of knowledge as a luminosity.

## II. Edith Wharton's *The Age of Innocence* (1920):

Newbold Jones or Edith Wharton's (1862- 1937) *The Age of Innocence*, is her twelfth novel published in 1920 then distributed by D. Appleton and Company as a book in New York and in London. *The Age of Innocence* has become the first book written by a lady to win a Pulitzer in 1921. It reveals some actual conflict in social life, such as divorce, sex deviation, and also bias and prejudice as well as distinction between upper and lower class. *The age of Innocence* depicts the lives between Newland Archer, Ellen Ollenska and May Welland. It openly deals with sexuality themes, that is regarded as taboo for a lady to leave her spouse and pick out to love somebody else. Wharton also gives the ethical message that couples must be loyal with each other. Wharton narrates the story by Newland, Ellen Ollenska and May as main characters in her novel. The story describes how Newland will fall in love with, May's cousin, Ellen who is recently separated from her obnoxious husband, but then gets married to May. These characters who have different personalities, also have different backgrounds. The crucial of marital status can be seen the minute Ellen wants to get divorce from her husband, but her family disagreed with her attitude. All society talk about her divorce as her husband is abusive ( Dwi Septi, 2015, p. 4-5). The novelist explains the social conditions in the nineteenth century. By that she criticizes the collective reality in New York. The New Yorker tradition and convention roll on the individual's life.

“Well --- she left him; nobody attempts to deny that.”

“He's an awful brute, isn't he?” continued the young enquirer, a candid

Thorley, who was evidently preparing to enter the lists as the lady's Champion. (Wharton, 1920, p. 11).

The author displays how the mentalities, norms, notions and tradition control the society over any other power. That convention has the authorities over the decision people could make.

Well --- then --- what more is there? In this country are such things tolerated? I'm a Protestant --- our church does not forbid divorce in such cases.” (Wharton, 1920, p.83).

The work portrays the social truth of American culture in nineteenth century, by describing the political aspects, economic, social, technology and science features. In addition to the religious aspect, Wharton's novel has focused on Ellen and May as the picture of two dissimilar descriptions of womanly individuality. Scandalous and innocent correspondingly, it aims to inspect the formerly ignored difficulties women face and challenging with the divorce and marriage juxtaposed. These facts have exposed an oppressive social order for women. They have to agonize disloyalty of their husbands, but if they ask for divorce, they must

also have social punishment. What makes Ellen flight away from conventional New York although she referred to tenderly by declaring “this dear old place is heaven” (Wharton, 1920, p. 14). The unhappy ending of her love suggests, the weakening of the heroine as an indication of Ellen’s struggle for individuality, freedom and liberation. Because of her dilemma between her freedom and her love for Newland. She wants to be close to Newland and at the same time she fears the society judging and criticizing her, let a side that she is already separated from her husband. Ellen as a female individual has had many complications and difficulties on confronting such society. The novel’s closing comment on Ellen’s choice to leave Newland then go to Paris could be seen as illustrations of the disturbance of the influence of others’ interferences and control a credit of female opinion, activity and struggle.

Newland has inclined to have two overarching conflicts between social convention and individual desire; viewing Newland’s opinion of women begins to release from convention to more liberal. Nevertheless, through his mixture construction of contradictory situations with his hypocrisy, Newland represents the weak individual in the eyes of individual desire and social convention. The conflict between these social conventions and (Ellen) his individual desire has illustrated the gender roles in marriage, illuminating the contradictions and dilemma in Newland’s mind. However, his hybrid speeches expose ideas in Newland’s mind.

When Sillerton Jackson accuses Ellen of living with M. Riviere, her former lover, Newland says: “Living together? Well, why not? Who had the right to make her life over if she hadn’t? I’m sick of the hypocrisy that would bury alive a woman of her age if her husband prefers to live with harlots.... Madame Olenska has had an unhappy life: that doesn’t make her an outcast”. (Wharton, 1920, p.39)

Newland’s specious viewpoint toward women’s liberty and then his anxiety for the consequences of this free will, expose his uncertainty. Newland shows his pride by marrying innocent woman, while he is reflecting sexual experience on his past. His declaration on the convention that saves and protects the family together which is his mechanism of a patriarchal ideology of marriage by pursuing to declare the exchangeability of collective interest and convention. It is also after this point that he and Ellen are a depiction of victimized and self-sacrificing individuals, because of the pressure of their society for the sake of collective satisfaction. Newland hesitates between collective approval and his longing to break away from the social order. In peculiar contrast to the picture of Newland that is offered as a conventional husband returning to the traditional inherited notions about matrimony. He badly desires to break away from the restrictiveness of New York but illogically he likewise considers in it. He appreciates it from within the ethical backgrounds of Old New York. However, by portraying Newland’s unbroken hesitancy between liberation and convention,

love and matrimony this implicates his slavish devotion to the preventive societies of Old New York.

Certain people and characters of Wharton's novel try to protect the inherited old values from their forefathers by securing themselves from the contemporary community. They are not given much room in the novel and this, according to Wharton's critique, shows that they are about to disappear (Ihsan,2006, p.51). Nevertheless, the normal people of the time are seen to have already changed because of the transformation that the humanity is experiencing under industrialism. The member of the true aristocratic families, for instance, though they prevent the destruction in conventions, appear to have changed to a certain point. They do not say anything against Ellen's style of wearing clothing and manner which is provocative. Even they do not disapprove her leaving the Duke. Both Newland and Ellen in *The Age of Innocence* suffer not fundamentally because of the influence of the society however for they are torn between the standards of democracy and aristocracy. Their living in a culture unconcerned to their emotional state is part of their destiny. They cannot choose between the two worlds; their abstentions and self-denial lead them to suffer. This establishes the key difference between them and other characters. Their suffering is a consequence of their being more moral as most of the other fellows of the society are about to be devoid of morality. Although, the suffering heroes cannot be described as ethically superior to other characters.

What makes Newland Archer essentially different from the other characters is his interest in scientific and literary books and having an active imagination. Ellen and her posture play an opposing effect in his consciousness of this monotonousness. His belief concerning women's right to be as free as men should be a derivation of his understanding habit. Yet, his conventionality to the rules of his communal set is continued all over the novel. He mechanically tries to evade himself from being drawn to Ellen as she embodies a rebellion against conventions. Primarily, by advancing his betrothal to May, and additionally he efforts to advance his marriage. Plus, he states that Ellen has a right to live as she desires and encourage her divorce from her husband, he consents the responsibility to convince and persuade her not to divorce. Accordingly, he makes it difficult for himself to marry Ellen. Her case makes him suspicious of the suitability of the established convictions of his circle and there performs a struggle between his feeling and reason of politeness, between the unavoidable conventions and his morality, between the unfitting wisdom of the old outline and the love with sexual nature which will block his way to contentment. It is seeming that he would lead a pleasing life if he did not enquire the inevitable old rules. When Ellen's frankness influences him most by establishing a distinction against the insincere and twofaced world of society. It is not astonishing that, at the end of the story, he returns back to his guesthouse after sitting on a bench opposite the building of which Ellen lives in Paris. Considering that he can reach her, Newland has turned back for the second time. And it is the second time for Ellen

too, although she knows that he is there, she does not turn her eyes on him. Newland crowns his faithfulness to his true self and his wife by returning to his hotel which signifies his inclination for the traditional notions of the age of innocence.

The 1870s New York is represented by Wharton as an ever-changing world. Ellen is an embodiment of the new lady in diverse degrees. Although she appears to have sexual freedom to a certain level, furthermore she has moral consciences which mark her at least lightly tied to the old morals. Newland is fascinated by Ellen's originality. Yet, the tension between his normal and acquired personality makes him grieve and at the end his actual character succeeds. Ellen is dissimilar on the surface but what makes her desist from espousing Newland is her American side: she hears that May refuses to be happy at the expense of someone else's unhappiness. Newland and Ellen are knights in rusty armours: what they pick to dress make them incapable of moving. Although their difficulties can be connected to their principles regarding others, neither of them can be proper in the precise sense of the word. Although they are married to other people, they kiss each other more than once and they are prepared even for an illicit relation. Newland has an affair with a married woman and Ellen enjoys sexual freedom. Their concern in the new notions both part and unite and them. They support freedom and pay for that. At the end, Newland, whose determination is not as robust as his aspirations and dreams, comes back to his unchallengeable self and Ellen belongs to Paris. In Archer's case the cause of the disappointment is seeming. His contemporary views lead him to be captivated by the uniqueness of Ellen Olenska; nevertheless, his inherited inclinations guide him to hinder his own way to Ellen by quickening his engagement and wedding to May (Ihsan, 2006, p.33-37).

Wharton has turned individual and social behaviors into a manuscript which makes interpretation and reading those individuals possible. The concerned of culture is highly pleasing for what is leading is the cultural life of a particular society at a precise time in the history of America. Wharton deals with cultural practices and societal values and of a society. She displays how traditional values change from one generation to another. She describes the stories of the New Yorkers breached into the kinship of its citizens. This is a conventional dismal city twisted into a powerful personified character which knows, sees, confirms, and rules all the essential beliefs and affairs of its citizens. Wharton exposes the refined superficial manners of authoritative wealthy families who shadow strict programs of personal and social behavior and custom. Most of the characters are the creation of these stultifying collective instructions from which there is no escape.

The concepts of modernism, the meaning of culture under the hollowness of World War I, besides different viewpoints towards women and principles determining their lives, behavioral patterns, marriage, divorce, and money are the facts that Wharton is anxious about (Haytock, 2010, p. 1-2). Only Ellen as

stranger, enacts in a different way and assists Newland see differently. As she encounters away the covers of conventionality, Newland comes to be awake to reality. Newland's suspicion and loathing towards New York's method of tradition specify that he has the convention in himself. His awareness is a faulty one for it is formed by the same structure which he hates. The novel presents other issues which show the comprehensive and oppressing power of New York society. One night, Newland considers on his future wife May, who is a

“terrifying product of the social system {...}and with a shiver of foreboding he saw his marriage becoming what most of the other marriages about him were: a dull association of material and social interests held together by ignorance on the one side and hypocrisy on the other {...} In reality they all lived in a kind of hieroglyphic world, where the real thing was never said or done or even thought, but only represented by a set of arbitrary signs...”. (Wharton, 1920, p.40-42)

While he confesses to Ellen that “We’re damnably dull. We’ve no character, no colour, no variety” (Wharton, 1920., p.242). These two characters are so strongly knitted together in the social and historical context of New York, and so familiar with social and cultural events and experiences, they have similar identities and fates. Now the readers come to the notions of family and marriage that have always played considerable roles in American society, especially during the era depicted in the novel. At the end of the novel, Wharton suggests that culture is not a customary of static principles and values imposed on society, but rather, a procedure of self-motivated and becoming values that influence both individuals and society. Several years later, Newland apprehends the collapse of the values and principles of his family by hearing and seeing Dallas’s (his son) behavior and ideas. Dallas desires to marry Fanny, Beaufort’s illegitimate offspring. Like Ellen, Fanny has been in Europe, nevertheless, in difference to Ellen, her reappearance to New York does not thrill people’s suspicions, moreover they would have permitted her coming back. Dallas and Fanny are the spiritual broods of so numerous sacrifices and impulse; their union sanctifies the arrival of a changed society in which previous outlaws have convert in-laws. Dallas is the illustrative of the new generation besides, he has the ability and confidence that derive of observing fate as an equal not as a master. New York is altered not only technically, with the telephone but also traditionally. Wharton's novel embodies this alteration and exemplifies culture as change (Hossein & Fatemeh, 2011, p.88-90).

The matter of divorce in Wharton’s novel is considered as a root of isolation and alienation. Old American society regards a divorced woman as fallen woman; consequently, a woman should endure all she faces with her spouse to keep her marriage. However, women in the novel are not allowed to pursuing their contentment through matrimony, even though the perception of marriage is diverse from each woman. Ellen does not allow these judgmental standards press her self-assurance or weaken her fortitude to be her own. It is expected that her

time absent from New York lets her to break free from the chains that fastened its chic society. Once she comes back home to New York, she imagines to be received with open arms rather than defeated by feeling of scorn. She is the target of betrayal and declaring her forte of character by deciding on to leave her husband. At first it looks that Newland purposes are to challenge the count's charge of Ellen disloyalties, to eradicate Ellen from the positions of disloyal woman, letting him keep his clean enthroned copy of her intact. Newland waits for Ellen to give evidence that she is acquitted of these charges. She neither refutes the accusation nor owns up to them. Newland reads her quietness as a revelation but later learns the fact. Accordingly, He affections Ellen and tries to attain some sign of emotion from her as he has a passionate vision of Ellen. But, she appears to be a villain, she is also a protagonist and an object of her society. The novelist considers the Lady as a victim because she is abused by Old society. She attempts to expose that Ellen is not intimidated at the end of the novel. Nevertheless, she is able to oppose the borders forced by male-controlled society quite straightforwardly and to move herself in a new, neuter society she is able to surpass these unwanted compulsions and challenge the masculine power. Although Ellen is a divorced lady, but then she is a heroine for she has the bravery to transcend the rigid boundaries of the old society of New York. Wharton suggests that Ellen has the ability to open a window for females to fight against the chains of society and preserve their rights (Haziam& Hanan, 2015, p.3-5).

## 5. Conclusion

H G Wells has depicted Kipps to be an individual seeking his love and satisfaction encountering the group who wants to control his own life. Kipps finds himself in bizarre situation from which it is difficult to escape. His engagement to Helen is a rabbit hole. He wants to be free and at the same time Helen and the surrounding society are controlling him completely. Up until Kipps makes his true decision. In the lack of agreement or harmony between him and Helen, when there is a real dissonance in chapter VI Discords Kipps was definitely artless, but he was correspondingly pleasant. His growth in the realm conveyed diminutive modification in his charisma, granting he tried courageously to create the change. One important purpose in composing Wells's romances was to bring back this moral of chaotic and imprudent society, to clarify how misleading are the resistances set up for laissez faire, and in how changeable a manner humans use in single matters a belief which shocks when its use is recommended in another. Furthermore, Wells has been concerned to enflame his readers to self-determining thought. It would rather be opposite intelligently than reinforced stupidly. His struggle is against the routine of mental idleness in what traces public prosperous, and he dislikes with a perfect abhorrence that habit of educational saying which he has named the personality's shelter from authenticities. Kipps had it illuminated to him as measure of his equipment for his new social class that it is an indication of education that the proper gentleman not ever displays his belief

outside the walls of a house of a worship. The massive attractiveness of Wells is a mark of these present-days, and not an immoral indication. Provocative humour, imaginative smartness, cleverness in characterization, and the interesting essence of anti-conventionalism, have made him a great achievement among authors with a high degree.

Wharton's *The Age of Innocence*, has two main characters Archer and Ellen. Both of them has certain goals to pursue their happiness. While these objectives are considered to be individualistic, therefore, they should confront the collective to make these dreams come true. Ellen does not allow these judgmental standards press her self-assurance or weaken her fortitude to be her own. It is expected that her time absent from New York lets her to break free from the chains that fastened its chic society. she is able to oppose the borders forced by male-controlled society quite straightforwardly and to move herself in a new, neutral society. She is able to surpass these unwanted compulsions and challenge the masculine power. Granting Ellen is a divorced lady, but then she is a heroine for she has the bravery to transcend the rigid boundaries of the old society of New York. Wharton suggests that Ellen has the ability to open a window for females to fight against the chains of society and preserve their rights. Archer fails to go cross from his realm to Ellen's despite the fact that his adoration for her is factual and persistent. He flunks to achieve his love for Ellen for the reason that he lacks the capacity to choose. Archer desiring for the decency and structure of his older era, then growing occurs once he faces his duties. But he keeps his fantasy as his lost love. The novelist displays the effect of collective's attitude and standards against the individual desires, although their values and principles are out of date plus these ideologies are unfair, discriminating and prejudiced. Wharton ends up by Archer's being unable even to meet Ellen, to concentrate on her censure to the weakness of the individual, who cares about the societies' point of view more than what is right or what is wrong. She critiques the powerlessness and the hopelessness of such figures, by not making her novel have a happy ending. As a result of that she is reflecting the unkindness as well as the meanness reality of hypocritical life.

## References

1. Balibar, Étienne. (1994) "Rights of Man' and 'Rights of the Citizen'", In: *Masses, Classes, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy before and after Marx*. New York: Routledge.
2. Dwi Septi Novitasari 2015 Negative Perception Over Widow's Status in Edith Wharton's *The Age of innocence* (1920): A Sociological

- Approach/A320110124 Department of English Education School of Teacher Training and Education muhammadiyah University of Surakarta
3. Eamonn, Butler. (2010): Ludwig von Mises – a Primer. Copyright © The Institute of Economic Affairs 2010 Westminster London sw1p 3lb in association with Profile Books Ltd
  4. F. H. Doughty (1926): H. G. Wells: Educationist. Jonathan Cape ' 30 Bedford Square Butler ~ Tanner Ltd Frome and, London.
  5. Green, Eva G. T Jean-Claude Deschamps. (2005): Variation of Individualism and Collectivism Within and Between 20 Countries A Typological Analysis University of Lausanne Dario Páez University of The Basque Country Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Vol. 36 No. 3, May 2005 321-339
  6. Haytock, Jennifer. (2010). Edith Wharton and the Conversations of Literary Modernism. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
  7. Herbert L. Stewart. (1920): The Prophetic Office of Mr. H. G. Wells. International Journal of Ethics, Jan., 1920, Vol. 30, No. 2 (Jan., 1920), Pp. 172-189
  8. Hossein Pirnajmuddin & Fatemeh Shahpoori Arani. (2011): Edith Wharton's The Age of Innocence: A Cultural Studies Reading. www.cscanada.net /Studies in Literature and Language. Vol.2 No.1, 2011.
  9. Ihsan, Durdu. (2006): The problem of cultural transformation and individual integrity in Edith Wharton's novels Thesis (M.A.), Marmara University (Faculty of Literature) NoV111341. ISBN9783640865079.
  10. Mises, Ludwig von. (1949): Human Action: A Treatise on Economics, New Haven: Yale University Press.
  11. Murray N. Rothbard. (1980): Individualism and the Philosophy of the Social Science. with a Foreword by Friedrich A. Hayek © 1979 Cato Institute. All rights reserved. CATO institute 747 Front Street San Francisco, California 94111.
  12. PATRICK, PARRINDER, (2005): H. G. WELLS Tono-Bungay with an Introduction and Notes by EDWARD MENDELSON Penguin Books Ltd, Registered Offices: 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL, England © Patrick Parrinder,
  13. Prof. Haziam Mhmood Ismael & Hanan Abbas Hussien (2015): Ellen Olenska's Character in Edith Wharton's The Age of Innocence. University of Baghdad - College of Education for Women - English Language Dept. J. Of College of Education for Women vol. 26 (4)
  14. R. Thurston Hopkins. (2012): H. G. Wells Personality Character Topography. With illustration by E. Harries Printed in Great Britin
  15. Rebecca, Lefebvre and Volker, Franke. (2013): Culture Matters: Individualism vs. Collectivism in Conflict Decision-Making. International Conflict Management, Kennesaw State University, 1000 Chastain Road, Kennesaw, Georgia 30144, USA.

16. Richard Toye. (2013): H.G. WELLS AND THE NEW LIBERALISM<sup>1</sup>University of Exeter R.Toye@exeter.ac.uk 16 May 2013 JOURNAL Twentieth Century British History. COPYRIGHT ANDREUSE Open Research Exeter makes this work available in accordance with publisher policies
17. WELL, H. G. (1906): SKIPPS.THE STORY OF A SIMPLE SOUL.NEW YORK CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. COPYRIGHT 1906, BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS PUBLISHED, 1906
18. Wharton, Edith. 1920. The Age of Innocence. New York.
19. Yuriy Gorodnichenko & Gerard Roland. (2013): Understanding the Individualism-Collectivism Cleavage and its Effects: Lessons from Cultural Psychology. University of California, Berkeley NBER and CEPR. All content following this page was uploaded by Yuriy Gorodnichenko on 28 June 2015.