

Leonard and Virginia Woolf's Rhetoric of New International Space

Yuko Ito

The binary concepts of civilisation and barbarism haunt the Bloomsbury Group, especially Leonard Woolf's writings between the wars. These notions are assigned specific territories in the institution of imperialism. In imperial geography, civilisation inhabits the centre, Britain, and barbarism, the margins, the colonised territory. In ancient Greece "barbarian" designates one who does not speak Greek, one living outside the pale of the Roman empire or a rude, wild, uncivilised person ("barbarian," def. A2, *OED* Vol. 1: 945). In this sense, the notion of civilisation is based on the European classical tradition and those outside it are defined as barbarians. The margin is to be civilised and its colonisation is to be justified according to imperialist logic. In 1902 J. A. Hobson who offered a definition of classical imperialism assumed that internationalism had been contained in imperialism as "an ideal unity of the empire" that ensures security and peace (8-9).

Clive Bell, Virginia Woolf's sister, Vanessa Bell's spouse, defines the concept of 'civilisation' in *Civilization: An Essay* (1928), by explaining the counter part of civilisation, 'barbarism' and 'savage.' Civilisation is conceived on the foundation of the binary concepts of civilisation and barbarism. For Bell, civilisation is characterised by Arnoldian aristocratic features which are "against the flock instinct" (180), that is to say, against working-class vulgarity. Bell constructs the notions of civilisation such as "a taste for truth and beauty," "intellectual honesty" or "good manners" (163) from, as is often criticised, an elitist viewpoint. He aestheticises civilisation and defines it as the character of the man of taste. Besides Bell's definition, Brian W.

Shaffer traces, in Leonard Woolf, civilisation as something that “aspires to global unity” (25), “individual and mental thing” (26).

In Leonard Woolf’s writing, barbarism is located within the civilised people’s mind and their politics, which he explores in the process of drawing a cognitive map of the civilised mind. The international space that Leonard and Virginia Woolf postulate is a non-existing space that is metaphorically compared to ‘network.’ Leonard Woolf particularly conceives of ‘internationalism’ outside the system of imperialism. They impose their own imaginative, idealised space on the international space, for their specific purposes: international peace and women’s self-realisation.

This paper explores the idea of civilisation and an international space as an imaginative community conceptualised by Leonard Woolf and Virginia Woolf’s work, focusing on: firstly, Leonard Woolf’s concept of ‘international space’ in his proposal of the international government; secondly, the rhetoric of civilisation in Leonard Woolf in the context of international peace; finally, justification of the enforcement of law and Virginia Woolf’s literary international co-operation.

I

To investigate the representation of international space in Leonard Woolf’s thought, it is particularly important to examine his *International Government* (*IG*) (1916), which came out as a statement of the Fabian Society’s early-war-time foreign policy. *IG* explores one of his highest concerns during and after the Great War, the establishment of an international organization to maintain peace, and in the process sketches the idea of a new international space. His arguments in this piece anticipate later works such as *Economic Imperialism* (*EI*) (1921) and *Imperialism and Civilization* (*IC*) (1928) in which, as discussed later, he will aim to revise his ideas.

In Britain, the idea of an international organisation was discussed in several groups and each made proposals conceptualising the organisation in

1915. There were a non-utopian and practical Bryce Group founded by James Bryce including G. Lowes Dickinson, who coined the name, 'the League of Nations' in 1914, middle-class, liberalistic League of Nation Society and the British Fabian Society.¹ By 1916, these major groups and the League to Enforce Peace in America made basic agreements, including the enforcement of collective economic and military action (Egerton 18). The early wartime plans advanced beyond the pre-war peace movement in this sense (Egerton 18).

When World War I broke out, Leonard Woolf was a member of the Fabian Society, a socialist group, which is said to have its roots in Victorian pragmatism and philanthropy, an action to promote the happiness and well-being of the working class. Drawing on his experience as a governmental agent in Ceylon between 1904 and 1911, Woolf authored an article, "An International Authority and the Prevention of War," on the possibility of supervising governments, which was published as a special supplement to the *New Statesmen*, on 10 July 1915. The article then appeared as *International Government* in 1916, which is supplemented with a more detailed proposal, "International Government" including practical approaches such as the establishment of international standards in communication, public health, industry, morals and crimes. Egerton calls this "functionalist approach" or "gas and water internationalism" that is typical of the Fabians (16). *IG* provided the Fabian Society with a perspective on international politics and influenced the framework of the League of Nations (Walters 22, 59).

Walters considers the drafts of the work by Norman Angel and Leonard Woolf as the most significant ones, as their drafts anticipate almost all of the important characteristics represented in the covenants of the League of Nations. Hiroshi Yoshikawa, in his analysis of Leonard Woolf's pacifist thought, states that Woolf's and Angel's conceptions of substituting an international order maintained by law for war and anarchy is not unprecedented. It had been already examined in the 19th century and they pushed this pacifist idea forward to realise an international government (Yoshikawa

9–11). Woolf is considered a liberal internationalist and distinguished from utopian internationalists such as H. G. Wells and Marxists who committed themselves to socialist internationalism (Rich 117). Woolf's ideas contributed to the British Draft in 1919 which was composed after examining Woodrow Wilson's second draft. Howard-Ellis remarks the excellence of technical co-operation in the British draft which is directly traced to Woolf's *IG* (84). The agreed Anglo-American Draft, the Hurst-Miller Draft in 1919 is largely based on the British Draft and the Third Wilson Draft.²

Most importantly, Leonard Woolf tries to introduce a new concept of international relations. He argues that up to then international relations used to signify an international relationship in terms of domestic or imperial interests. He describes what "international" used to mean:

The ordinary view is that the action of a nation is to be determined solely by its own ideals and desires. In a sense, therefore, any international question is not international, but domestic, and a sovereign Power always has to consider only two things — what it desires and whether it is strong enough to enforce its desire. But the whole of an international organisation and authority implies an agreement that each nation is willing that its action will be, in part, determined by what other nations desire. (*IG* 28)

His idea of an international relationship is not dominated by hegemonic interests. "International" signifies a psychical space or an imagined community among nations; its spatial territory not visible on the world map and its meaning and territory modifiable by different definitions. Woolf's description of international space offers the anti-hegemonic articulation of that invisible space. He puts forwards a concept of international space which builds on a mental territory of co-operation rather than on domestic preoccupations with self-interest and desire.

More concretely, "international" also means "belonging to the International Working Men's Association." One of the uses of "international" to signify a community which consists of the same interest groups from several countries in Europe is shown in "The Working Men's International" estab-

lished by Karl Marx. In his "Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association" in 1864, Marx envisages the possibility of "a still greater victory of the political economy of labour over the political economy of property" (11) and the emancipation of labour even against philanthropic middleclass spouters "who have all at once turned nauseously complimentary to the very co-operative labour system they had vainly tried to nip in the bud by deriding it as the Utopia of the dreamer" (12). Leonard Woolf's new international space is not directly related to the labourers' group, but at the beginning of his earlier proposal in "An International Authority," he quotes from a socialist conference which discusses "some form of international organization" that unites working classes of all industrial countries (IG 7). In this sense, Woolf partially derives his conception of international network from the working class's internationalism. The beginning of his relation to working class's co-operative movement is seen in the fact that Leonard and Virginia Woolf were friends of Margaret Llewelyn Davies, who devoted her life to the Women's Co-operative Guild, and Leonard Woolf, particularly, is involved in this movement.³ In his autobiography Woolf comments: "The vitality and inspiration of the Guild — and also its organization — were mainly due to Margaret" (*Beginning Again* 102). The Women's Co-operative Guild, Davies states in 1931, was building its international network, and she stresses their Pacifist movement as it submitted the members' demand for disarmament to the League of Nations.

In *Imperialism and Civilization (IC)*, Leonard Woolf presents two contradictory systems of international space:

The first is the respectable and time-honoured system of individualism. The world of nations is a world of sovereign and independent States, individual and omnipotent units of statehood, each pursuing through an imaginary international vacuum its sacred interests. Unfortunately the real world is not an international vacuum. . . . The system is therefore individualistic, and under it the ultimate arbiter is power and force. . . . The other system is based on a completely different conception of the world of nations. It is no longer a world of isolated units moving majestically along their own orbits; it is a world of States, nations, and peoples, all closely interrelated parts of

a vast international society with its own economic and political organization.
(115–16)

Here, two kinds of space he mentions are both imaginary. Imperial states presume an illusory space that is free to be territorialized. His definition of the new international space is also metaphorical. Woolf's idea of the new international space is of a world where all the states, nations and peoples are interrelated as a network. He declares: "I am not one of those who believe that there are inherent superiorities and inferiorities in different races and peoples" (*Imperialism and Civilization* 119). The new international space envisages a connection between the politically and economically exploited and the imperial centre, on the same horizon of values.

Furthermore, international government works to undermine the class-oriented social system. Co-operation of nations and states encourages the co-operation of communities or groups of the same interests among the nations. He insists on restricting the ruling class's devouring interests:

Purely national government makes no provision for the representation of vital group interests, and therefore makes it so easy for the ruling and powerful classes to delude whole nations by specious appeals to patriotism and vague reference to vital national interests. A sane and practical internationalism implies the regulation of the relations of national groups through organs of government. (*IG* 223)

Leonard Woolf's logic is that prevention of war can be achieved by restricting the monopoly of the ruling class. International co-operation thereby involves the possibility for the dominated classes, as well as the dominant, to pursue their own interests. In reality, 'national interests' are not those of the whole nation, and work to exclude those of the working class in particular: "Over and over again, when we analyse what are called national interests, we find that they are really the interests, not of the nation, but of a much smaller group" (*IG* 222). His argument persistently supports the exploited classes by trying to set the interests of all the classes on an equal basis. International government is expected to build an authority representing the interests of

nations and races, beyond the framework of each nation state. It intends to inaugurate a community where the politically and economically exploited, who used to bear the sign of the colonised and primitive, would be given different signification.

It could be said that Leonard Woolf's idea of an international relationship aims at the evolution of both international society and Britain as a nation state. As the backbone of his thought, there is Fabianism which restricts the hegemony of the dominant class and supports the 'evolution' of the British race. His concept of internationalism involves the potential for changing the relations among different domestic interest groups, by setting up networks of links among the class-groups of different countries. In *IG*, only "International Labour Legislation" is mentioned as an example of the law to protect the interest of a special class. It is basically "the protection of the worker against the evils of our factory and industrial system" (180). The protection of the middle class and upper class are not included as their profit is already protected by the existing capitalism. Inclusion of the element of workers' internationalism would manifest a way to restrict imperialistic capitalism. Woolf's international network takes in a framework that is related to Marx's Working Men's International.⁴

II

A major Bloomsbury Group member, Maynard Keynes's project for the arts is also connected to the civilisation of the uncultured by restoring what war had taken away. Keynes who had close friendship with Woolfs and contributed to the state's art policy, presents in 1945 the purpose of the Arts Council: "the artist and the public can each sustain and live on the other in that union which has occasionally existed in the past at the great age of a communal civilised life" ("The Arts Council: Its Policy and Hopes" 32). The Arts Council takes the part of a civilising agent. Keynes specifies the artless places which had been created by the war: "It was the task of C. E. M. A. [Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts] to carry music, drama and pictures to places which otherwise would be cut off from

all contact with the masterpieces of happier days and times: to air-raided shelters, to war-time hostels, to factories, to mining villages” (31). Places produced as the result of the Second World War and working class places are supposed to be in need of fine arts. The Arts Council’s civilising objectives centre on sites of war and working class culture. In this sense, civilisation in Keynes’ writing is related to artistic space production: arts territorialize uncivilised space. Civilisation as arts’ project is considered to rectify both the effect of war and the aesthetics of the working class.

Moreover, in “Art and the State” (1937), Keynes is distressed by the state’s policy which supports only economic projects that are related to war and ignores the preservation of the countryside and national monuments. Keynes also criticises the state for neglecting the imperatives of health, recreation, amenity, or natural beauty that the sites provide: “So low have we fallen to-day in our conception of the duty and purpose, the honour and glory of the State” (2). Keynes throws into contrast the apparent glory of industrialised society with the true baseness of a “perverted theory of the State” (2) which connives at the destruction of the countryside and natural beauty. This destruction in fact proves civilisation’s blindness to the importance of the state’s heritage. Keynes does not use the words, barbarism and civilisation, but the framework of barbarism within civilisation, or distorted civilisation constructed upon barbarism is implicit in his essays.

At the beginning of his discussion in *IG*, Leonard Woolf implies that the international world will make a progressive movement from barbarism to civilisation, though it is not a dramatic progress, with the support of an international government:

But it [World War I] is neither the beginning nor the end of anything; it is just a little sagging to one side, to violence and stupidity and barbarism, and in ten or fifteen or twenty years’ time there will be a sagging to the other side, to what we dimly recognise as progress and civilisation. (*IG* 9)

His rhetoric identifies the historical repetition of barbarism and its persist-

ence in the international world.

Leonard Woolf discloses barbarian characteristics within what are called civilised countries, and mentions the incompleteness of their civilisation in 1933:

Civilization, i. e. an ordered society of humane, educated, intelligent, free, prosperous, and cultured individuals, is a delicate organization and has never yet firmly established itself anywhere in the world. We are all of us still half-savages, and these instincts of the animal or the savage to kill, dominate, persecute, torture other people . . . find themselves uncomfortable in such an ordered and humane society. (*The Intelligent Man's Way to Prevent War* 8)

Here what is called imperial topography can no longer be applied. Barbarism is within civilised individuals and it cannot be wiped off. In other words, the imperial topography is internalised within the civilised. In "Why War?" published in English in 1933,⁵ Freud analyses the psychological characteristics of civilisation: one is "a strengthening of the intellect, which is beginning to govern instinctual life" and the other one is "an internalization of the aggressive impulses" (362). According to Freud, even in the civilised person, the savage character is internalised. Civilisation and barbarism are applied respectively to the world under the order of an international government and to animal instinct within the civilised countries. Leonard Woolf expects the international government to civilise those barbaric sites within civilisation. Here, his evolutionistic ideal, the evolution of war animals into peaceful citizens, is also implied.

Leonard Woolf also alludes to the fault of the public opinion which considers "the State or nation as eternally the ultimate unite of communal organization" (216) and implies that his idea of installing internationalised inter-state government is right: "though the sane man who finds himself in a world of madmen may be wise to act like a lunatic, there is no call upon him to think like one" (218). In Woolf's expression, reality is awaiting a medical operation: "Treaties perform in international society the part of anaesthetics in surgery: they get the patient into a condition which makes it

possible to operate; but unfortunately up to the present the means and instruments for operating have been wanting" (*IG* 18–19). The part of "anaesthetics" here functions as the device to suppress a nation's barbaric activity, and places the patient-nation into a suspended position where its political maladies are to be remedied. Thus Woolf's rhetoric describes reality as an illness. There would be even a tragic perspective towards the civilisation of the future, one which presents the prophecy of devolution, without the existence of international law: "We have . . . reached the point in the history at least of Europe where continued progress depends upon the growth of International Law" (82).

Moreover, the image of man as animal, or insect, is applied to the evolutionary stages of the masses. Leonard Woolf states, from a sceptical standpoint, that offering an ideal, highly civilised institution from the beginning would not necessarily be an effective solution, because "national and international masses" cannot catch up with the civilised order and reason:

Man in national or international masses is not yet an orderly or a reasonable animal. He is an animal of passion and prejudice. Any system or organisation or machinery for governing his affairs must, if it is to be accepted by him, allow play to those passions and prejudices. It is no good building him a brand new beautiful international institution. The human institutions really used by him are secreted by him much in the same way as some small repulsive insects secrete a kind of building around themselves. (*IG* 80)

According to Woolf's logic, the organisation as 'law' is not something that invisibly binds one from the outside; it comes from the inside of the masses to bind themselves. The organisation is also given an organic image, rather than being figured as a mechanical system. The above statement relies on colonialist symbolism to superimpose the signs of animalism on a particular group of people and justifies governing them for the excuse of civilisation.

Comparably, in Freud's "Civilization and Its Discontents," 'law' is externalised, as the power of community. The super-ego is an internalised institution, but here its function is left in the hands of the community. Freud

states that one of the characteristics of civilisation is "the manner in which the relationships of men to one another, their social relationships, are regulated — relationships which affect a person as a neighbour, as a source of help, as another person's sexual object, as a member of a family and of a State" ("Civilization and Its Discontents" 283–84). Freud continues: "The power of this community [a majority against a stronger individual man] is then set up as 'right' in opposition to the power of the individual, which is condemned as 'brutal force'. This replacement of the power of the individual by the power of a community constitutes the decisive step of civilization" (284). In Freud, civilisation is a communal power that acts against an individual, brutal force. This communal power is related to Leonard Woolf's international government, which is a mediator of civilisation to restrict individual governments' activity communally or an organization that represents and executes the international law.⁶

The advocacy of international government has a certain similarity with the support for imperialism. Both of them try to colonise the space where Western reason and order are not yet established. Leonard Woolf assesses the international organisations and laws of the past, and more or less repeats the logic of traditional imperialism, in the sense that international government is supposed to discipline uncivilised characteristics in the midst of civilisation. The international government is basically planned to preserve each nation's sovereignty, but it aims to rectify the 'un-civilised,' to take a step towards 'civilisation.'

Leonard Woolf's attitude is in fact ambiguous: he criticised the imperialistic justification to invade, but he also used the same argument to justify an international government in *Economic Imperialism (EI)*. The logic of imperialism is to make non-Europeans subordinate to superior, civilised countries. Woolf mentions the way in which imperialistic invasion is justified:

When territory has been acquired, the arguments for the adventure have always been, before the acquisition, either military, economic, or sentimental (prestige). The European State has always had either (1) to punish someone for not being European and civilised (military punitive expeditions), or (2) to protect someone already conquered and acquired from the

bad example of uncivilised and unconquered neighbours (military punitive expeditions). . . . (*EI* 16–17)

He uses the same imperialistic justification, the same rhetoric of imperialism, when he protests the necessity of international government. Leonard Woolf's new concept of internationalism punishes someone for 'not being civilised.' The geographical structure of European imperialism presents Europe as a civilised space and the colonised areas as a barbaric space which is to be civilised. He implies that barbarism within the civilised world should be dominated and disciplined. The purpose of an international government is to bring about evolution in the international society. However, Woolf's international government is the imposition of the same imperialistic rhetoric.⁷ But the desire to 'civilise' the civilised countries puts into question the whole civilised versus barbaric polarity that imperialism is based on, as the imperial binary-oppositional concept, the coloniser as the civilised and the colonised as barbarian does not function properly.

III

The last part of *IG*, "The Supernational Authority that Will Prevent War," which was composed by a Fabian Committee, proposes economic sanctions, and then the enforcement of law by the declaration of war against a recalcitrant state (254–55). In 1948, Henry R. Winkler evaluates the Fabian's scheme as "severely limited and practical" in giving each state the right to go to war in the final settlement of dispute, "in the hope that, as international organization become stabilised, [national] disarmament would come by itself" (97). The Fabians' final destination would be the justification for the temporal enforcement of power.

There is in fact a discussion about whether the international law should be enforced, or not in Leonard Woolf's publication. He states in his introduction to *The Framework of a Lasting Peace* (1917):

The alternative to regulation by force is regulation by general rules. . . . you

cannot alter the fact of their [general rules] existence and influence, or the fact that if they were not unconsciously and consciously recognized daily and applied daily, nine-tenths of international intercourse and nine-tenths of international commerce would instantly become impossible. The foundation of every scheme of international government to prevent war is a recognition of these facts" (15).

Leonard Woolf disagrees with the regulation of the international relations by force, and insists on the necessity of daily recognition of international law as a custom. However, his opinion is ambivalent and the possibility of pacifist control is considered limited in the following writing.

Leonard and Virginia Woolf's assessment of international law in an informal document, "In^L Re^{NS}" (1916), reflects their ideal concepts of law and regulation concerning international relations. The disbelief in civilisation, or human evolution is apparent in *IG*: "society is so complex that though the majority of men and women do not want to fight, if there are no laws and rules of conduct, and no pacific methods of settling disputes, they will find themselves at one another's throats before they are aware of or desire it" (9). Law, according to Leonard Woolf, is indispensable to keep people civilised.

In "In^L Re^{NS}" which was recorded on paper by Virginia Woolf, and is considered to be one of Leonard Woolf's conceptual workings of international peace, they argue that the law could be enforced by "might." Here, the law is considered to be external to one's mind, not dwelling naturally inside it. It could be said that it is visible as a physical power or threat. Wayne K. Chapman and Janet M. Manson surveyed Leonard and Virginia Woolf's documents on peace in "Carte and Tierce: Leonard, Virginia Woolf, and War for Peace" in reference to minute details of their political context. They state that "Leonard Woolf (or, more problematically and intrinsically, the Woolfs) became committed to a definite position in relation to the passionately anti-imperialist, idealistically pacifist intelligentsia of the Bloomsbury stripe" (64), but addressing the question of practical politics in their manuscript "In^L Re^{NS}," their conclusion is that the law must be enforced with "might" to preserve peace.

In “In^L Re^{NS},” Leonard and Virginia Woolf discuss the necessity of power to enforce international law: “there is a strong impulse to lay the whole blame for the unsatisfactoriness of In^L Law & to find the whole cause of war in the lack of any machinery for enforcing compliance with law & treaty obligations” (Chapman 18). They are circumspect in discussing the necessity of the enforcement of law. They refer to an ethical problem which arises from it: “Thus in my opinion a society based fundamentally upon what we call law & order, that is upon the principle that general rules shd. be continually enforced upon unwilling members by the organised forces of the community, is an extremely low & barbarous form of society” (21). However, they negotiate a practical solution which contrasts with an ideal ethical viewpoint, presuming that by admitting collective use of force behind international law, international society becomes better than the existing society. They also state: “we ought at the moment to admit it [might] as a sanction of in^L government” (21).

The invisibility of the machinery of the law, that is to say, the impracticability of the enforcement of the law, is what Leonard Woolf thinks the fatal cause of the failure of the League of Nations. Woolf describes the general view of government: “The new conception of force” which compels an individual through the organised force of the community is “not only considered expedient as making for law & order but is held to be positively good” (“In^L Re^{NS}” 20). Nevertheless, he thinks that, ethically, compulsion in human relationships is never a good thing. That is why, if the law was idealistically immanent in oneself, or in a nation, his utopian international space could be established. When he reluctantly approves the use of force, his pacifist belief in the international control of barbarism betrays itself.

Virginia Woolf’s pacifist stance also reflects her ideal of international relations, especially as expressed through her ideas about writing. According to her paper read to the Workers’ Educational Association, Brighton, in 1940, the idea of the world without war could be explored within literature as international co-operative space:

Literature is no one’s private ground; literature is common ground. It is not cut up into nations; there are no wars there. Let us trespass freely and

fearlessly and find our own way for ourselves. It is thus that English literature will survive this war and cross the gulf — if commoners and outsiders like ourselves make that country our own country, if we teach ourselves how to read and write, how to preserve and how to create. ("The Leaning Tower" 178)

What is suggested by "English literature" here is an ideal international space where everyone can join, to reproduce a border-less community. However, English literature here becomes the subject of imperialist authority which prevails over the world. In an introductory letter to Davies's *Life as We Have Known It* (1931), Woolf tells her experience of the congress of the Women's Co-operative Guild. Especially in the latter half of the letter, she describes her indirect experience of working-class women's life from the papers they wrote. A packet of the papers was given by Davies at the conference because "if we read them the women would cease to be symbols and would become instead individuals" (xxix). The papers express "the mind [of working women] which lay spread over so wide a stretch of England" (xvii). By introducing the contents of the papers, though she writes from the middle-class intellectual's standpoint, she contributes to the Women's Guild by articulating "the mind" and presents the potentiality of the collective voice of women: "These voices are beginning only now to emerge from silence" of obscurity (xxxix). Verbalisation of "the mind" which consists of internationally networked women becomes equal to weaving the literary "common ground" as international space of co-operation in "The Leaning Tower."

In "Craftsmanship" (1937), Virginia Woolf doubts the historical improvement of literature:

do we write better, do we read better than we read and wrote four hundred years ago when we were unlectured, uncriticized, untaught? Is our Georgian literature a patch on the Elizabethan? (141)

Woolf formulates the archives of "words," and describes the international 'mating' of words: "English words marry French words, German words,

Indian words, negro words, if they have a fancy" (142). Woolf mentions the democratic character of the words as they do not make any distinction of "uneducated words" from "educated words," "uncultivated words" from "cultivated words": "there are no ranks or titles in their society" (142). From the above quotations, Woolf's words are considered to make community where 'the exotic,' including the historical, colonial and cultural primitiveness, is equally placed with 'the civilised.' This community of words, Woolf describes, "live[s] in the mind" (141-42). Woolf's "mind" and "common ground," would have the possibility to be networked internationally, to construct an international, democratic archival space of writing.

Virginia Woolf's argument against war extends to theorising about a utopian space for women, who constitute a politically and economically disadvantaged group.⁸ Defending their interests, she also characterises international space as a utopia for women, posing the question: "how much of 'England' in fact belongs to her [a daughter of an educated man]" (*Three Guineas* 195). The answer is "her sex and class has very little to thank England for in the past; not much to thank England for the present; while the security of her person in the future is highly dubious" (196). She continues:

"'Our country,'" she will say, "throughout the greater part of its history has treated me as a slave; it has denied me education or any share in its possessions. . . . the outsider will say," in fact, as a woman, I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman my country is the whole world. (*Three Guineas* 197)

As a result, the daughters of educated men, or middle-class intellectual women, who are outsiders, neither share "our civilisation," nor "'our' dominion upon other people" (198). The interests of middle-class intellectual women, which are not insured in "our country," are supposed to be protected in "the whole world," just as Leonard Woolf's international government is designed to protect the interest of the working class which is devoured by capitalism. She presents an imaginative space which is woven by women's co-operation, and relinquishes the possibility of the women

'belonging' fully to any state. "The whole world" is not a new international space in a positive sense. It is an international space predicated on the exclusion of the institution of a nation state, or patriarchy from one's imagined community. Middle-class women of intellect dispose of any sense of national identity in "the whole world."

Establishing a new concept of international space is an attempt to undermine the education and tradition of patriotism. In Virginia Woolf's essay, "Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid" (1942) she analyses the forms of education and tradition which caused patriotism and military honour. Woolf cites a patriotic passage expressed by a soldier from the First World War: "To fight against a real enemy, to earn undying honour and glory by shooting total strangers, and to come home with my breast covered with medals and decorations, that was the summit of my hope. . . . It was for this that my whole life so far had been dedicated, my education, training, everything" (174). She expresses the imperative for something that can substitute these patriotic and military ideals: "we must help the young English to root out from themselves the love of medals and decorations. . . . We must compensate the man for the loss of his gun" (175), when she hears a sound of an air raid which "compel[s] one to think about peace" (173). For the young English, 'international space' is the territory in which they can seek their honour, but Woolf explains that an international space filled with the sound of an air raid — the result of the soldiers' pursuit of honour — should be taken over by a new concept of international space that abolishes patriarchy and patriotic honour. Virginia Woolf's pacifism is here based on the transformation of the system of territory where the young English achieves patriarchal and hierarchical desire.

Patricia Laurence comments that Leonard and Virginia shared an idea that barbarism is embedded within the European civilisation of the 1930s (126–27), but this idea occurs in Leonard Woolf's writing in an earlier stage, during the Great War. According to Leonard and Virginia Woolf's argument, civilisation is the property not only of European nations, but also of other nations. At the same time, barbarism can be found within European culture. What is designated as 'civilised geographical area' is a region that is in fact internalised and shared in individual's psychological space. It is a rhetorical space constructed upon the civilisation-barbarism opposition that is

also inscribed in their contemporary writing. Leonard Woolf focuses on the barbarism within the civilised world:

if civilization is destroyed, it will not be by the Hitlers and Mussolinis and their crude, barbaric violence, but by the muddled betrayal of the civilized. It is not the barbarian at the gate, but in the citadel and in the heart who is the real danger. (*Barbarians at the Gate* 169)

By internalizing barbarism within the nation, imperial mapping is applied to the nation's psychical space, setting the territories of civilisation and barbarism in it.

However, presenting a degraded spirit or a degraded society within what could be the space of civilisation not only justifies the initiation of a new method of governing international society, but also bears the problem of the enforcement of the law over the uncivilised. Significantly, the binary opposition between civilisation and barbarism, that used to characterise the opposition between Europe and the others, is no longer adequate. His international space is no longer based on the hierarchical relation between the coloniser and the colonised. Leonard states:

If . . . Europe is to be for the Europeans, and America for the Americans, and Australia for the Australians, Asia must be for the Asiatics, and Africa for the Africans. And that will mean the end of imperialism, the end of conflict, and the beginning of a synthesis of civilizations. (*Imperialism and Civilization* 134)

The “synthesis of civilizations” — quite an idealistic concept incorporating plural civilisations — means a space where European civilisation is not the dominant one. Here, his idea is revolutionary in the sense that it presupposes multiple civilisations. The binary opposition between civilisation and barbarism is no longer applied to the relation between Europe and other countries. He seeks for the coexistence of plural civilisations; it could be modelled on the idea of co-operation. Even though he uses a conservative logic or rhetoric in order to introduce international government, his ultimate

purpose can be seen in the above quotation. The characteristic of his ideal is a society which does not allow the limited prosperity of elite nations to dominate all others. The key to make it possible is the control of international relations by international government.

The concept of civilisation and the textual production of international space in Leonard and Virginia Woolf present radical reconstruction of English and European cognitive space. Their international spaces — Leonard Woolf's idea of the co-existence of plural civilisations in the world, Virginia Woolf's representation of "the mind" as the archive of working women's life, "the mind" where different languages in the world co-exist and "the whole world" where middle-class women can cooperate internationally outside the system of patriarchy — all convert the traditional hierarchical spatial relation into a democratic international space. In other words, imagined boundaries of a nation state and its institution are considered to lose their integration of territoriality in Leonard and Virginia Woolf's international space.

Notes

¹ Egerton mentions other minor groups: the leftist circle by John Hobson and H. N. Brailsford and conservative Round Table Group by Philip Kerr (16–17).

² Howard-Ellis mentions several drafts which went through: the Phillmore Report and Draft, Colonel House's Draft, the First Wilson Draft, General Smuts' Draft, the Cecil Plan, the Second Wilson Draft, the Third Wilson draft, the British Draft and the Hurst-Miller Draft (75–86). See also Peter Wilson for the detailed analysis of *IG* from the viewpoint of political science.

³ Leonard and Virginia Woolf were invited to the congress of the Women's Co-operative Guild in Newcastle by Margaret Llewelyn Davies in 1913.

⁴ As the other kind of cosmopolitan law, Leonard Woolf mentions "international maritime legislation." Some trans-national organizations are also proposed, such as postal system, telecommunication system, railway system, public health and so on.

⁵ James Strachey notes that "Why War?" is one of the open exchanges of letters between Albert Einstein and Freud, which was arranged by the Interna-

tional Institute of Intellectual Co-operation under the League of Nations (Freud *Civilization, Society and Religion* 343).

⁶ Freud criticises the League of Nations: “the endowment of necessary power” is not fulfilled in it so that it cannot restrict the aggressive impulses that cause war (“Why War?” 354).

⁷ Laura Moss Gottlieb criticises: “His [Woolf] suggestion only requires the obedience of sovereign states to some world governmental body which would, presumably, issue decrees in some rational and disinterested manner, but would not necessarily initiate any major changes in the status quo” (249).

⁸ Kyoto Okumoto focuses on the pacifism in *Three Guineas* from the standpoint of peace studies.

Works Cited

- Bell, Clive. *Civilization: An Essay*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1928.
- Chapman, Wayne K. and Janet M. Manson. “Carte and Tierce: Leonard, Virginia Woolf, and War for Peace.” *Virginia Woolf and War: Fiction, Reality, and Myth*. Ed. Mark Hussey. New York: Syracuse UP, 1991.
- Egerton, George W. *Great Britain and the Creation of the League of Nations: Strategy, Politics, and International Organizations, 1914-1919*. London: Scholar P, 1979.
- Freud, Sigmund. “Civilization and Its Discontents.” *Civilization, Society and Religion: Group Psychology, Civilization and Its Discontents and Other Works*. Trans. James Strachey. 1955. London: Penguin, 1985. 251-340.
- . “Why War?” *Civilization, Society and Religion: Group Psychology, Civilization and Its Discontents and Other Works*. Trans. James Strachey. 1955. London: Penguin, 1985. 343-62.
- Gottlieb, Laura Moss. “The War between the Woolfs.” *Virginia Woolf and Bloomsbury: A Centenary Celebration*. Ed. Laura Marcus. London: Macmillan, 1987. 242-52.
- Hobson, J. A. *Imperialism: A Study*. 1902. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1965.
- Howard-Ellis, C. *The Origin, Structure and Working of the League of Nations*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928.
- Keynes, J. M. “Art and the State.” *Britain and the State*. Ed. Clough Williams-Ellis. London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1937. 1-7.
- . “The Arts Council: Its Policy and Hopes.” *The Listener* 12 July 1945:

31–32.

- Laurence, Patricia. "A Writing Couple: Shared Ideology in Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas* and Leonard Woolf's *Quack, Quack!*" *Women in the Milieu of Leonard and Virginia Woolf: Peace, Politics, and Education*. Eds. Wayne K. Chapman and Janet M. Manson. New York: Pace UP, 1998. 125–43.
- Marx, Karl. "Address and Provisional Rules of the Working Men's International Association." *Marx and Engels: 1864–68*. Moscow: Progress Publications, 1987. 3–16.
- Okumoto, Kyoko. "Pacifism in Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas* and Thoughts on the 'Culture of Violence': 'Fear' in Men and 'Fear' in Women." *Osaka Jogakuin College Kiyō* 32 (2003): 65–75.
- Rich, Paul. "Reinventing Peace: David Davies, Alfred Zimmern and Liberal Internationalism in Interwar Britain." *International Relations* 16.1 (2002): 117–33.
- Shaffer, Brian W. *The Blinding Torch: Modern British Fiction and the Discourse of Civilisation*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1993.
- Walters, F. P. *A History of the League of Nations*. 1952. Westport: Greenwood P, 1986.
- Wilson, Peter. *The International Theory of Leonard Woolf: A Study in Twentieth-Century Idealism*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Winkler, Henry R. "The Development of the League of Nations Idea in Great Britain, 1914–1919." *The Journal of Modern History* 20.2 (1948): 95–112.
- Woolf, Leonard. *Barbarians at the Gate*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1939.
- . *Beginning Again: An Autobiography of the Years 1911 to 1918*. London: Hogarth, 1964.
- . *Economic Imperialism*. London: Swarthmore P, 1921.
- , ed. *The Framework of a Lasting Peace*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1917.
- . *Imperialism and Civilization*. London: Hogarth, 1928.
- , ed. *The Intelligent Man's Way to Prevent War*. London: Gollancz, 1933.
- . *International Government*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1916.
- , and Virginia Woolf. "In^L Re^{NS}." *Leonard and Virginia Woolf Working Together and the Hitherto Unpublished Manuscript 'In^L Re^{NS}'*. Eds. Wayne K. Chapman and Janet M. Manson. London: Cecil Woolf, 1997. 11–24.
- Woolf, Virginia. "Craftsmanship." *The Crowded Dance of Modern Life: Selected Essays*. Vol. 2. Ed. Rachel Bowlby. London: Penguin, 1993. 2 vols. 137–

43.

- . “An Introductory Letter to Margaret Llewelyn Davies.” Introduction. *Life as We Have Known It: by Co-operative Working Women*. Ed. Margaret Llewelyn Davies. London: Hogarth, 1931. xv-xxxix.
- . “The Leaning Tower.” *A Woman’s Essays: Selected Essays*. Vol. 1. Ed. Rachel Bowlby. London: Penguin, 1992. 2 vols. 159-78.
- . *Three Guineas*. London: Hogarth, 1938.
- Yoshikawa, Hiroshi (吉川宏). 『1930年代英国の平和論—レナード・ウルフと国際連盟体制』 [The 1930s Pacifism in England: Leonard Woolf and the League of Nations]. Sapporo: Hokkaido UP, 1989.

Synopsis

Leonard and Virginia Woolf's Rhetoric of New International Space Yuko Ito

This paper explores the ideas of civilisation and international space in Leonard Woolf's proposal for an international government and Virginia Woolf's essays in order to find out the positions of their 'civilisation' and 'barbarism' among hierarchically related territories and within the 'civilised' nation. They impose their ideas on the illusory expansion of international space, for the purpose of civilisation not only at home but also in international communities.

Leonard Woolf's international space, a space of imagined community among nations, suggests a world where all the states, nations and people are interrelated on the same ground. His idea includes the restriction of imperialist exploitation by the ruling class. Thus he seeks for the evolution of both international society and domestic one from the pacifist viewpoint.

His scheme is to alter imperial topography that places civilisation in the centre and barbarism to be civilised in the margin outside European civilisation. He locates barbarism, a brutal force that causes war, within civilised individuals and nations. However, his insistence to discipline nations and international community indicates the imposition of the same imperialist framework on his international relations. Moreover, he informally compromises with the enforcement of the law.

Leonard and Virginia Woolf's international spaces — Leonard Woolf's idea of the co-existence of plural civilisations in the world, Virginia Woolf's representation of the working women's voice, her formulation of the archives of words where different languages in the world co-exist and her assumption of an international space where middle-class women can cooperate internationally outside the system of patriarchy — all convert the traditional hierarchical spatial relation into a democratic international

space. In other words, the hierarchy between civilisation and barbarism that compels imperial or patriarchal spatial order disintegrates. Imagined boundaries of a nation state and its institution are considered to lose their integration of territoriality in the Woolfs' international space. Their concept of civilisation and the production of international space present radical reconstruction of English and European cognitive space.