

“MY COUNTRY IS THE WHOLE WORLD”:
THREE GUINEAS AND THE CULTURE OF PACIFIST DISSENT

by

REBECCA WISOR

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in English in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City University of New York

2008

UMI Number: 3310663

Copyright 2008 by
Wisor, Rebecca

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI Microform 3310663
Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2008

REBECCA WISOR

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in English in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Jane Marcus

Date

Chair of Examining Committee

Steven Kruger

Date

Executive Officer

David Greetham

Sandi Cooper

Cassandra Laity

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

“MY COUNTRY IS THE WHOLE WORLD”:

THREE GUINEAS AND THE CULTURE OF PACIFIST DISSENT

by

Rebecca Wisor

Advisor: Professor Jane Marcus

Virginia Woolf, like many women writers, is notorious for having purged the most subversive political content from her writings in the course of preparing her manuscripts for publication. The practice of self-censorship pervades Woolf's work of the thirties, the decade in which she was engaged in her most forceful critique of militarism, capitalism, fascism, nationalism, imperialism, and patriarchy. The holograph and typescript fragments of *Three Guineas*, the three scrapbooks in which she collected source material for that work, and the photographs that appear in its earliest published versions demonstrate Woolf's extensive engagement with the tradition of feminist pacifism. Rather than a set of beliefs that developed only in response to the escalating political crises of the thirties, I suggest Woolf's feminist pacifism to have been a persistent, evolving ethos that informed and propelled nearly all of her writing.

Chapter One situates the work's interlocking composition, publication, and reception histories within their historical and cultural backgrounds, revealing how thoroughly each of these aspects was saturated by the pacifist discourse of the interwar period, and how thoroughly the work itself has permeated pacifist discourse in the seventy years since its publication. Chapter Two establishes a rationale for the

construction of a posteclectic edition of *Three Guineas* and proposes several models capable of displaying the work's varied pre-publication states and the pacifist content contained therein. In Chapter Three, I suggest that *Three Guineas* is best understood as part of Woolf's ongoing cultural dialogue with feminist pacifists, past and present; with Britain's patriarchal peace movement; and with those British institutions of Church and State that she regarded as implicit in the perpetuation of war. Given the importance of the *Three Guineas* photographs within this dialogue, Chapter Four reconstructs the historical and cultural significance of each subject in an attempt to reveal what these individuals would have signified for Woolf and her contemporary readership.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my deepest gratitude to those who have seen me through this project in countless ways.

First, to my advisor and mentor, Jane Marcus, whose conviction, passion, and vision have exerted a powerful force on my life and work, and whose belief in the importance of this subject made me want to write about it, and to keep writing about it.

To the members of my dissertation committee, David Greetham and Sandi Cooper, whose work and talk challenged my thinking in productive ways, and to Cassandra Laity, who was there at the start and who helped me to grow.

To my family, especially my mother and my grandmother, for their constant support and their lessons in love.

To my friends, both near and far, whose humor, sympathy, and encouragement have sustained me along the way.

And to my husband, Jeff, for the day and the night.

This is for him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Virginia Woolf and Pacifist Resistance	1
The Cultural Evolution and Work of <i>Three Guineas</i> : A Composition, Publication, and Reception History	31
Touching the “Untouchable” Text: Notes	91
Toward a Posteclectic Edition of <i>Three Guineas</i>	
Isolating the Interpersonal: <i>Three Guineas</i> as Cultural Dialogue	158
Do Not Let Us Praise Famous Men: Doing the Work the Text Demands of Us	204
Coda: “Belong[ing] to the World”: Pacifism and the Transnational Imaginary in Late Modernism	269
Endnotes	283
Works Cited	306

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Sample passage of a proposed parallel-text edition of Virginia Woolf's "Women Must Weep—Or Unite Against War" and <i>Three Guineas</i>	126-27
Figure 2. Early typescript version of a passage from <i>Three Guineas</i>	141
Figure 3. Intermediate typescript version of a passage from <i>Three Guineas</i>	142
Figure 4. Late typescript version of a passage from <i>Three Guineas</i>	143
Figure 5. Sample passage of a proposed genetic edition of <i>Three Guineas</i>	145-47
Figure 6. Sample passage of a proposed fluid-text edition of <i>Three Guineas</i>	154
Figure 7. Successive revisions of a passage from <i>Three Guineas</i>	160

Introduction: Virginia Woolf and Pacifist Resistance

Virginia Woolf was a pacifist and a feminist who held those two causes to be inseparable. *Three Guineas* (1938) is her most pronounced expression of these feminist pacifist beliefs, and one of the most significant contributions to feminist pacifist thought and the contemporary peace movement. While the past decade has seen a burgeoning interest among Woolf scholars in the intersections between fascism, feminism, and war, neither her work nor thought have been situated adequately within the historical context of the twentieth-century peace movement, the tradition of feminist pacifism in Britain, or theoretical discussions of pacifism. These lacunae are the result of numerous confusions and prejudices common among earlier generations of modernist scholars, as well as Woolf's own deliberate attempts to obfuscate her politics. Relocating the text's feminist pacifist roots is to replicate in criticism the central premise of *Three Guineas*: that the causes of feminism and pacifism are inextricable.¹ It is my hope that, by joining in the chorus of feminist voices, including those Berenice Carroll, Jane Marcus, Brenda Silver, Hermione Lee, Merry Pawlowski, and Anna Snaith, this study may further contribute to the groundbreaking efforts underway to "claim" (and proclaim) Woolf's status as a social thinker and a public intellectual (Marcus, "Wrapped in the Stars and Stripes" 18).

While the polemical *Three Guineas* came as a shock to many readers and outraged and alienated virtually all of her immediate circle, earlier fictions like *Jacob's Room*, *Mrs. Dalloway*, and *To the Lighthouse* had similarly, if more quietly, voiced feminist protests against the human losses incurred by war and a patriarchal social system that sees such losses as acceptable, necessary, and justifiable. Rather than a departure from her earlier works, *Three Guineas* should rightfully be regarded as the culmination of

Woolf's lifetime of resistance to war, fascism, and patriarchy. Her fundamental opposition to violence can be traced back to an early childhood episode that she would record on the eve of the Second World War:

I was fighting with Thoby on the lawn. We were pommelling each other with our fists. Just as I raised my fist to hit him, I felt: why hurt another person? I dropped my hand instantly, and stood there, and let him beat me. I remember the feeling. It was a feeling of hopeless sadness. It was as if I became aware of something terrible; and of my own powerlessness. I slunk off alone, feeling horribly depressed. ("A Sketch of the Past" 71)

She would voice a similar sense of hopelessness at the prospect of another war in a diary entry dated 6 September 1939, commenting on how war "seems entirely meaningless—a perfunctory slaughter, like taking a jar in one hand, a hammer in the other. Why must this be smashed? Nobody knows" (D5 234-35). Unapologetic and uncompromising in its arguments and analyses, *Three Guineas* is saturated with invective, unlike the cleverly concealed venom of *A Room of One's Own* and the more diluted critiques of *Jacob's Room*, *Mrs. Dalloway*, and *To the Lighthouse*, which are discussed below.

Despite the overtly pacifist content that dominates her novels, essays, diary entries, and letters of the thirties, Woolf's reputation as a political thinker of influence has met with a great deal of resistance. One cannot underestimate the impact of Leonard Woolf's posthumous characterization of his wife as "the least political animal that has lived since Aristotle invented the definition" (*Downhill* 27) and Quentin Bell's assertion that his aunt "had attempted to be politically active; it was the ability, not the inclination, that was lacking" (*Virginia Woolf II* 221). Failing to question the veracity of such claims,

Woolf's early biographers and critics only managed to further advance the misconception that it was Leonard, and decidedly *not* Virginia, who wore the political "pants" in the family: a misconception all the more plausible given Leonard's prominent political affiliations, which included Fabian socialism, the British Labour Party, the Union of Democratic Control, and the British Co-operative Movement, and Virginia's far more inconspicuous ones; aside from the more distinguished British Labour Party and the Women's Co-operative Guild, these included that "extremely shadowy organisation," the People's Suffrage Federation, the London and National Society for Women's Service, the Women's Service Library, the Village Institute of Rodmell, For Intellectual Liberty, and the International Association of Writers for the Defence of Culture.² Her association with Bloomsbury, maligned for its elitism and highbrow aestheticism, has also advanced this misperception, and was the source of much criticism leveled at Woolf in the late 1930s by reviewers and contemporary authors, including, most notably, Q. D. Leavis, Wyndham Lewis, and C. E. M. Joad.³

The disavowal of Woolf's radical politics, both in her day and in our own, supplies us with an instructive lesson about society's failure to absorb and respond to the challenges posed by confrontational, radical texts written by women, and about what happens to those who write them and to their image.⁴ Jane Marcus attributes Leonard Woolf and Quentin Bell's mischaracterization of Woolf's politics to their pronounced anxiety, since "the image of someone silly and apolitical is less threatening than the image of someone as sure of her intellectual position as the Virginia Woolf who wrote *Three Guineas*" ("No More Horses" 282). *Three Guineas* is, above all, a profoundly disquieting work: like the mirror turned toward the audience in *Between the Acts*, it

refuses its audience amnesty and, in the end, forces men and women alike to take a close, painful look at their complicity in perpetuating war. The anxiety, restlessness, and extreme unease expressed by Miss LaTrobe's audience in response to this trick is similar to that evoked by the polemic of *Three Guineas*, particularly among male members of the establishment. Since many prefer lashing out at the hand that holds the mirror to focusing on what the mirror reveals, impassioned arguments about Woolf's political irrelevance may be masking the discomfort produced by such politically challenging works. Naomi Black argues, "the vehemence of attempts to represent this sort of feminism as apolitical and marginal shows just how essentially radical it is" ("Virginia Woolf and the Women's Movement" 194). Discussing Nigel Nicolson's long tradition of "indiscriminate male tirades against Woolf's political philosophy and her book," Jane Marcus similarly concludes that "such animus expressed so recently must encourage us to take this work seriously" ("Introduction" 44). Attending to the reception of literary works can yield more than an understanding of the socio-cultural matrix in which it is necessarily imbedded, revealing the processes by which subversive narratives and social critiques are suppressed by those with interests and traditions to protect.

The highly gendered conception of "political engagement" by which Woolf and other modernist women writers have been and continue to be judged has also played an important role in obscuring recognition of their politicism, as Susan Stanford Friedman has argued in her seminal essay on H. D., "Modernism of the 'Scattered Remnant.'" Recognition of alternative forms of political engagement is essential to understanding how outsiders historically have made their presence known when denied access to the more traditional means of political expression or organization; it is also to understand

how history silences subjects whose expressions and experiences disrupt and subvert dominant narratives. Naomi Black observes that the critical dismissal of Woolf's politics "seems related to a more general dismissal of women because they are not much involved in the few activities which men are prepared to recognize as politics" ("A Note," 5-6). My project extends the recuperative efforts of Hermione Lee, David Bradshaw, and Brenda Silver to suggest that Woolf's conscious style of political engagement was entirely consistent with her "Credo" of Outsiderism articulated in *Three Guineas*.⁵ Discerning from her own experience of "the private house" "something in the conglomeration of people into societies that releases what is most selfish and violent, least rational and humane in the individuals themselves" (*Three Guineas* 105), she regarded institutionalized politics as inherently inimical to the pursuit of peace. Regarding rationality and free will as essential to the prevention of war, Woolf instead envisioned her thinking as a form of fighting and her writing as a form of active political resistance.

Nowhere does dissension over Woolf's politics present itself more than in discussions of *Three Guineas*, where a "custody battle" "to name the book's meaning and value" (Silver, "The Authority of Anger" 341; Marcus, *Languages* xi) continues to rage among scholars anxious to quantify Woolf's "meaning and value," or currency, as a political thinker and public intellectual. The "construction of Woolf as apolitical, frail, asexual, and private is by no means obsolete" at the beginning of the twenty-first century, Anna Snaith similarly observes (*Virginia Woolf* 3). Even among the most well intentioned scholars, attempts to assert the terms, nature, and longevity of her commitment to pacifism have been largely compromised by erroneous information and

textual misinterpretation.⁶ Contrary to the claims of Alex Zwerdling and Sybil Oldfield, and contrary to the common practice of her time, Woolf did not renounce her pacifism, and continued to make clear her anti-militarist stance throughout the early years of the war leading up to her death. The point is crucial, given that the persistence of these beliefs in the face of fascism, and her particular refusal to separate the causes of pacifism and anti-fascism, are that which make her commitment to pacifism exceptional, compelling, and worthy of critical attention.

Ironically, Woolf's own construction of an apolitical, "cold blooded" persona in letters to family and friends only further marred her reception as a political figure (*L4* 66). Peppered with self-deprecating remarks about her lack of political knowledge, such letters have been eagerly co-opted by critics seeking "proof" of her apoliticism. Failing to recognize these statements as disingenuous instances of persona construction, nor how through them she was "affecting to be less politically observant than she was" (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 530), critics anxious for ammunition preferred a literal and none-too-critical interpretation of her remarks, thereby overlooking the multiple rhetorical purposes that they contain. Identifying her territory as the literary rather than the worldly was a habitual posture that she adopted frequently in letters to her closest friends and family members; she appears to have adopted this posture sometimes as an appeal for greater intimacy—as seen in a comment to nephew Julian Bell, reflecting how "little she knows—what you do about your poor old Virginia" (*L5* 433)—and other times to obtain humorous effects, as in a letter to Ottoline Morrell in which she quips, "When even I cant [*sic*] sleep at night for thinking of politics," she writes, "things must be in a fine mess" (*L5* 428). That such self-deprecating comments should figure so prominently in her

communiqués suggests their usefulness as a means of connecting and reconnecting to family and friends, and of invoking her familiar, negotiated social identity.

Woolf's self-deprecating remarks also appear to have been part of a self-protecting strategem—"a smoke-screen against being laughed at, or being thought to act out of character" (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 684)—that she used when writing to acquaintances. Ever conscious of her lack of formal education and fearful of being the subject of mockery, Woolf strategically places herself outside of critical range by mocking herself: it is a defensive gesture, a preemptive strike, a means for protecting her intellectual ego. She "deliberately presented herself as an unworldly, even mystical private person with no desire for contact with political life: what Leonard Woolf liked to call a 'silly,' . . . especially when writing to people who *were* heavily involved," her biographer notes (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 682). Lee argues convincingly that Woolf's construction of this elaborate persona was motivated by her sense that politics were Leonard's "job" and that "she could not compete on his ground" (683). Her use of this defensive tactic was exacerbated by an awareness of her political "Other-ness" as the thirties progressed and her radical politics became increasingly marginalized in her marriage, in her social group, and in society as a whole. Whether out of a desire to connect or protect, Woolf's self-deprecating remarks reveal more about her psychology and her responses to the circumstances of her historical moment than about her politics, while her diaries, scrapbooks, notebooks, manuscripts, and published texts reveal a keen political mind that refutes claims—her own as well as those of her critics—to have had no "grasp" of politics.

Woolf's proclivity for self-censorship has also proven an obstacle to establishing her reputation as a political thinker. The discrepancy between the pre-publication and published versions of her works is particularly marked in her work of the thirties, the decade in which she was engaged in her most forceful critique of militarist, capitalist, fascist, patriarchal, and imperialist ideologies. While self-censorship can be seen in earlier works such as *The Voyage Out*, *To the Lighthouse* and *A Room of One's Own*, it is particularly pronounced in *Three Guineas* and *The Years*, the companion-text and fictional counterpart of *Three Guineas*.⁷ The dominance of an eclectic approach to textual editing, paired with a long-standing bias among critics and publishers for Woolf's fiction—and quite specifically *against* the vitriolic *Three Guineas*⁸—has left the pre-publication versions of *Three Guineas* and *The Years* to more or less languish in the Woolf archives. Two relatively recent shifts within contemporary textual studies—the gradual supplanting of the modernist, eclectic approach to textual editing by a postmodern approach that celebrates textual fluidity, on the one hand, and the adoption of a more expansive view of the “text” as that constituted by a multitude of pre-publication states—offer promising theoretical bases for a future edition of *Three Guineas*.

Pre-Guineas: Feminist Pacifism in the Early Works of Virginia Woolf

Peace historian Martin Ceadel has distinguished ten descriptive categories for the purpose of classifying pacifist positions. The most fundamental distinction he makes is that between the “absolutist” pacifist position, which holds that war and violence are impermissible under any circumstances, and a “reformist” position, which maintains that

war can be prevented only “through a restructuring of the political order” (“Ten Distinctions” 21). He aligns *pacifism* with the absolutist position, and *pacificism*, which permits the use of force as a final measure, with the reformist.⁹ This artificial opposition of absolutist and reformist positions, however, is unable to accommodate Woolf’s complex pacifism. While her view that physical force is impermissible in all instances situates her, in Ceadel’s terms, within a tradition of absolute pacifism, her emphasis on altering patriarchal society in order to prevent war places her simultaneously within the feminist tradition of reformism. It would seem, then, that in bridging the gap between absolutism and reformism, Woolf’s feminist pacifism accomplishes what Ceadel regards as the impossible by being rooted firmly in *both* a desire to end war through political and social restructuring and the belief that violence is impermissible under any circumstances. That Ceadel inexcusably identifies the feminist pacifist tradition as having emerged as late as the 1980s (“Ten Distinctions” 26) despite its existence as a continuous tradition in Britain and on the continent from the early nineteenth century, as Sandi Cooper has shown, suggests the likelihood that his theories have been formed without an adequate accounting of women’s unique contributions to pacifist thought.¹⁰

While Woolf’s social critiques are rooted in several traditions of British political thought, including liberalism, utilitarianism, and socialism, they are most heavily indebted to a tradition of feminist pacifism that stretches back to mid-nineteenth century Quakerism in Britain, and before that to European women’s protests against the Napoleonic Wars (Cooper, “Women’s Participation”). The development of a feminist pacifist tradition in Britain coincided with the rise of the international feminist movement; newly formed women’s groups were forced by the Franco-Prussian war

(1870-71) to consider, for the first time, their outlook on the use of physical force (Brown 1). The formal designation of “feminist pacifism” (or “pacifist feminism”), however, was not to emerge until the Great War (Brown 4), when women suffragists began to articulate “a psychological and ideological kinship between their work for suffrage and the emergent need of work for peace. For them, peace and freedom from oppression were inseparable; suffrage was essential to peace” (Costin 305).¹¹

Woolf’s novels examine the nuances of the “psychological and ideological kinship” binding feminism to pacifism and present her evolving feminist critique of militarism, war, patriarchy, and oppressive social institutions, placing even her fiction at the center of a tradition of feminist pacifist thought. Where once Woolf critics emphasized a divide between the political nonfiction and the experimental fiction of her oeuvre, this false dichotomy has been deconstructed in the past decade by critics eager to explore the thematic and stylistic expressions of Woolf’s politics, particularly her views on race, class, sex, gender, and war, in the early novels and the later experimental novels.¹² While Woolf’s earlier novels have been traditionally associated with aesthetics more so than with politics, they can be read nevertheless as evidence of her persistent interest in the interpenetration of the public and private, and the feminist and pacifist, spheres.

Woolf’s preoccupation in *The Voyage Out* and *Night and Day* with the oppressive nature of patriarchal institutions and the patriarchal family, “where the tyrannical rule of most men flourished unopposed” (Bazin and Lauter 28), suggest Woolf’s early formulation of the connection between private and public forms of tyranny, and her early exploration of how fictional forms could be used as a vehicle for subversive feminist

content. Situating *Night and Day* in its specific historical moment, Jane Marcus identifies the influence of the Bloomsbury-Cambridge group on this “antiwar novel,” calling it “a feminist pacifist’s response” to the “masculinist,” misogynist version of pacifism espoused by her peers (“Enchanted Organ” 21). Beginning with *Jacob’s Room*, Woolf would make her feminist pacifist critique more explicit in the novels, using them to ruthlessly expose the role of patriarchy in creating and sustaining war. From *Jacob Flanders* and *Septimus Warren Smith* to *Evans* and *Andrew Ramsay*, Woolf’s novels, elegies for real and fictionalized human casualties alike, function as persistent protests against the social structures and institutions that support the administration of war.

Jacob’s Room, *Mrs. Dalloway*, and *To the Lighthouse* register in fictional form Woolf’s vehement opposition to the Great War, an ethical position she frequently expressed during that conflict. That she should beg her friend Katherine Cox, tending to Serbian refugees in Corsica at the time, “For God’s sake don’t sacrifice anything to your country” (L2 76), suggests how little Woolf was taken in by the propaganda being produced by the war machine early in the war. Thinking back on this period while writing the memoir of her nephew Julian Bell, who was killed driving an ambulance in the Spanish Civil War, she would reflect that “We were all C.O.’s [*sic*] in the Great war” (qtd. in Bell, *Virginia Woolf II* 258). That she should identify herself during the war as one who “repudiate[s] the importance of what is being done” (D1 131) suggests, moreover, a rejection of the very reasoning being used to garner support for the war effort. The earliest vehement expression of her sense of political outsideness, it seems, was motivated by a troublesome, “distressing,” sense of repulsion from her fellow citizens over the very subject of war propaganda. “The revelation of what our compatriots

feel about life is very distressing,” she wrote in 1915 to Duncan Grant. “One might have thought in peace time that they were harmless, if stupid; but now that they have been roused they seem full of the most violent and filthy passions” (L2 71). Woolf’s repulsion toward the patriotic rhetoric so dominant in wartime, and the propaganda that feeds on it, fills her diaries and letters of the period. She reflects in a diary entry from October 1918, “The Northcliffe papers [the *Daily Mail* and *The Times*] do all they can to insist upon the indispensability & delight of war. They magnify our victories to make our mouths water for more” (D1 200). “The clamour and blare of military music” (D1 71) and her disgust at the “patriotic sentiment . . . so revolting that I was nearly sick” (L2 57) find expression in *Jacob’s Room*, in the narrator’s reflection that “nowadays it is the thin voice of duty, piping in a white thread from the top of a funnel, that collects the largest multitudes” (162). “Patriotism is the devil—yes” (D4 291), she would be moved to reflect amidst the prelude to the Second World War.

As part of the vast research she undertook preparatory to writing *The Years*, and inspired by a reading of Vera Brittain’s *Testament of Youth*, Woolf would return in 1933 to her war diaries, noting “how close the tears come, again & again” (D4 193). The war had left Woolf despondent about the destructiveness of human nature and humanity in general, about how “even a jingo can now believe in any good from war, or any ideal, or anything, one feels tempted to add undertaken by bodies of human beings in concert” (D1 229). Her diaries and letters written immediately after the war reflect this sense of despondency, which made her feel herself to be a political outsider. She reported being made to feel “immensely melancholy” (L2 290), “more and more melancholy and hopeless of the human race” (L2 293), by the Armistice Day celebrations, which she

regarded as merely “some thing got up to pacify & placate ‘the people’” (D1 292). The celebrations seemed to her to mock the reality of the war dead and injured, and the celebrants but “children to be amused” (D1 294). She noted with shame her own part in the procession, and the jarring effect of one particular moment during the celebrations: “It was a melancholy thing to see the incurable soldiers lying bed at the Star & Garter with their backs to us, smoking cigarettes, & waiting for the noise to be over” (ibid).

This sense of her political outsideness is revealed in a letter to Margaret Llewelyn Davies, in which Woolf refers to the war as “this preposterous masculine fiction” (L2 76). “Do you see any sense in it?” she continues, referring to an article she has just read in the *Times*. “I feel as if I were reading about some curious tribe in Central Africa” (ibid.). Woolf’s alignment of war with masculinity bears traces of the feminist pacifist thought of Frances Hollowes, who similarly termed militarism “a masculine invention” in her 1915 book, *Mothers of Men and Militarism* (qtd. in Liddington, *Road* 92). The significance of the quote to her feminist pacifism become clear only on viewing it in its original context:

I’ve been reading Carlyle’s Past and Present, and wondering whether all his rant has made a scrap of difference practically. But Bertie [Russell], according to Bob Trevelyan who lunched here, takes his lectures very seriously, and thinks he’s going to found new civilisations. I become steadily more feminist, owing to the *Times*, which I read at breakfast and wonder how this preposterous masculine fiction keeps going a day longer—without some vigorous young woman pulling us together and marching through it—Do you see any sense in it? I feel as if I were reading about some curious tribe in Central Africa—And now they’ll give us

votes; and you say—what do you say Miss L.I.D? I wish I could borrow your mind about 3 days a week. (L2 76)

This fragmented narrative juxtaposes a quiet mockery of masculine attempts at civilization building (through lecturing) with images of vigorous, militating women on the march for the vote and for peace. Beneath this juxtaposition lies the larger question that would inspire *Three Guineas*: how a woman might “make a scrap of difference” in preventing war. Becoming “steadily more feminist,” Woolf expresses skepticism at men’s efforts to end war, asking whether ranting like Carlyle had made “a scrap of difference practically,” or lecturing like Russell might “found new civilizations.” Her critique of masculine culture’s attempts to prevent war concludes with a powerful, distinctly feminist vision torn straight from the suffragist lexicon: she envisions the image of an individual woman, “pulling us together and marching through” that “preposterous masculine fiction,” as if war were a plate of glass capable of being smashed (or marched) “through” with a brick. “Do you see any sense in it? . . . What do you say Miss L.I.D?” is Woolf’s attempt to share her vision with a fellow pacifist whose political opinion she valued and respected. This moment can be viewed as Woolf’s first tentative attempt at “pulling . . . together” women in the name of peace, a task she would accomplish successfully two decades later in *Three Guineas*, as women’s overwhelmingly positive responses to that work prove.¹³

Woolf’s conviction that war and masculinity were intimately linked was corroborated by firsthand access to the reality of Downing Street supplied by her cousin, H. A. L. Fisher, who had served as a cabinet minister in Lloyd George’s government. In 1918, she recorded at length her feelings about being

In touch with one who was in the very centre of the very centre, sitting in a little room at Downing St. where, as he said, the wireless messages are racing through from all over the world, a million miles a minute; where you have constantly to settle off hand questions of enormous difficulty & importance—where the fate of armies does more or less hang upon what two or three elderly gentlemen decide.

(D1 204)

Their conversations solidified her already strong sense of the connections that exist between war, patriarchy, colonialism, and capitalism. She was to reflect on this connection in an extensive passage in *Jacob's Room* in which, in a tone of mock-reverence, the narrator imagines what takes place in the “very centre of the very centre”:

The wires of the Admiralty shivered with some far-away communication. . . . The voice continued, imprinting on the faces of the clerks in Whitehall (Timothy Durrant was one of them) something of its own inexorable gravity, as they listened, deciphered, wrote down. Papers accumulated, inscribed with the utterances of Kaisers, the statistics of ricefields, the growling of hundreds of work—people, plotting sedition in back streets, or gathering in the Calcutta bazaars, or mustering their forces in the uplands of Albania. . . .

The voice spoke plainly in the square quiet room with heavy tables, where one elderly man made notes on the margin of typewritten sheets. . . .

His head—bald, red-veined, hollow-looking—represented all the heads in the building. His head, with the amiable pale eyes, carried the burden of knowledge across the street; laid it before his colleagues, who came equally burdened; and then the sixteen gentlemen, lifting their pens or turning perhaps

rather wearily in their chairs, decreed that the course of history should shape itself this way or that way, being manfully determined, as their faces showed, to impose some coherency upon Rajahs and Kaisers and the muttering in bazaars, the secret gatherings, plainly visible in Whitehall, of kilted peasants in Albanian uplands; to control the course of events. (172)

Woolf mocks the self-importance of the men who “control the course of events” while gesturing toward the implications and extent of their excessive power. Focusing on the men’s ceremonial and altogether impersonal, inhuman manner of determining “the course of history,” Woolf uses the passage as a foil to offset the novel’s very human casualties, both that of Jimmy, who quite literally “feeds crows in Flanders” (97), and the aptly named Jacob Flanders himself.

Woolf continues this conceit in another passage of the novel in which her narrator adopts a tone of mock-reverence to describe the precision of calculated destruction, refusing to glorify the “dozen young men in the prime of life” or their “perfect mastery of machinery.” War is a choreographed affair, an “old pageant of armies drawn out in battle array upon the plain” (163), a ballet of young men whose lives and deaths are as orchestrated as their movements:

The battleships ray out over the North Sea, keeping their stations accurately apart. At a given signal all the guns are trained on a target which (the master gunner counts the seconds, watch in hand—at the sixth he looks up) flames into splinters. With equal nonchalance a dozen young men in the prime of life descend with composed faces into the depths of the sea; and there impassively (though with perfect mastery of machinery) suffocate uncomplainingly together. Like blocks of

tin soldiers the army covers the cornfield, moves up the hillside, stops, reels slightly this way and that, and falls flat, save that, through field glasses, it can be seen that one or two pieces still agitate up and down like fragments of broken match-stick. (155-56)

In her attention to the scene that can be seen only “through field glasses,” the narrator points to the distance separating the “tin soldiers” from those men with the “bald, red-veined, hollow-looking” heads who choreograph their position: the same men who “shape” history, “impose some coherency upon Rajahs and Kaisers,” and “control the course of events” (172). Woolf thus shows how patriarchy is implicated not only in the execution of war, but in the governance of colonies (Rajahs), the suppression of discontented workers, the prosecution of sedition, and the production of history and meaning.

The passage extends its alignment of war and patriarchy to include capitalism, thereby demonstrating the far-reaching grasp of patriarchal power. “These actions [those of war],” the passage continues, “together with the incessant commerce of banks, laboratories, chancellories, and houses of business, are the strokes which oar the world forward, they say. And they are dealt by men as smoothly sculptured as the impassive policeman at Ludgate Circus” (155-56). This skepticism toward the very notion of “progress” anticipates Woolf’s assault on capitalism in *Three Guineas* in which she exposes its role in eroding individual humanity and thus producing war. The passage is perhaps more significant, however, for being one of the earliest public expressions of Woolf’s sense of political outsideness. Replacing the narrator’s subtler, mock-reverential tone with an overt marker of difference (the phrase “they say”), she marks the

narrator's position as different from, or "other" than, that of those who regard war, business, science, government, and capitalism as the signs of social progress. From *Jacob's Room* on, Woolf would variously use narrative voice and interior monologue to give a voice to the outsider, and to her own "different" ethical positioning.

Perhaps the most extensive voicing of the outsider position occurs in *Mrs. Dalloway*, the only novel of its generation to offer an extended meditation on the tragedy of war through direct access to the consciousness of one of its victims, Septimus Warren Smith, "one of the first to volunteer. . . to save an England which consisted almost entirely of Shakespeare's plays and Miss Isabel Pole in a green dress walking in a square" (130). A conversation between Septimus and Sir William Bradshaw illustrates how the reality of Septimus's experiences has stripped war of all its earlier association with glory. When Bradshaw asks, "'You served with great distinction in the War?,'" Septimus only thinks, "The European War—that little shindy of schoolboys with gunpowder? Had he served with distinction? He really forgot" (145). *Mrs. Dalloway* reveals patriarchy's implication in the power structures that authorize certain kinds of speech, a realization that reflects both Woolf's own experiences with the oppressiveness of a patriarchal family and a patriarchal medical establishment. When, in response to Bradshaw's question, Septimus merely repeats the word "war," Bradshaw reflects that "he was attaching meaning to words of a symbolical kind. A serious symptom, to be noted on the card" (145), thereby imposing a false meaning on Septimus's words that effectively silences his actual speech. It is significant that the very speech silenced by the patriarchal medical establishment in the novel contains the most radically pacifist "revelations": "Change the world. No one kills from hatred. Make it known" (35). War

had provided for Septimus access to “profound truths which needed, so deep were they, so difficult, an immense effort to speak out, but the world was entirely changed by them for ever” (102). The “supreme secret” (ibid.), “the greatest message in the world” (126), that Septimus wishes to tell the Prime Minister is the antidote to war: “love, universal love” (102). That this message should go undelivered allows Woolf to emphasize her point that the wholesale silencing of radical, outsider speech leads directly and irrevocably to the perpetuation of the status quo, and thereby to the perpetuation of war.

Woolf further explores society’s silencing of dissenting, pacifist voices in her treatment of another of the novel’s outsiders, Doris Kilman, whom we are told “talked too about the war. After all, there were people who did not think the English invariably right. There were books. There were meetings. There were other points of view” (197). The clipped language of these sentences suggests conversations conducted in whispers, a discretion adopted out of necessity: for Miss Kilman, who “had never been able to tell lies” (187), knows the dangers of speaking too freely. Woolf reveals a keen awareness of the price that outsiders pay for free speech, explaining that Miss Kilman was “turned . . . out [of school] because she would not pretend that the Germans were all villains,” since, “after all, she could read history” (ibid.).

Both *Mrs. Dalloway* and *Jacob’s Room* contain critiques of what Woolf referred to as the “violent and filthy passions” of patriotism, mocking the ready willingness of citizens to sacrifice their lives out of a blind reverence for royalty, that “flag flying in the British breast” (*Mrs. Dalloway* 28). “When a Royal hand attached to an invisible body slipped out and withdrew the red and white bouquet reposing on the scarlet ledge,” she writes in *Jacob’s Room*, “the Queen of England seemed a name worth dying for” (68). A

similar sense of duty and patriotism is aroused in onlookers in *Mrs. Dalloway* by the merest glimpse of what might be royalty: “At once they stood even straighter, and removed their hands, and seemed ready to attend their Sovereign, if need be, to the cannon’s mouth, as their ancestors had done before them” (26). Woolf critiques the pious sentiment and pageantry of militarism in her description of boys marching to lay a wreath on the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier: “Boys in uniforms, carrying guns, marched with their eyes ahead of them, marched, their arms stiff, and on their faces an expression like the letters of a legend written round the base of a statue praising duty, gratitude, fidelity, love of England” (*Mrs. Dalloway* 76). Peter Walsh observes their progress as they pass “all the exalted statues, Nelson, Gordon, Havelock, the black, the spectacular images of great soldiers . . . looking ahead of them, as if they too had made the same renunciation” (77). “One had to respect it,” Peter notes to himself, just as “the traffic respected it; vans were stopped” (76). Woolf was to examine the negative consequences of respecting militarism, and the possible positive consequences of refusing to respect it, in *The Years* and *Three Guineas*.

The “Time Passes” section of *To the Lighthouse* contains what may be Woolf’s most haunting evocation of the war, heard in “ominous sounds like the measured blows of hammers dulled on felt. . . as if a giant voice had shrieked so loud in its agony that tumblers stood inside a cupboard vibrated too” (200). The effect of war on the home front is registered: it interrupts the “jocundity” and “serenity” of the holiday resort, imprinting on the beach landscape “the silent apparition of an ashen-coloured ship . . . a purplish stain upon the bland surface of the sea as if something had boiled and bled, invisibly, beneath” (201). Changes made to the holograph and typescript versions of the “Time

Passes” section, however, stripped the work of its most direct assaults on the patriarchal roots of war and of its singular vision of a creative, regenerative, primordial, and distinctly feminine force embodied in Mrs. McNab. The result is an absence in the final text of the “antimilitaristic, fiercely feminist condemnation of the pointless violence of blind male dominion” present in the holograph and typescript versions (Haule 173). It is interesting to note that Woolf relegates her most direct expression of pacifism—her reference to the War as “the mindless warfare, the soulless bludgeoning” (qtd. in Haule 167)—to the margins of her holograph draft, its physical positioning reflective of the marginality of her pacifist position. Her censoring of this textual “white poppy” is part of a pattern of self-concealment that would reach its fullest flowering in *The Years*.

The nine hundred page holograph version of *The Years* reveals the development of Woolf’s feminist pacifist critique of war and the fictional origins of her outsider. In comparing the holograph version of that novel with the final product, Grace Radin concludes that the holograph suggests “an explicitly political novel” (*Evolution* 35) that differs greatly from the final product: absent is Woolf’s “radical and explicit ‘outsider’s’ denunciation of a male-dominated, imperialistic, war-mongering and class-ridden society” (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 675). Woolf’s revisions were so extensive that, when read together, the excised passages and cancelled galley proofs constitute “another unwritten novel” (Radin, *Evolution* xviii)—or, more accurately, another *written* novel. The impact, in particular, of the excision of two “enormous chunks” removed from the novel at the proof stage “changes the meaning of the work as a whole” and “softens the antiwar impact of the novel” (Radin, *Evolution* 81).

The holograph of *The Years*, like *Jacob's Room*, poses an explicit connection between war and education; in the 1917 dinner scene, Woolf uses Nicholas to articulate her own position on war as a product of education and influence. Nicholas's connection of George's (North's) decision to enlist with his University education, of men's desire to serve with women's glorification of war, and of women's lack of patriotism with their social oppression (Radin, *Evolution* 68, 71) align her argument in *The Years* with that of *Three Guineas*. In the first of the two chunks cut from the proofs, Woolf fictionalizes civilian, and particularly women's, glorification of war, dramatizing and illustrating its effect on soldiers. Woolf shows passengers glancing "admiringly" at the soldiers, and points out that the soldiers were "obviously conscious of the admiring glances that were cast on them" (qtd. in Radin, "'Two Enormous Chunks'" 181). A woman accompanying an officer in uniform "felt that people wanted to hear her speak. A vague sympathy, a dumb admiration, surrounded them wherever they went"; as the couple leaves, the narrator notes, "eyes glance appreciatively after them" (qtd. in Radin, "'Two Enormous Chunks'" 182, 183). Woolf reveals women's complicity in romanticizing and glorifying war, with one woman imagining that it is to be the couple's last night together before leaving for the Front: "Sad as it was, there was a sweetness in it which gave her a thrill of something like pleasure" (ibid.). This section also critiques civilian passivity in its depiction of the "numb and torpid" passengers on the train, who all "seemed to be gloating; to have fed on the garbage of the newspapers; and to be passively chewing the cud" (qtd. in Radin, "'Two Enormous Chunks'" 186, 182).

Woolf's revisions erased much of novel's overt references to the impact of the Great War on the home front. The war is a decisive presence in the first "chunk," from

the newspapers whose bold headlines blare the sinking of three British cruisers and the omnipresence of soldiers about to leave from the Front, to the mental preoccupation of various characters with the “thousands of young men . . . standing in the rain; thousands . . . lying wounded” (qtd. in Radin, “Two Enormous Chunks” 183). In this section, Woolf suffuses even the setting with pacifist sentiment: “What for, what for, what for, the train seemed to be growling” (qtd. in Radin, “Two Enormous Chunks” 182). While Radin suggests that these cuts can be explained by Woolf’s sense that their antipatriotic content was “ill-timed” given the rise of fascism, this explanation seems unlikely given Woolf’s willingness to publish what her most “antipatriotic” text, *Three Guineas*, just one year later in 1938. Rather, evidence from her diaries suggests that Woolf felt pressure from Leonard, “whose blank spots over Virginia’s work always centred on her politics” (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 304), to reduce the overt political content of the novel; his “tepid” reaction to the holograph (*D5* 122), combined with his conviction that art and politics should be kept separate (*D4* 345-6)—a point that she and Leonard were arguing while she was finishing the novel--would rouse her anxiety over the novel that she already felt to be “dangerously near propaganda” (*D4* 300).¹⁴

Virginia Woolf in the 1930s: Re-thinking Politics in “My Own Tongue”

Woolf’s skyrocketing fame in the 1920s and 1930s brought with it an increased and burdensome visibility. The rapid escalation of international events—including Japan’s invasion of Manchuria in 1931, Hitler’s selection as German Chancellor in 1933, Mussolini’s invasion of Abyssinia in 1935-6, and the start of the Spanish Civil War in 1936—meant that she was frequently on the receiving end of solicitations for money,

manuscripts, and various other forms of material and nonmaterial support for both international and domestic causes. She reported to Julian Bell in early 1936 how “Every day almost I get rung up to be asked to sign this, subscribe to that. . . . Society bubbles from society; and what good they do I don’t know; but I sign and I protest and so on” (L6 21). By early spring 1937 she recorded having “six letters to sign daily—or nearly so” (L6 112). The weight of these demands, paired with her disdain for the rise of fascism, placed Woolf in a difficult ethical position that would significantly impact her notion of outsider activism as articulated in *Three Guineas*. Her personal writing reveals a mind torn between the *desire* to be involved, and the *need* to do so on her own terms. “I don’t see how any one can keep out of it [politics] as things are,” she wrote to Julian Bell in late 1936 while at the same time negotiating precisely how she would be “in” it (L6 83).

Her diaries and letters of the thirties reveal complex, evolving views on group membership in political organizations and committees: she questioned their efficacy, their distasteful interpersonal politics, and their excessive demands on her attention. She disliked the interpersonal “politics” of conventional, organized politics: the bickering, the dissension, the futility of endless meetings and interminable bouts of conversation, “the party spite,” as she called it (L4 392). “I cant [*sic*] conceive how you politicians can go on being political,” she wrote to Margaret Llewelyn Davies. “All the summer we had nothing but political arguments with Maynard and others; and I finally felt it so completely silly, futile, petty, personal and unreal. . . . All they do is to abuse each other” (ibid). Her involvement with these organizations helped shape her outlook on group involvement; she reported feeling “badgered” and “abused and rooked,” and found the influence of the groups “harassing” (L6 51; L6 60, 62). Moreover, she had an avowed

aversion to the “preachiness” of political organizations, preferring instead to arrive at a political or ethical position through her own process of reasoning; she was to reject overt preachiness or didacticism in her writing of the thirties, maintaining that “speech making is an effervescence of foam—intoxicating to vanity, obstructive of truth” (*Pargiters* 5). Accordingly, Woolf would describe *The Pargiters* as containing “millions of ideas but no preaching” (*D4* 152), and would appeal directly to the individual’s powers of reasoning in *Three Guineas*. In an ongoing exchange with Ethel Smyth on the subject of causes, Woolf voices her objection to “the whole doctrine of preaching; of causes; of converting; teaching etc. . . . I think what I mean is that all teaching at the present moment seems to me a blasphemy” (*L4* 327-28, 329).

Woolf’s outlook on group membership and involvement in political organizations is wholly consistent with her critique of organizations in *Three Guineas*. “She disliked the idea of belonging to a fully paid-up group” (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 684) because she understood how group membership could, and did, adversely affect the individual’s powers of reason; she would instead praise the individual mind for its superior power to “think of things in themselves” (*Room* 115). “A society is a conglomeration of people joined together for certain aims; while you, who write in your own person with your own hand are single. You the individual are a man whom we have reason to respect,” she writes in *Three Guineas* (104). She saw group membership as antithetical to the pursuit of truth, since

No passion is stronger in the breast of man than the desire to make others believe as he believes. . . . Whigs and Tories, Liberal party and Labour party—for what do they battle except their own prestige? It is not love of truth, but desire to

prevail that sets quarter against quarter. . . . Each seeks peace of mind and subserviency rather than the triumph of truth and the exaltation of virtue.

(*Orlando* 149)

In *Three Guineas*, she would go on to connect skepticism toward groups with women's experience in the private house, where they have learned that while individual men may be trusted, men massed in groups act unpredictably and unreasonably. Her own experience of the private house leads Woolf to deduce the existence of "something in the conglomeration of people into societies that releases what is most selfish and violent, least rational and humane in the individuals themselves," a conglomeration described in *Three Guineas* as "an ill-fitting form that distorts the truth; deforms the mind; fetters the will" (105). Societies encourage divisions, when what is wanted are unions: in these societies, the private brother is "sunk" and replaced by "a monstrous male, loud of voice, hard of fist, childishly intent upon scoring the floor of the earth with chalk marks, within whose mystic boundaries human beings are penned, rigidly, separately, artificially" (*Three Guineas* 105). Woolf views participation in such societies as agreement to participate in such activities: "For by doing so [joining the proposed society] we should merge our identity in yours; follow and repeat and score still deeper the old worn ruts" (*ibid.*). Thus, Woolf's insistence that women should act independently rather than "massed in groups" reflects not only her desire that they should preserve their outsider status, but her belief that women, too, are capable of the same unpredictable and irrational behavior that she associated with group membership. Woolf inaugurates a radically feminist model of political engagement in *Three Guineas* that is born of women's education in the private sphere. Its logic is unassailable: societies and

organizations, which impair the individual's ability to reason, must be replaced by independent, secret, and anonymous action based on the exercise of reason, for only "obscurity lets the mind take its way unimpeded" (*Orlando* 104).

Nevertheless, she could not help but be part of the discussions that disturbed her peace, concluding that "the bray and the drone of those tortured voices" audible from the "meetings in the next room" meant that "one cant, alas, entirely withdraw" (*L6* 60). Her desire (and need) to be involved with the political questions of her day clashed with her need (and desire) to discover a new model of political engagement; rather than withdraw from politics while working out the terms of her engagement, however, she took part in the meetings, discussions, and debates of her day, though somewhat guardedly in order to preserve the integrity of independent thought. That Woolf was attempting to protect the integrity of her own mind helps to account for the fitful, sporadic nature of her involvement in political activities and organizations, which often has been mischaracterized as evidence of political ambivalence. Her involvement in organizational politics was characterized by periods of active involvement followed by periods of resentment and retraction (*Lee, Virginia Woolf* 684): periods of active participation allowing her insight into the psychology of political organizations and putting her in dialogue with the political voices and issues of her day, and periods of retraction supplying her the necessary intellectual space (a metaphorical "room" of her own) in which to consider carefully issues and arguments and to "evol[v]e a position in opposition to the voices she heard through the door" (*ibid.*). During the height of the Spanish Civil War, Woolf would write that she was "not a politician: obviously. can [*sic*] only rethink politics very slowly into my own tongue" (*D5* 114). Periods of retraction

from organized politics would provide her the intellectual space necessary for such acts of political translation.

Woolf's attendance, during the thirties, at peace conferences and meetings of the Labour Party, the Women's Co-operative Guild, the League of Nations Union, and two anti-fascist organizations, For Intellectual Liberty (FIL) and Vigilance, in addition to the omnipresent sound of "the voices she heard through the door" (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 684), meant that Woolf was witness to the heated debates surrounding internationalism, collective security, and sanctions that divided pacifists of the interwar era. "Our room seemed to be the centre of all the howling winds, and distracted and vociferous politicians," she recalled of the summer of 1936 (*L6* 76). Everyday life supplied Woolf myriad occasions for political discussion and debate, supplying material she could then "rethink" into her own "tongue" before tackling in essays or fiction. She used her diaries and, from 1931-38, her scrapbooks, to record raw material that she wanted to "rethink." Her diary records the raw material of conversation in great detail, capturing the flow of discussions and arguments in order to be able to reconstitute, and revisit, them in privacy. The most frequently discussed subject for much of the thirties, predictably, was how to prevent war. "Stephen [Spender] & I think how to improve the world," an entry of 1935 reads (*D4* 303). Another entry recounts a conversation with friends regarding practical obstacles to peace: "whether one can give people a substitute for war. Must have the danger emotion" and the need to "divert them on to some harmless object" (*D4* 307). Woolf records her own contribution to the conversation, questioning whether "war [has] ever won any cause" (*ibid*). Conversations with Julian Bell about his longing to fight in the Spanish Civil War—"a fever in the blood of the younger generation which we can't

possibly understand” (qtd. in Bell, *Virginia Woolf II* 258)—would prompt her to examine men’s “longing—instinctive and irrational—to fight” (*L6* 234-35). She records conversations on war in her diary in painstaking detail, as if recording minutes to a meeting: “A long close political argument [with Julian, Stephen Spender, and Kingsley Martin]. . . . What is our duty? What is the responsible man like KM to do? Cant be a pacifist; the irresponsible can. I sat there splitting off my own position from theirs” (*D5* 79-80). This “splitting off” of her position from theirs, and “testing” of their views, offers insight into how essential this process of translation was to Woolf’s sense of her own political position. She was to draw heavily on these political encounters in developing her philosophy of outsiderism in *Three Guineas* and in formulating the feminist pacifist analysis of war that is found there.

In Chapter One of what follows, I reconstruct the complex composition, publication, and reception histories of *Three Guineas*, showing each aspect of the work to have been suffused thoroughly by the pacifist discourse that defined England in the 1930s. Paying careful attention to the work’s pre-publication and post-publication states, I go on to demonstrate its continuing importance within contemporary discourses of the feminist peace movement. The second chapter offers a historical overview of the editing of Woolf’s works more generally, and argues that a new edition of *Three Guineas* is needed that is capable of depicting the work’s complex pre-publication and post-publication states, in addition to its published ones. I explore the viability of the parallel-text edition, the genetic edition, and the fluid-text edition as potential models for this new edition and consider the kinds of readings that might result from each model. Building from the theoretical foundations of the previous chapters, Chapter Three advances a view

of *Three Guineas* as a socially constructed text, revealing its arguments to have been in direct dialogue with those of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century feminist pacifist movement, Britain's patriarchal peace movement, and prominent leaders of Church and State. Chapters Three and Four suggest practical and ideological motivations behind Woolf's calculated use of photographs in *Three Guineas*, and Chapter Four reconstructs the historical and cultural significance of the photographic subjects, revealing their overall significance to the work's argument as a whole.

Chapter One: The Cultural Evolution and Work of *Three Guineas*: A Composition, Publication, and Reception History

Conception and Composition

The history of the conception and composition of *Three Guineas* is a complex and fascinating one. Although only fragments of the holograph and typescript survive, Woolf's frequent references in her letters, diaries, and scrapbooks allow us to trace its constantly changing trajectory from its moments of inception.¹⁵ While aspects of this evolution have been recounted elsewhere by Woolf scholars,¹⁶ my own account attempts to situate the work's interlocking composition, publication, and reception histories within their historical and cultural backgrounds, foregrounding theoretical and practical assumptions as to the simultaneity of conception and composition and the fundamentally social nature of composition, which is always produced through a complex configuration of "social negotiations" (Bryant 53). In the account of conception and composition that follows, I have attempted to date stages in the work's development as precisely as possible, which may prove useful in future attempts to date the work's holograph and typescript fragments.

What would be published on 2 June 1938 as *Three Guineas* was first conceived in the bathtub in January 1931 as a sequel to *A Room of One's Own* focused on "the sexual life of women" (D4 6), a concept derived from the paper "Professions for Women" that Woolf was to deliver on the following day to the London/National Society for Women's Service. Although she would not begin to write *Three Guineas* until late 1936—"save for some frantic notes" (D5 112)—after she had finished writing *The Waves* (1931), *The*

Second Common Reader (1932), *Flush* (1933), and *The Years* (1937), 1931-36 was an important gestation period in the conception of that work, during which she contemplated and developed it almost continuously. Life itself was providing much of the impetus for the book: I “make up arguments, see pictures, keep dropping something new into the cauldron, which must bubble as richly as possible before its poured & stilled & hardened” (D4 96). The reading of biographies, letters, newspapers; conversations with friends; observations of everyday life: all acted powerfully on its future direction, making the book resemble a receptacle for “all I know, feel, laugh at, despise, like, admire [*sic*] hate & so on” (D4 152). She found that every memory she possessed, every encounter she had, and every book she read was relevant to the work—“as if everything added to that torrent—all books become fluid & swell the stream” (D4 142). This period was, by her own later account, one spent “observing & collecting,” a project she had begun much earlier when preparing to write her first anti-war novel, *Jacob’s Room* (D4 133).¹⁷

Early references to *Three Guineas* in her diaries and letters, and entries included in her scrapbook during this period, suggest precisely which themes of *A Room of One’s Own* she had initially intended to pursue in its sequel. The title and content of her January 1931 talk “Professions for Women” make clear her continued interest in the exclusion of women from the professions, as does a June 1931 letter to Ethel Smyth soliciting “a purely objective statement” from Ethel on “the exact disabilities (not being allowed to play in orchestras etc [*sic*] which women suffer in music” (L4 348). Her continuing dissatisfaction with women’s exclusion from the Universities is evident, too, in her response at being asked in February 1932 to deliver the Ford Clark lectures at Cambridge: whether she could do it “without sealing my lips when it comes to tilting at

Universities” (D4 79). By May 1932, she was beginning to extend the feminist economic analysis of *A Room* to consider how “the male virtues are never for themselves, but to be paid for. This introduces another element into their psychology—to be paid for; what will pay. . . . (I’m thinking of the book again.)” (D4 95). The answer to this question of “what will pay”—the unpaid labour and sacrifices of Britain’s daughters, sisters, and wives—would become a central refrain of *Three Guineas*.

Woolf’s vision for the work’s scope by this time can also be inferred from her scrapbook entries of the period. Of those items that can be dated definitively, several relate to the book’s proposed focus on “the sexual life of women”: these include handwritten copies of two excerpts from the *New Statesman*, dated 13 February 1932, on the subject of abortion (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 5), and a clipping detailing the ruin suffered by the women whom Tolstoy seduced throughout his early manhood (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 13). Several entries from this period deal with men’s attitudes toward women’s professional advancement, and the persistence of the “separate spheres” doctrine: these include a typed copy of a letter sent to Ethel Smyth by Albert Einstein in which the eminent scientist reflects on the rarity of women’s “passionate and lasting devotion to a purely intellectual cause,” and then asks whether one should “wish that it were otherwise” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 10); a news clipping alleging that “women are discovering that their enfranchisement will only be worth while if it enables them to increase in femininity” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 24-25); and a third news clipping detailing the resignation of eleven male committee members upon the appointment of a woman librarian (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 15).¹⁸

Woolf's economic analysis of women's political power in *Three Guineas* is entirely dependent on the particular historical and cultural moment in which the book was written. By the thirties, the limitations of postwar legislation benefiting women had grown perceptible: the Representation of the People Act of 1918, which had extended suffrage to women property holders over the age of thirty, and the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act of 1919, which had allowed women "unrestricted" access to the professions, had by this time proven themselves inadequate to the task of combating the deeply entrenched, systemic nature of patriarchal oppression that continued to define the period. While women were no longer legally prohibited from performing certain jobs or exercising the right to vote, it was clear to Woolf, and to many other feminists of the period, that men's vanity, jealousy, pride, and capital were far more difficult obstacles to overcome.¹⁹ As the thirties wore on, and another war loomed nearer, women were commonly criticized in the Press for having failed to live up to the promises made before the war by advocates of women's suffrage: namely that their different education and experience (or, as essentialist feminists argued, their biological difference from men), would enable women to put an end to war once granted a political voice, which was conceived of in limited terms as a political vote. This limited conception is one of Woolf's primary targets in *Three Guineas*, in which she argues that a political voice only can be attained once women reach a state of economic independence. If women have failed thus far to effect change, Woolf reasons, it is because men's resistance to the expansion of women's rights has made it nearly impossible for the masses to attain this true state of economic independence. It is only now, she argues, that women in any significant numbers are beginning to secure for themselves the requisite economic

independence for political efficacy. With their clippings and notes testifying to the pervasiveness of misogynist attitudes and the ubiquity of the Victorian notion of separate spheres for the sexes, Woolf's scrapbooks fully document the central role played by the controversy over women's political efficacy in the conception of *Three Guineas*. They contain ample documentation of the financial advantages bestowed on the son as against the daughter of the educated man, and of the vanity, jealousy, and pride that such advantages bestow on their possessor: two additional aspects that women must combat in order to secure their economic independence.

As one might expect of a work given the early titles "Answers to Correspondents" and "On Being Despised," *Three Guineas* directly confronts those who criticize women's political accomplishments, transforming their criticisms into further evidence by which men might be indicted for resisting the independence of their sisters. That the daughters of educated men should be forced to pay for the education of their brothers *and* be viewed by them with scorn left Woolf "quivering & itching" to write what she was now tentatively calling "Men Are Like That" (D4 78). The scornful voices of men like H. G. Wells, J. C. Squire, and C. E. M. Joad provided much of the impetus for the work during the early stages of its conception; Volume One of the scrapbooks contains both a typed excerpt from Joad's *Under the Fifth Rib* and Squire's review of *A Room of One's Own* (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 2, 16). She was so clearly angered by the remarks of J. C. Squire in September 1931 that she notes having "read Montaigne this morning & found a passage about the passions of women—their voracity—which I at once opposed to Squire's remarks & so made up a whole chapter of my Tap at the Door or whatever it is" (D4 42).

H. G. Wells's *The Work, Wealth, and Happiness of Mankind*, which Leonard was reviewing in February 1932, similarly outraged her, its sentiments on women's political failures echoing those of C. E. M. Joad: "My mind is set running upon A Knock at the Door . . . owing largely to reading 'Wells on Woman'—how she must be ancillary & decorative in the world of the future, because she has been tried, in 10 years, & has not proved anything" (D4 75). While she responds directly and specifically to the three men in *Three Guineas*, their utterances are held up simultaneously as evidence of a far more pervasive misogyny: for the world, Woolf tells her readers, is full of "men like Mr Joad and Mr Wells" who are ready to "deny your [professional women's] poverty" and "accuse you of apathy and indifference" (42).²⁰

Much of the scope of the future *Three Guineas* appears to have been already in place by 1931-32: dated scrapbook entries suggest a definite interest by this time in women's position in the Civil Service, the University, the legal system, and, by January 1933, in the Church.²¹ Her intention to include four of the work's five photographs also can be dated to this period, as indicated in a diary dated 16 February 1932 (D4 77).²² As with the creation of any art object, however, her conception of the work continued to evolve even as its composition began. By 2 November 1932, she had been struck with a new vision for the work:

I have entirely remodeled my "Essay". Its to be an Essay-Novel, called the Pargiters—& its to take in everything, sex, education, life &c; & come, with the most powerful & agile leaps, like a chamois across precipices from 1880 to here & now—That's the notion anyhow, & I have been in such a haze & dream & intoxication, declaiming phrases, seeing scenes, as I walk up Southampton Row

that I can hardly say I have been alive at all, since the 10th Oct. Everything is running of its own accord into the stream, as with Orlando. (*D4 129*)²³

Despite her claim to have begun writing the essay on 12 October 1932, her references to having been “declaiming phrases” and “seeing scenes” from 10 October 1932 to 2 November 1932 suggest that she was occupied more with conception than composition during this time. But progress on the work she was now calling “The Pargiters” was swift—“far the quickest going of any of my books” (*D4 132*). Between 2 November and 17 December 1932, she reported having “almost written out my first fury—234 typewritten pages since Oct 10” (*ibid.*), and, two days later, she reported having “written myself to the verge of total extinction,” having composed “60,320 words since Oct. 11th” (*D4 132*). Her diary contains frequent references to the all-consuming nature of the project: I have “never lived in such a race, such a dream, such a violent impulsion & compulsion—scarcely seeing anything but the Pargiters,” she wrote (*D4 133*). In January 1933, she reported being interrupted by “the making up of scenes—unconsciously: saying phrases to myself; & so, for a week, I’ve sat here, staring at the typewriter, & speaking aloud phrases of The Pargiters. This becomes more & more maddening” (*D4 142-43*). “These cursed scenes & dialogues will go on springing up in my head,” she continued in another entry. “It is a tiresome bewildering distraction now” (*D4 143*).

Being forced to “define my attitude” in the midst of writing the book is likely to blame for some of this exasperation. But she also refers to the period with great affection as “a great season of liberation” and “a tremendous revelation,” a moment in which “everything appeared very distinct, amazingly exciting. I had no restrictions whatever, & was free to define my attitude with a vigour & certainty I have never known before” (*D5*

135). The chief means by which she would educate herself on any subject was through newspapers and books—chiefly biographies, autobiographies, letters, and diaries. A voracious reader with democratic tastes, she reportedly took in as many as four daily newspapers and claimed (one hopes facetiously) to be reading twenty books “at once” (L5 137), both of which account for the range and number of notes and other materials contained in her reading notes and scrapbooks. The expanded scope of her project is mirrored in the first volume of the scrapbooks: the wide range of subjects treated in the latter half of the volume—documents on subjects as diverse as women’s education, professions, dress, and status in the Church, along with items on abortion, war, love, and painting—reflect the work’s growth during late 1932 and early 1933 from a project focused on the “sexual life of women” to one intended “to give the whole of the present society—nothing less: facts, as well as the vision” (D4 151-52).

Friends and acquaintances would prove to be another important resource in her political education, helping her clarify her understanding of events and figures. In 1933 alone, she could be seen actively soliciting information and facts from Ethel Smyth, Margaret Llewelyn Davies, Pippa Strachey, Rebecca West, and Lady Shena Simon on subjects as diverse as women’s education, the suffrage movement, and professional opportunities for women, all of which would be used in *Three Guineas*. Ethel’s experiences, for example, proved useful to Woolf’s education about Emmeline Pankhurst and the suffragettes (L5 141), views on militarism and war (L5 146), and women’s exclusion from the musical profession; Shena Simon provided facts about educational opportunities for women and women’s admission to Newnham College, Cambridge (L5 201, 243; L6 132-33); Pippa Strachey, Secretary to the London/National Society for

Women's Service, supplied stories of professional opportunities for women; and Rebecca West proffered anecdotes of "Mrs Pankhurst, and how she smelt when hunger striking" (L5 259).

Progress on what she was now calling *The Pargiters* was interrupted in 1933 by various technical problems that were to have a decisive impact on the shape of the work. While she had envisioned the structure of the work in January 1933 as a series of alternating fictional and factual interchapters, presented in the form of "a curiously uneven time sequence—a series of great balloons, linked by straight narrow passages of narrative" (D4 142), the structure proved too difficult to satisfactorily execute. She complained of the difficulty of integrating the factual and fictional aspects of the work—"keeping the march of events" while supplying commentary (D4 152)—and of converting "intellectual argument" into "the form of art" (D4 161). She appears to have been dissatisfied with the results of her efforts, for after rereading and revising the first chapter on 2 February 1933, she announced that she was omitting the interchapters, "compacting them in the text," and instead including an appendix with dates (D4 146). This decision effectively put an end to her plans for an Essay-Novel, splintering the project into what would become her "novel of fact," *The Years*, and her polemic, *Three Guineas*. She would continue work on the novel throughout 1933 and 1934, and claimed to have written the last word of the 900-page book on 30 September 1934 (D4 245). Work on the extensive revisions she was to make in an effort to shorten the novel, compress it, and avoid "the burden of something that I wont call propoganda" were underway by 15 November 1934 (D4 262, 281). She reportedly finished rewriting the now 797-page novel by December 1935 and, by November 1936, claimed to have cut the

book from “close on 700 to 420 pages” (L6 84), lamenting that the extensive revisions had made it “a very bad book” (L6 94). “Never have I worked so hard at any book” (D5 16), she would reflect after completing the extensive revision process.

It was while continuing to revise *The Years* in late December 1934 and early January 1935 that she once more mentions her desire “to write On being despised. My mind will go on pumping up ideas for that” (D4 271). The political scene in Britain, and in Europe as a whole, had changed dramatically in the years that Woolf had been occupied writing her novel of that name: the years between 1931 and 1935 had seen the collapse of internationalism and the failures of the League of Nations in Abyssinia and Manchuria; Hitler and Mussolini’s rise to power and the subsequent evisceration of women’s rights in Germany and Italy; the visible threat of fascism in Britain, marked by the ascendancy of the British Union of Fascists under the leadership of Oswald Mosley; and the virulent dissension between pacifists and internationalists over the issues of sanctions, force, and rearmament, which led to the fracturing of the pacifist movement. She would incorporate knowledge of these political changes and world events into her work, figuring them into her developing analysis of human psychology and gender relations.

Of particular interest to her during this time was the status of women’s rights under fascism: this subject appears, in fact, to have motivated her return to the project in January 1935. One of the earliest dated entries in the second volume of scrapbooks is a handwritten letter Woolf received from Princess Elizabeth Bibesco dated 1 January 1935 (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 51). Asked by Woolf “why the woman question was ignored” in the Cambridge anti-war council’s upcoming anti-Fascist exhibit, the Princess responded, “I

am afraid that it had not occurred to me that in matters of ultimate importance even feminists could wish to segregate & label the sexes. It would seem to be a pity that sex alone should be able to bring them together” (D4 273). Woolf’s response to herself—“What about Hitler?”—suggests that she repudiated the characterization of such behavior as exclusively “feminine,” when Hitler himself could be seen “segregat[ing] and label[ing] the sexes” (ibid.). “So we go on, sparring & biting,” she wrote about Elizabeth Bibesco. “I shouldn’t mind giving that woman a toss in the air” (D4 273). That Woolf began referring to the work as an anti-Fascist pamphlet shortly thereafter suggests the importance of this letter, which she pasted into her scrapbook and copied by hand into her diary (D4 302; MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 51).

Although Woolf appears not to have added any items to the second volume of scrapbooks from February to August 1935 while engaged in the final stages of rewriting *The Years*, her diaries reveal several events that are important to the development of her anti-fascist pamphlet at this stage. One of these was Leonard’s progress on his anti-fascist polemic, *Quack, Quack!* (1935), a Marxist analysis of contemporary culture that he worked on throughout 1934. A second event to occur during this period was a conversation with E. M. Forster in the London Library on 9 April 1935, about the Library Committee’s decision to continue excluding women from their ranks. The decision so angered her that she expressed the immediate desire to “make up a phrase in my book on Being Despised” (D4 297-98). As she imagined the possibility of herself having been admitted to the Committee, her sense of outrage grew stronger: “The veil of the Committee’s temple—which, whether university or cathedral, was academic or ecclesiastical I forget—was to be raised, & as an exception she was to be allowed to enter

in. But what about my civilisation? For 2,000 years we have done things without being paid for them. You can't bribe me now" (ibid.). Women are not to be bought off cheaply through a begrudging admission to hitherto forbidden provinces, their civilisation abandoned at the first possibility of joining men's; rather, she argues, they must not abandon the wealth and the singular history of their own civilisation—the story of how their unpaid labour and unpaid-for education resulted in a civilisation capable of eradicating war.

Woolf added two news clippings from August 1935 to her scrapbook, both taken from the same day's *Times* and related to fascism in Germany: the first, a clipping detailing the arrest of the "outspoken" Frau Pommer for "insulting and slandering the State and the Nazi movement," and the second detailing Hitler's militarist, masculinist vision of Germany as a "nation of men" rather than "a nation of pacifists" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 20). She began to collect clippings in earnest once more in October 1935. The volume contains four news clippings dating to that month: one, dated 16 October 1935, on the outcome of the conference of the National Council of Women (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 4); one, dated 18 October 1935, featuring a photograph of a helmeted Major Fey, head of the Vienna Heimwehr and indexed under the descriptive label, "head dresses for men" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 5); another detailing the organization of the capitalist system, dated 15 October 1935 (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 19); and still another that appears twice—the only clipping of the three scrapbooks to do so—relating Lord Hewart's toast on "England," delivered at a banquet for the Society of St. George at Cardiff, dated 1 October 1935 (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 3, 12).²⁴

The renewed vigor with which she began collecting items appears to have been spurred by her attendance at the Labour Party Conference in the first days of October 1935. This conference was to have a profound impact on the direction of *Three Guineas*, effecting its transformation from an anti-fascist pamphlet to an anti-war pamphlet. Woolf reported in a diary entry dated 2 October 1935 the tremendous impact made on her by the showdown between pacifist Labour leader George Lansbury and trade union leader Ernest Bevin, and of Labour's official rejection of the absolute pacifist position in favor of sanctions, which was the ultimate result of that meeting: "Three days [ago] I got into wild excitement over The Next War [*Three Guineas*]. Did I say the result of the L.P. at Brighton was the breaking of that dam between me & the new book, so that I couldn't resist dashing off a chapter: stopped myself; but have all ready to develop—the form found I think—as soon as I get the time?" (D4 346-48). She recorded her impressions of the meeting at great length:

It was very dramatic: Bevin's attack on Lansbury. Tears came to my eyes as L[ansbury] spoke. And yet he was posing I felt—acting, unconsciously, the battered Christian man. Then Bevin too acted I suppose. He sank his head in his vast shoulders till he looked like a tortoise. Told L.[ansbury] not to go hawking his conscience around. And what is my duty as a human being? The women delegates were very thin voiced & insubstantial. On Monday one said, It is time we gave up washing up. A thin frail protest, but genuine. A little reed piping, but what change against all this weight of roast beef & beer—which she must cook? All very vivid & interesting; but over lapping; too much rhetoric, & what a partial view: altering the structure of society: yes, but when its altered? Do I trust Bevin

to produce a good world, when he has his equal rights? . . . My sympathies were with Salter who preached non-resistance. He's quite right. That should be our view. (D4 345-46)

Several aspects of the Conference appear to have affected Woolf deeply.²⁵ First, the voices of the “thin voiced & insubstantial” women—that of a “little reed piping”—prompted Woolf to think about *how* women’s collective political voice could be made more substantial, and precisely how it might be able to effect “change against all this weight of roast beef & beer”: a question that forms the central axis of *Three Guineas*. Second, the Conference supplied her with statistics for “the sum that we are now spending upon force”—£400,000,000—and that serves as a refrain in the published version of *Three Guineas*. She makes effective use of these statistics in the holograph as well, to answer the question of “how far . . . influence [can] be effective without capital or force behind it”: “Perhaps on the evidence of history before us—the evidence of the Brighton Congress of the sum that we are now spending upon force, the answer is: influence is powerless without capital or force behind it” (M28 holograph 22). Above all, the Conference moved Woolf to consider precisely how capital-based influence might be used to prevent war, a question that suggests Woolf’s fundamentally optimistic view of the current political scene:

If we accept the view of the B. [ishop] of London & the L. P. conference at Brighton that in the last resort we (have to) depend upon force, then of course ‘influence’ of all kind is ruled out. . . . But even so, the ‘last resort’ is not at the moment reached in England. . . . But let us suppose that there is an interval, how (could) can we use our new weapon to prolong that interval? That is the question:

& it is one that deserves all the plain speaking & free thinking of which we are capable. (M28 holograph 40, 41-2)

Out of Woolf's "plain speaking & free thinking" in *Three Guineas* emerges an answer to this question: women can best use their capital to prolong the interval of peace by contributing to organizations that promote the education and professionalization of women, which alone can ensure them a political voice louder than "a little reed piping."

Despite being obsessed throughout the next few months with writing "my Next War—which at any moment becomes absolutely wild, like being harnessed to a shark" (D4 348), Woolf does not appear to have actually begun work on it until several months after the rewriting of *The Years* had been completed in December 1935. The broadening scope of the book, which is also reflected in the scrapbooks, left her anxiously pondering the shape and organization of the work. She felt that writing as if "its all the articles editors have asked me to write during the past few years—on all sorts of subjects. Shd. women smoke. Short skirts. War—&c. . . . wd give me the right to wander: also put me in the position of the one asked. And excuse the method: while giving continuity" (D4 361). By January 1936, however, she had abandoned this plan in favor of an epistolary format; by March 1936, she had begun referring to it as "Letter to an Englishman" (D5 18) and, by 24 March 1936, as "Two Guineas." The date of the first entry of the second volume of the scrapbooks, 4 March 1936, suggests that, while she had been gathering clippings with greater intensity starting in October 1935, she did not begin to mount them in her book until March of 1936 or soon after, by which time she had collected enough material to fill 21 pages of the book. Her commitment to organizing and mounting these materials at this time is consistent with her deep preoccupation with the writing of the book at the same

time: a preoccupation that had become so extreme by March 1936 that she remarked, “I must very nearly verge on insanity I think I get so deep in this book I don’t know what I’m doing” (D5 20).

Although Woolf recorded having “made up” the first pages of the book in April 1936 (D5 22) and, later, to have begun the writing of *Three Guineas* in November of that same year (D5 35), little, if any, actual writing appears to have taken place until on or after 28 January 1937, when she noted in her diary that she “began 3 Guineas this morning, & cant stop thinking it. My plan is to write it out now, without more palaver, & think perhaps it might be roughed in by Easter” (D5 52). This start date is consistent with several other references, including one made on 12 February 1937, in which she mentions that she has been “writing hard since Jan 28th at 3 Guineas” (D5 54) and another made on 18 February 1937 in which she mentions having “now written for 3 weeks at 3 Guineas, & have done 38 pages” (D5 55). Between April 1936 and January 1937, she continued to collect items for her scrapbook with increasing vigor, at times clipping multiple items on the same day, and collecting enough material to fill approximately 25 pages of the scrapbook.

By her own estimation, she worked quickly and steadily at *Three Guineas* during the first half of 1937. She appears to have begun writing the Universities section first, and planned that the section on professions should follow. In February 1937, she notes feeling “so entirely imbued in 3 Guineas that I can hardly jerk myself away to write here. (here in fact I again dropped my pen to think about my next paragraph—universities—how that will lead to professions & so on” (D5 62). By March 1937, she reports being “absorbed all the morning in the Un[iversit]y part of 3 Gs.” (D5 64) and “having a good gallop at 3

Guineas” (D5 65). This gallop appears to have been temporarily slackened by the stresses surrounding the publication of *The Years*: despite her claims in late March to have “once more loaded myself with the strain of 3 Gs. at which I have been writing hard & laboriously,” she sees herself “straining to draw that cart across the rough ground” (D5 67). Distracted by reviews of the novel, she remarks how “all 3 Gs. is held up—yet I have it pressing for speech” (D5 71), and claims to “have toiled a little at 3 Gs but cant concentrate sufficiently” (D5 70). “Now I must begin again on 3 Gs,” she reminds herself (ibid.). Her comment that she feels “too jaded to tackle the Professional chapter of 3 Gs” (D5 69), suggests that she was close to completing, or had already completed, the first draft of the Universities chapter by March 1937. That the latest dated entry in the second volume of the scrapbooks—Woolf’s typewritten reflections on a service at St. Paul’s, dated 21 March 1937 (MHP B13.f, Vol. 2: 55, 56)—can be found on pages 55 and 56 of the 59-page volume suggests that she completed this volume at around the same time as she finished writing the first draft of the universities chapter in March 1937. That she should continue, until December 1937, to collect items in volume three pertaining to the wealth of men’s colleges, the poverty of women’s colleges, and educational restrictions imposed upon women suggests that she continued to think about previous sections following their completion, and may have planned to further strengthen her arguments by incorporating new facts and statistics at the rewriting and revising phase.

The composition of *Three Guineas* was impacted by Woolf’s anxiety over the reception of *The Years*. As she awaited the novel’s publication in March 1937, she expressed considerable anxiety on a number of counts: “I’m going to be beaten, I’m going to be laughed at, I’m going to be held up to scorn & ridicule—I found myself

saying those words just now. . . . The worst will be that the book will be treated with tepid politeness, as an effusive diluted tired book. All my other books have stirred up strife: this one will sink slowly & heavily (*D5 64*).²⁶ The reception of that book, it seemed to her, would foretell the reception of *Three Guineas*, and so she surveyed the crowds with rapt attention. A positive review in *The Observer* is taken by her to mean that *The Years* “will be debated; & this means that 3 Gs. will strike very sharp & clear on a hot iron” (*D5 68*), while Maynard’s “enthusiasm” for the book “gives more ply to 3 Guineas” (*D5 76*). Even negative responses to *The Years* generate a certain degree of excitement over the far greater hostility she anticipated receiving upon publication of *Three Guineas*: “Allington sneers at me on the BBC . . . so the deans have their vanity, & if I say what I mean in 3 Guineas I must expect considerable hostility. Yet I so slaver & silver my tongue that its sharpness takes some time to be felt” (*D5 84*).

After a hiatus lasting perhaps as long as two months, she resumed work on the project in the final days of May. By 1 June 1937 she noted that she had “at last got going with 3 Guineas—after 5 days grind, re-copying & to some extent re-writing” (*D5 90*). Given her anticipation in March at beginning work on the Professions chapter, it seems logical to assume that the section she is re-writing in late May is the universities section. In addition to resuming work on *Three Guineas* at this time, she appears to have begun collecting items once more for the third volume of her scrapbooks, the first entry of which can be dated to 11 June 1937.²⁷ On 16 June 1937, she claims to have been “just finishing the education section,” which she has, by then, “much re-arranged” (*ibid.*). Rewriting and rearranging of this section was completed by 22 June 1937, when she

remarks: “I won’t do 3Gs. till Monday [28 June]—till I’ve had a quiet breather,” she remarks. “Then the Prof. Chapter: then the final” (*D5 95*).

Woolf did indeed begin work on “that very difficult chapter,” the Professions chapter, on 28 June 1937 (*D5 100*) and appears to have worked on it steadily, “in full flush” (*D5 101*) and “full flood” (*ibid.*), until 19 July 1937, on which date she announced that she was preparing to “storm the last section of 3Gs” (*D5 103*). During the interim, we find her soliciting a copy of Stanley Baldwin’s speech on women in the Civil Service from Vera Douie, the librarian at the Women’s Service Library, presumably for use in the second section.²⁸ Her comment suggests that she was close to finishing, or perhaps had already finished, the second section of the work by the time that her nephew, Julian Bell, was killed in late July 1937 while driving an ambulance in Spain. She would report being “completely stuck in my war pamphlet” just one month later on 17 August 1937: “I’m always wanting to argue it with Julian—in fact I wrote it as an argument with him. Somehow he stirred me up to argue” (*L6 159*). Another comment made at this time—“there’s 3 Guineas to finish: the last chapter, now I suppose its stiff & cold” (*D5 105*)—suggests that the composition of the third section may already have been underway at the time of Julian’s death. Between late August and late September 1937, she worked steadily at the third section, a task which “kept me completely submerged from 9 to one every morning; & driven me like a motor in the head over the downs to Piddinghoe &c every afternoon from 2 to 4” (*D5 111*). The last stretch of writing was intense: “every morning was crammed to the margin with 3 Guineas,” she would recollect upon writing the last page of the main body of the work on 12 October 1937. “Oh how violently I have been galloping through these mornings! It has pressed & spurted out of me, if thats any

proof of virtue, like a physical volcano” (D5 112). She announced her intention at this point to add notes and a bibliography to the work, and continued to collect items for her scrapbook throughout the remainder of 1937.

Woolf spent November and the early part of December revising and rewriting the first section of *Three Guineas*, which was provisionally completed and delivered to the typist on Monday, 13 December 1937 (D5 121). Five days later, on 18 December 1937, she had completed rewriting the second section, which was ready to be dispatched to the typist (D5 122). She had completed work on the final chapter at some point during the first half of January 1938, delivering it to the typist by 15 January 1938 (D5 125, 126). By the following month, February 1938, Woolf had begun making final corrections to the typescript and writing the notes. A comment made on 1 February 1938, announcing her intention to make *Three Guineas* “more compact & the notes shorter & sharper in the time added” (D5 126), suggests that some of the notes may already have been completed by this point, although perhaps not enough to show Leonard when he read the typescript for the first time on that date.²⁹ Leonard’s lukewarm response to the book in general, and to her satire in particular, appears to have strengthened her desire to “sharpen” the notes, particularly as “my satire seems to him mild”: “One always has to allow for the extreme diminution of force: the effect on a second person is so much slighter than one expected. My satire seems to him mild. But the final verdict has not yet been given. I have now to do the notes” (D5 127). That life should go on providing evidence for the arguments she was making in the notes to *Three Guineas* only extended the process further; as one might expect, she continued to solicit information from friends that could be woven into the tapestry of the notes, seeking clarification from Ethel as late as 24 February 1938 on

the matter of equality in women's musical training and their exclusion from orchestras. "I want it [3gs] to be accurate," she explained (L6 216-17). She worked simultaneously on writing the notes and correcting proofs, and remarks with dismay on 10 March 1938: "Here am I working 5 hours a day to finish off those notes, those proofs, & severely warned by L. today that unless I send off both in 6 days from this very Thursday, we must postpone till the autumn" (D5 128). If Leonard had gotten his way, which one assumes he must have, the galleys would have been sent to the publisher on 28 March 1938 (D5 131-32). We know that she was busy correcting proofs of notes by 31 March 1938 (D5 132) and anxiously anticipating the arrival of page proofs, which were due to arrive on 13 April 1938. By 26 April 1938, she was expressing a great deal of despair while correcting page proofs and, two days later, on 28 April 1938, announced that the final proofs were ready to be dispatched.

Publication and Reception

At least three distinct versions of *Three Guineas* were published within Woolf's lifetime. The first to appear was a serialized version published in the May and June 1938 issues of the *Atlantic Monthly* as "Women Must Weep" (May 1938) and "Women Must Weep—Or Unite Against War" (June 1938).³⁰ The first full-length version of *Three Guineas* was published by the Hogarth Press on 2 June 1938. Printed by the Garden City Press Ltd. of Letchworth, Herfordshire, the work had a fairly large first run, as Woolf noted with some trepidation in her diary: 16,250 copies were printed and priced at 7s.6d, a cost considerably more expensive than the Penguin edition of the *Second Common Reader*, which appeared around the same time.³¹ An American edition of the book, with

significant changes, was published by Harcourt, Brace and Company in New York on 25 August 1938: 7,500 copies were printed and priced at \$2.50.

The likelihood that a fourth version of the work appeared during Woolf's lifetime has gone entirely unmentioned in accounts of the work's publication history, and is absent as well from Kirkpatrick's bibliography. A letter dated 24 September 1938 in the *Three Guineas* letter file, transcribed and published by Anna Snaith, reveals that Woolf had agreed to allow extracts of the work to be published by the Married Women's Association, a British organization that advocated the economic and political interests of married women. (It seems probable that the letter was actually written by *Juanita Frances*, who founded the Association and served on its Executive Committee, rather than by "Granita" Frances, as Snaith's transcription reads.) As Snaith notes, enclosed with this letter was receipt for three pounds and sixpence, the amount contributed by Woolf toward publication expenses. Juanita Frances's comment that "the publishers have the text & I have instructed them to go through it again carefully" implies expressed concern on Woolf's part that the extracts may have required some additional correction or emendation, as well as the likelihood that proofreading or correction of the text was underway at this time. Neither the records of the Married Women's Association at The Women's Library, nor the *Three Guineas* letters file in the Monks House Papers, appear to contain further information as to where or when the extracts were published, or by whom.³² Further research into the possible existence of this version is clearly warranted, given its importance to efforts "to preserve the extensive breadth and array of cultural spaces into which texts penetrate" (Grigely 47).

The history of the publication of *Three Guineas* following Woolf's death is fascinating in light of the controversy surrounding the exclusion of the work's five black-and-white photographs from reprints beginning in 1963—a decision amended in Britain only as recently as 1993, and in America in 2006.³³ The first edition was re-issued in 1943 as the Uniform Edition, again priced at 7s.6d, while remainders of the first impression were issued as the Uniform Edition in 1947. Several reprints by photo-litho offset were issued in 1951, 1968, and 1977, although the 1968 and 1977 reprints excluded the five black-and-white photographs that initially accompanied the text. Harcourt, Brace & World issued a second American edition, the first to appear without the photographs, as a Harbinger Book in May 1963, while Penguin Books issued a second English edition in 1977 priced at 80p. Additional reprints of the second English edition were made in 1978, 1979, 1980, and 1982. A composite edition of *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas*, containing four of the five original plates and an introduction by Hermione Lee, was published by the Hogarth Press in 1984, and re-issued as a paperback in 1996. A photo-offset reprint of the second English edition of *Three Guineas*, again with an introduction by Hermione Lee and four of the five original plates, was issued in 1986 by the Hogarth Press; additional reprints were issued in 1988 and 1991. A second composite edition of *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas*, with four photographs, edited and introduced by Morag Shiach, was issued as a World's Classics book in 1992; additional reprints were made in May and December 1992, 1993, 1994, and 1996. The five photographs were finally restored, in their proper positions in the text, in a third composite edition that appeared in 1993, edited with notes and an introduction by Michele Barrett; published by Penguin Books as part of their *Penguin*

Twentieth-Century Classics series, the edition was reprinted in 1995 and 1996. Two editions of note have appeared more recently: Blackwell's Shakespeare Head edition (2001), edited and introduced by Naomi Black and Harcourt Brace's edition (2006), the first American edition to restore the work's original photographs, introduced and annotated by Jane Marcus.³⁴

Three Guineas was published on the heels of *The Years*, which had made an international celebrity of Woolf following its publication on 11 March 1937. The fictional counterpart of her pacifist polemic quickly became the best-selling of any of Woolf's works in England and America; by 1 June 1937, *The Years* had topped the charts in England, according to the *Herald Tribune*, remaining there until late August 1937, when it slipped to second or third on the list (*D5* 90-91). At the same time, it became the best-selling novel in America, selling 38,000 copies in America alone within six months of its publication (Briggs, *Virginia Woolf* 301). Despite a few dissenting voices in the Press that disparaged the book, the public appears to have reached a positive general consensus about this eminently readable historical novel.

Following such successes closely, the differences in the sales and reception of *Three Guineas* were readily apparent. The sales of *Three Guineas*—8,000 copies sold by December 1938 (*D5* 193) and a “dead failure” in America (*D5* 269)—did not approach those of *The Years*, and the polemic failed to obtain the kind of general consensus that the novel had, arousing as much ire as it did hearty enthusiasm among her readers. Woolf “prophesied” the work's reception rather accurately: “On the whole I shall get more pain than pleasure; I shall mind the sneers more than I shall enjoy Ly Rhondda's enthusiasm. There'll be many sneers—some very angry letters. Some silences. . . . L. says I must

expect some very angry reviews from men. I add, From women too. Then there'll be the clergy" (*D5* 145, 146). The work's reception was, indeed, to be characterized by alternating bouts of sneering, enthusiasm, and silence, which left Woolf vacillating between the extremes of pain and pleasure, as she had predicted. "Much less unanimity than about *Room of One's Own*," she wrote in December 1938. "A suspended judgment upon that work then seems fittest" (*D5* 193).

Most troublesome and perplexing to her, because altogether unexpected, was the silence of her closest friends and family regarding the work. She expresses her disbelief at their silence on numerous occasions, remarking in July 1938, "not a word said of it by any of my family or intimates" (*D5* 155-56) and again in December 1938, "not one of my friends has mentioned it" (*D5* 193). This silence was all the more oppressive in light of the praise with which Forster's "Two Cheers for Democracy" was received in September 1938: "I depressed by praise of Morgan's *Credo*: silence on all my friends part about my own" (*D5* 169). On two distinct occasions, she commented, "my own friends have sent me to Coventry over it"—an intriguing turn of phrase in light of its military allusion to the English Civil War.³⁵

Rather than ostracism in response to the work, she had imagined (and perhaps even eagerly and somewhat mischievously anticipated) that it might ignite the passions of her intimates, who ran the political gamut: for instance, she told Vita repeatedly "how you'll hate my new novel" (*L5* 121, 153; *L6* 231) and referred to it when speaking to Ethel as the book "which you will unreservedly hate" (*L5* 137; *L6* 232).³⁶ In a letter written to her sister shortly before the book's publication, she remarked, perhaps somewhat brashly, "I shan't, when published, have a friend left" (*L6* 218). "What the

bemedalled Wolves, with whom we dined last night, will say I don't know, but would probably find amusing," she writes (*D5* 147). After a visit with Vanessa, Clive Bell, Frankie Birrell, and Raymond Mortimer in December 1932, she began to anticipate "the little pricks which will be so lavishly provided when *The Pargiters* comes out" (*D4* 132)—a feeling which only intensified as the book's argument grew increasingly pacifist. In November 1935, after dinner with the literary critic Raymond Mortimer and novelist Aldous Huxley, she noted: "After our dinner at Raymond's with Aldous & the subconscious hostility I always feel there, I'm facing the fact that my next book, *Professions, The Next War*, will need some courage. 2 million women all longing for men, Aldous said. Raymond insisted, with his little hard squeak, that men were now unfairly treated: have to maintain a <woman> wife" (*D4* 354).

Naturally, Woolf hoped that Leonard would proffer a passionate response to the book that had become so central to her daily life during the last seven years. Despite feeling "quite confident once in a way" about showing the book to him in February 1938, his reaction was less than enthusiastic, and her disappointment more than palpable: "One always has to allow for the extreme diminution of force: the effect on a second person is so much slighter than one expected. My satire seems to him mild" (*D5* 127). "L. gravely approves *3 Gs.*," she remarked several days later. "Thinks it an extremely clear analysis. . . . One cant expect emotion, for as he says, its not on a par with the novels" (*D5* 127). Despite her claim to have been "on the whole content" (*ibid.*) with his response, a subsequent reference to "the horrid anti climax of *3 Gs.*," when "I didnt [*sic*] get so much praise from L. as I hoped" (*D5* 133) suggests otherwise. "The omens are mixed: L. is less

excited than I hoped; Nessa highly ambiguous; Miss Hepworth & Mrs Nicholls say ‘Women owe a great deal to Mrs Woolf’” (D5 141).

These “mixed” omens offered a fairly accurate gauge of the response that was to come. Awaiting the book’s publication, she expressed fear that the book “will excite nothing but mild sneers; & how very inconsequent & egotistical V.W. is” (D5 136-37). She repeatedly expresses her fear that the book will fail to make an impression, and that it will be “an empty gesture” (L6 229): “What I’m afraid of is the taunt Charm & emptiness. The book I wrote with such violent feelings to relieve that immense pressure will not dimple the surface. That is my fear” (D5 141). In this regard, she found Lady Rhondda’s response to the book to be particularly encouraging; for while, being “highly patriotic & citizenlike . . . [she] might have been roused to object” to the book, she wholeheartedly praised it. Woolf regarded her reaction as “a good omen; because this shows that certain people will be stirred; will think; will discuss; it won’t altogether be frittered away. . . . Its on the cards that it will make more splash among the ink pots than I thought” (D5 141-42).³⁷ Woolf responded, with gratitude, “if someone like yourself feels there is some scattered flying truth about in it then perhaps it won’t be, as I so often feel writing to be, a mere bonfire of words” (L6 236).

Most early reviews of the book seconded Lady Rhondda’s judgment of *Three Guineas* as a book of merit and substance. On 4 June 1938, the *Times Literary Supplement* hailed her as “the most brilliant pamphleteer in England” and pronounced its conviction “that this book may mark an epoch if taken seriously” (D5 148). Following laudatory reviews in *The Times* and in *Time and Tide*, the feminist periodical edited by Lady Rhondda, and Basil de Selincourt’s “terrible indictment” (D5 148) of it in *The*

Observer, she felt confident that “I have already gained my point: I’m taken seriously, not dismissed as a charming prattler as I feared” (D5 149).³⁸ On 11 June 1938, she concluded with satisfaction, “now, save for the Sunday Times, the ink splash is over, & I can count it on the whole a good deal better than I expected. On the whole 3 Gs. is taken seriously: many high compliments; some snarls . . . but generally kind” (ibid.). Of the “snarls” she received, Queenie Leavis’s is perhaps the most noteworthy. Woolf remained unscathed by the “drubbing and . . . scourging” (L6 271) she received in Leavis’s September 1938 *Scrutiny* article, “Caterpillars of the Commonwealth Unite!,” (D5 165), which criticized Woolf for what she perceived to be elitism.³⁹ While content to have her ideas taken seriously, Woolf remained puzzled by the mixed reception of the work, musing, “I used to be praised by the young & attacked by the elderly. 3Gs. has queered the pitch. For the G. M. Youngs & the Scrutineers both attack that. And my own friends have sent me to Coventry over it. So my position is ambiguous” (D5 188). The mixed response within the press was mirrored by equally mixed personal responses. While Leonard was nonplussed, Forster unimpressed, Vanessa “ambiguous,” Vita “exasperated” by Woolf’s “misleading arguments” (L6 242-43), and Keynes “very critical” of the book (qtd. in Briggs, *Virginia Woolf* 332), she received enthusiastic letters from contemporaries that included Saxon Sydney-Turner, Lady Rhondda, Pippa and Ray Strachey, Shena Simon, Violet Dickinson, Naomi Mitchison, Margaret Llewelyn Davies, Nelly Cecil, Helena Swanwick, and Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence.

Responses to the work frequently revolved around one of several central pivots: Woolf’s use of photographs and notes in the text, her assessment of women’s present social and economic position, and her views on how women can assist in the prevention

of war.⁴⁰ It is the third of these that concerns me here. Nearly half of the 82 letters that Woolf kept in response to *Three Guineas* were written in reference to Woolf's suggested methods for preventing war. While a few correspondents voiced doubts about the possibility of peace in the current political climate, or of the efficacy or practicality of the methods outlined in *Three Guineas*, an overwhelming majority wrote to express agreement with her proposed methods and her feminist pacifist critique. The letters frequently express gratitude toward Woolf's contributions, along with the desire that she continue the work begun in her book; many of her correspondents, in fact, saw fit to write Woolf with their own ideas of how a Society of Outsiders might be brought into being or about additional activities with which Outsiders might engage themselves, thereby collaborating with Woolf in the writing of the text.⁴¹ The letters frequently reflect a sense of urgency and desperation at the current political climate, with some letter writers meditating on how that climate renders the pacifist position a difficult one to maintain. Many express gratitude toward Woolf's efforts to enumerate the causes of war, while others express disagreement with her enumeration. If "it was the *timing* of her publication of polemical views which disturbed the critics" (Marcus, "No More Horses" 270), then one might also say that "it was the *timing* of her publication of polemical views" on war that generated such an active, and overwhelmingly positive, response among the masses.

Three Guineas was published just as the star of post-World War I pacifism was in its decline, precipitated during the thirties by the increasing threat of fascism in Germany, Italy, and Spain. Evidence of Hitler's and Mussolini's appetite for power and land, which had been made obvious by their designs on Sudetenland and Abyssinia; by Germany's superior air power, which had been made clear by the highly effective aerial bombing of

Spanish civilians; and by the unlikelihood that the “moral authority” of the League of Nations would be capable of preventing war, which had been proven by their recent failures in Abyssinia and Manchuria, all played a hand in forcing the British masses to retreat from a pacifist position to a more moderate “pacifist” one that reserved the right to impose economic sanctions and to use physical force as a deterrent. This latter distinction regarding sanctions had forced a similar divide between internationalists and pacifists just a few years earlier—a divide played out perfectly in Virginia and Leonard’s marriage, as this diary entry reveals: “Aldous refuses to sign the latest manifesto because it approves sanctions,” she writes. “He’s a pacifist. So am I. Ought I to resign. L. says that considering Europe is now on the verge of the greatest smash for 600 years, one must sink private differences & support the League” (D5 17). This ideological divide was also to be played out within the Labour Party itself, which, in late 1935, would officially align itself with the League of Nations in favor of sanctions. Her scrapbooks record the numerous organizations that had officially endorsed League policy at that time, including the Labour party, the Church of England, the National Council for Equal Citizenship, and the National Council for Women (MHP b16.f, Vol. 2: 4, 49; Vol. 3: 34), all of which would have seemed to her precipitous and alarmist in their support of the League. In 1934-35, the majority of the British population accepted sanctions “as a necessary deterrent” and “an adequate means of coercing an aggressor” (Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 147, 155), a position that would only intensify with the growth of a perceptible anti-fascist movement in Britain in the late-thirties.

The start of the Spanish Civil War only intensified the debate over pacifism as the “mainstream of progressive values” became “increasingly anti-fascist and, therefore,

hostile to pacifism” (Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 228). For many pacifists, Franco’s violent take-over of a democratically elected government seemed sufficient cause for the use of force and polarized the Left into distinct pacifist and anti-fascist factions. Anti-fascism quickly became synonymous with a willingness to fight, and thus increasingly antithetical to the beliefs of an absolute pacifist: a political conflict played out between Woolf and her nephew, Julian Bell, whose position in response to the situation in Spain had grown increasingly militaristic and belligerent. As the nation’s escalating fear of fascism prompted widespread demands for rearmament and modernization of the military, the minority who maintained their pacifist beliefs became increasingly marginalized by British mainstream society and its institutions. The second volume of Woolf’s scrapbooks document the increasingly virulent, and vocal, reaction to pacifism that invariably occurs during any countdown to war. The headline of one clipping, “If We Had Been Pacifists In 1914—‘Hitler Would Be In Whitehall’” (MHP b16.f, Vol. 2: 50)—conveys the alarmist tenor typical of anti-pacifist propaganda circulating during this time. (Such a headline must have struck Woolf as humorously ironic, given her argument in *Three Guineas* that Hitler *was* effectively already *in* Whitehall.) Woolf’s interest in the Church’s retreat from pacifism was particularly keen, as can be determined from the number of clippings on the subject that appear in the scrapbooks (MHP b16.f, Vol.2: 49, 50, 24).⁴² As if the public vilification of pacifists were not enough, two of pacifism’s most vocal advocates, George Lansbury and Arthur Ponsonby, lost their respective platforms at this time: the former through his defeat at the 1935 Brighton Labour Conference and the latter through his resignation from the House of Lords, both of which

resulted in a significant decrease in the public representation of pacifist interests (Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 190-91).

Despite the languishing peace movement of the mid- to late-thirties, pacifism itself did not disappear, but was transformed into a secular “personal-witness style of pacifism” (Liddington, *Road* 101) practiced by individuals as “a revolutionary social faith” (Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 291)—a transformation reflected in the correspondence Woolf received in response to *Three Guineas*. This emphasis on pacifism as a secular “faith,” practiced on the individual level, resonates with Woolf’s conception of the Society of Outsiders as “a religion for free people” (M28 holograph 4). “Forced to adjust to being a minority movement without political influence for the foreseeable future” (Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 264)—in Woolf’s vernacular, forced to adjust to being political Outsiders—pacifists, particularly humanitarian and socialist pacifists, re-envisioned themselves as a “small self-selected community in which individuality could find expression while also helping to create the nucleus of a new social order” (Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 291-92) and re-organized themselves into a loosely conceived and structured movement, a “Society,” centered on individual action and witness. Woolf’s Society of Outsiders is predicated on similar lines: reconceiving outsider status as an advantage, Woolf argues that exclusion from mainstream institutions is central to a new form of political empowerment centered on a belief in the efficacy of individual actions. The model of independent social activism propounded by Woolf in *Three Guineas* was, thus, immediately recognizable to many pacifists who had had to adopt some of the same independent methods out of political necessity. Accordingly, many of the letters that

Woolf received express a sense of identification and familiarity with this model of independent action.

The gratitude expressed repeatedly throughout these letters suggests that *Three Guineas* had given a name to a feeling with which many of Woolf's readers were already familiar--that of being an Outsider; several correspondents, in fact, so identified with the feeling that they adopted the moniker, referring to themselves as "a very grateful Outsider" (17), a "member of the Society of Outsiders" (59), and your "fellow Outsider" (111). This voluntary identification with the label of "Outsider" appears to have been particularly strong among those correspondents whom one might call "secular" pacifists, those whose position is derived from an ethical or moral conviction rather than a religious tradition. That *Three Guineas* should have received a hearty welcome among this quarter should not be at all surprising, for, lacking the camaraderie found in tightly knit religious communities, it seems likely that secular pacifists would have experienced an even greater sense of social and political alienation, and an even greater need for a sense of community and group identity, than religious pacifists. Several letters express gratitude for the glimpse of community shown them in *Three Guineas*: upon reading "Women Must Weep" in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Belinda Jelliffe wrote, "It is encouraging to know that others, of some power, are with one in spirit" (164), while Constance Cheke maintained that one's convictions "need fortifying by the knowledge that, as others are also resisting, their resistance will not be in vain" (112). Still another writer expressed "comfort" at knowing "that you too are relying on individual effort—however microscopic and wide of the mark it may seem" (87).

The thirty-eight letters Woolf kept in response to her feminist pacifist critique of war are valuable documents for gauging the temperature of the British population on the subject of war in 1938-39. Many of those written just after the book's publication in June 1938 express a sense of urgency on the subject, and a commitment similar to Woolf's to "prolong" the present "interval of peace" in some way. Margaret Rhondda, founder and editor of the feminist newspaper *Time and Tide*, wrote that *Three Guineas* has "come at exactly the right moment" (21) and that it "may have I think (if only Europe doesn't too quickly break into flames) a profound effect" (17)—"if there may only be time" (22). The eminent suffragist Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence wrote approvingly of Woolf's analysis of "the problem which is at present preoccupying the mind of the great mass of the people—how to avoid the menace of war which threatens to destroy us all" (64). Several correspondents urged Woolf to form a Society of Outsiders, noting that "at a time like this there is not a moment to be lost and there are so many of us who want a lead" (86): one wrote to ask whether Woolf had "begun some constructive movement," since "you appear to me to be the obvious person to do so" (86), while another offered encouragement, "for I am hoping you will feel so encouraged—if encouragement is what you need—that you will continue what you have begun in this volume" (97-98). In spite of such heartfelt letters asking her to assume a position of "leadership," since "you will know so much better, if anything can be done and what" (156-57), Woolf reiterated her position, in Fanny Mounsey's words, that "individual work is more valuable than a society" (87).

Enthusiasm for Woolf's treatise was dampened in some quarters, as one might expect, following the Munich Crisis in September 1938 that further increased the already

considerable divide between the pacifist and anti-fascist positions and led the masses to mistakenly equate pacifism with appeasement. So long as pacifists were regarded as supporters of peace at any price, their position was linked to that of Neville Chamberlain, at a time when the British population was generally anxious to avoid any further appeasement of European dictators. The disastrous consequences of the Munich Crisis for the viability of the pacifist position may have been what Nowell Smith had in mind when he predicted that “the frantic applause which has greeted the Prime Minister’s plucking of a very precarious safety out of the nettle which he and the more or less monied classes have been helping to grow all these years, augurs ill for any real attempt—such as women would certainly make—to remove the removable causes of war” (90). How closely opposition to war was being equated with appeasement in the popular imagination can be seen in Shena Simon’s comment that opposing the war would mean “that I must become a supporter of N. Chamberlain & his policy of letting the dictators do what they like—in Spain, to the Jews & the socialists” (50). Many writers express the feeling of having no other choice than to support the next war, in spite of one’s feelings against war in general: “Much as one loathes and abhors the very thought of War, is one smilingly to turn the other cheek when Germany—enormously strong through her forcible annexation of Czechoslovakia, the Tyrol, Memel, etc. turns her greedy eyes to these islands? Is one meekly to allow oneself to be bombed, annexed, and are we and our Empire to submit without resistance to becoming a minor German state?” (32-33). Ideological positions are superseded by matters of practical necessity in such times, as Shena Simon explained in a letter to Woolf:

After the last war I felt that war was the greatest evil and that nothing justified it. When, however, Hitler rose to power in Europe I felt—largely I think because I am a woman—that war would be better than a world dominated by his ideas and his practices. So I criticised the government for its retreat before the dictators and as I realized that standing up to Hitler involved the risk of war, I felt that it was only logical for me to be ready to take my part in it, if it came. . . .

War, I agree, is a hideous evil, but I am not a pacifist and so I am ready to admit that it may prevent an even more hideous evil, just as although nobody likes shutting up human beings in prison, it may be necessary to shut him up to prevent his doing damage to other people. (158)

(This “lesser of two evils” argument, of course, would grow even stronger once the Nazi extermination program became apparent to the world.) Another correspondent argued that the practical realities of present-day warfare trumped Woolf’s ideological position, since wars that target the infrastructure necessary to civilian life (and civilian life itself), like the Spanish Civil War, have “made peace, and armament-for-defence, almost synonymous terms, as the aggressor countries fear nothing but well armed defense” (168).

Despite Nowell Smith’s fear that women would be unable, in the present political climate, “to remove the removable causes of war” (90), and Andree Ito’s pronouncement that “the masses have neither time, nor desire, nor the discernment to educate or save themselves” (53), it appears that Woolf’s call to action actually energized her readership, motivating them to continue thinking about how women might be specially positioned to prevent war. A few readers contest aspects of Woolf’s argument, such as her policy of

“indifference,” considering their objections important enough to put in writing. One woman writes, “Your suggestion that educated women should stand aside indifferently from the whole question is a ‘counsel of perfection’ when bombs are killing their families and destroying their homes I am afraid [*sic*] that advice would certainly leave you in a minority of one” (168), while another, socialist author Naomi Mitchison, writes to question “the whole policy of ‘indifference,’” which “postulates a very unusual kind of person, one who is not bound to the wheel of affection in any way. How can I, for instance, be indifferent to whether or not my sons get involved in the next war?” (41).⁴³ Two correspondents wrote to express their belief that Woolf was too optimistic in her assessment of women’s political capabilities; Ernest Huxley, a bus conductor, argued that women lack the organizational skills required to animate a Society of Outsiders, while a female correspondent explained, “I can’t visualise women ever acting together to prevent it [war], no matter how educated and independent they were. Except, of course, in the same way as men, through political organisations” (48). Another woman, Agnes Smith, with whom Woolf would continue to correspond until the end of her life, voiced problems with Woolf’s model as it applied to the working classes: “You say glibly that the working woman could refuse to nurse and to make munitions and so stop the war. A working woman who refuses to work will starve—and there is nothing like stark hunger for blasting ideals” (99).⁴⁴

Woolf’s gendered analysis of the causes of war, and of the role of women’s participation in the last war, was an issue of some dispute among her correspondents, most typically among men. One man, “Wm” Drummond, observed that “the women folks in the last war were more enthusiastic for the killing of British French German etc.,

soldiers than were any section of men. . . . You know Mrs Woolf the part that women played in the last War—Write a book indicting them for their blood stained share in it” (77)—a point that would prompt her 1940 essay, “Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid.” A second man, Ernest Huxley, condemned the enthusiasm with which women took up men’s jobs during the war, and held them solely responsible for the economic depression that followed upon the heels of the war. The prevalence of the Marxist analysis of the causes of war, particularly among men, is also suggested in these letters. As Wm Drummond maintained, “It is the Capital and Labour elements that control and always will control Peace, War and everything else. I think Women can never enter either Capital or Labour sufficiently strongly to be able to exercise much influence from those directions on Peace or War” (78). Shena Simon reported the popularity of this argument among male speakers at a Fabian meeting, where, while discussing Woolf’s feminist analysis of war, “several speakers—men—tried to argue that war was the fault of capitalism & would disappear when socialism came” (104).

Most correspondents wrote, however, to express their support for and agreement with Woolf’s ideas as to how women might prevent war. One correspondent reiterated Woolf’s position in expressing the need for “some kind of organisation among women for after the peace and of course towards it . . . as opposed to the absurd degrading and damaging regimentation of women on ‘military’ lines which has sapped our influence entire” (156). Another writer, Belinda Jelliffe, pondered a question central to Woolf’s own, asking “how can women be got to co-operate?” (165). After suggesting a mechanism whereby a Society of Outsiders might be organized, another woman, Constance Cheke, elaborates on the rules of membership, which she states should be

“simple purity of intention, zeal, & entire willingness to co-operate” (112) among its members. Observing that “we say that war is terrible, ‘a hideous evil’ the Archbishop of York calls it, and at the same time we heap praise and honours on people who take part in it,” Shena Simon calls for an educational revolution, and adds the following recommendations to Woolf’s Society of Outsiders:

Women should not attend processions like Coronations, etc. which consist largely of troops, or military Tattoes, and should use all their influence to prevent children from being taken. They might protest to the Cinema managements of News Reels showing too many military events, and also to members of Parliament about the expenditure of their money as taxpayers on grand uniforms for the forces. They would not themselves accept honours for any war work that they might have done, and might protest against honours being given to men for exploits that involve the death of other people. (163)

Several correspondents wrote to tell Woolf of their own efforts at Outsider activity: one, a Miss R. Ranken, detailed her efforts to promote social change by sunbathing topless (59-60), while another, Mrs. Fanny Mounsey, retold her efforts to replace competitive with noncompetitive music festivals in her town (87). But it was a third letter, from former suffragette Ellen Crockren, that would have engaged Woolf’s attention most sympathetically, given her own experiences combating misogyny within the Labour Party. Relating the details of a meeting of the League of Nations Union Branch in Oxford at which Gilbert Murray criticized women before asking for their support, Miss Crockren reflected: “I felt clearly that to continue to be the hewers of wood and drawers of water for the League of Nations, was to indirectly encourage the male ascendancy that is the

essential of warfare. . . . in fact such service can be seen as encouragement to war” (68-69). She reiterates Woolf’s policy of indifference when she asserts that women must “give up pleading, trying to influence . . . and hold themselves superior to services of subservience” (69), and suggests the WSPU policy “of going forward as women independently” (69) as an effective model for the organization of a Society of Outsiders. Still another correspondent ably summed up Woolf’s position on the need for women to work *as* women for peace when she wrote, “I think that if we are to be any use as constructive workers, it must be from another angle to that of the male. That, brains being equal, in the ordinary sense of the word, it is our different angle of view and of understanding which is so vitally important” (157).⁴⁵

While many writers reiterated Woolf’s claim that peace would come through the actions of women working independently, as social Outsiders, toward a common goal, others expressed alternative views—economic, religious, and political—as to what might bring peace to the world. For Marxists, the advancement of socialism would bring peace; for Christians and Quakers alike, the advancement of the Gospels. One Quaker wrote to express his faith in “the only fundamental foundation on which mankind can build a worldwide Commonwealth—the Jesus of the Gospels” (56). Despite Woolf’s excoriation of Saint Paul, her Quaker correspondents unanimously commended her efforts toward peace, one of them remarking, “You are working as the Friends are, and a multitude of men and women all over the world are, to avert war. Probably no sharper weapon can be found than ridicule of men and bareing [*sic*] the injustices suffered by women, every word, the unvarnished truth. . . . Your book has given at least one reader food for thought” (89). Another wrote that *Three Guineas* “should be read & digested by every

thinking man & woman,” and promised to distribute copies of the book to his students upon graduation (55). Another Quaker correspondent held that the path to peace would come through women’s political education, a position not unlike Woolf’s own in *Three Guineas*. Women ought to “go ahead with their political education,” she wrote. “You are not going to do things politically without being political. Writers such as Vera Brittain, Storm Jameson and yourself might exert a very great influence if you would begin to understand what the struggle is all about” (109). Still others expressed their heartfelt belief in the power of thought to create peace, a position that Woolf would adopt in her 1940 essay, “Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid.” “The greatest of all world-changing influences is thought” (64), wrote Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence, while another correspondent put it this way:

As I see things, the kernel of war insanity is THOUGHT. If war were out of thought it would not be engineered. Armaments must first be thought. . . . Peaceful thought must mean PEACE [*sic*] Warlike thought must mean WAR. Thought is the regenerating Power. By its side words and acts appear as but vassals. . . . Thus sitting in ones chair at one’s writing desk, one can set going thought force that claimed as linked [*sic*] to invisible forces of Truth and Love can ‘move mountains’ of oppression and false dominance. (69-70)

That this idea would resonate throughout “Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid” further illustrates the importance of these letters in continuing to shape Woolf’s thinking on matters of war and peace.

In “The Authority of Anger: *Three Guineas* as Case Study,” Brenda Silver identifies three distinct “historical periods, or moments” in the reception of that work, each marked by a distinct orientation toward the work’s anger:

First, the moment of publication, when the threat of war gave the question of who controlled the discourse about war a central role in the work’s public reception; next, the period between 1941 and 1968 when the book virtually disappeared from the public view; and finally the recent rediscovery and partial canonization of the text, which has been surrounded by controversies that speak directly to the status of feminist criticism. (347)

The first period is characterized by an excess of attention, among reviewers, to the work’s style in an attempt to deflect attention from its angry tone and content. She argues that “the constructions of the author that emerge from the reviews illustrate both competing perceptions of what counts as effective, or authoritative, public discourse and a number of strategies for denying Woolf’s text access to it” (348). She continues:

Within these competing discourses, the representation of Woolf’s tone, in particular the care taken by both sympathetic and unsympathetic critics to distance the tone from anger, serves to locate the text not in the realm of the public debate about culture and war, but in the realm of the aesthetic, with its implications of the private, the interior, the feminine. . . . The result of the emphasis given to Woolf’s style and voice was to undercut the authority of her arguments, in particular those about dominance and the origins of war that belong most clearly in the masculine realm. Instead, the arguments were all too often subsumed in praise of the art. (ibid.)

Inscribed in this percipient analysis are Silver's own assumptions about the gender of particular kinds of discourse and the means by which reviewers may prohibit women entry to public discourse. While the proper functioning of various social mechanisms ensures that discourse on the causes of war takes place more often in the shadows of the private sphere than in the bright light of the public one, it is a discourse that belongs as much to the feminine as the masculine realm—a conclusion borne out by a long tradition of feminist pacifism within Europe.⁴⁶ The letters written in response to *Three Guineas* suggest that the work was operating, moreover, very much within the “realm of public debate about culture and war,” a position that it continues to occupy to the present day. Rather than signifying the successful limitation of Woolf's text to the private, feminine realm of discourse, I would argue that contemporary reviewers' efforts to mask the work's anger signify the anxiety provoked, particularly among men, by Woolf's feminist pacifist analysis: an anxiety that attests to the work's very real participation in the “realm of public debate about culture and war.”

According to Silver, the second period of the work's reception began with Woolf's death, which “inaugurated a period of almost total silence about the text” that lasted until 1968 (352). During this period, “the immediacy of Woolf's arguments and with it the passion of her vision and her voice were lost. Equally important, the ‘author’ herself underwent a transformation in which the artist, the novelist, identified solely with her experimental style, so eclipsed the polemicist that any expression of cultural or political critique was perceived as an intrusion” (ibid.). It was during this period, she notes, that *Three Guineas* began to be viewed as the antithesis to the more accommodating *Room of One's Own*, and her work situated “firmly in the private,

internalized realm of pure art”: both the result of her association with the Bloomsbury Group and the ascendancy of formalist modes of literary criticism in Britain and America (353).

Silver marks the publication of Batchelor’s and Marden’s work in 1968 as the start of the third period in the reception of the work, “a series of moments, or exchanges, that chart, along with changes in the political climate and the nature of literary criticism, the advent of feminist criticism” in the mid-1970s (354). Central to the resurrection of *Three Guineas*, in Silver’s account, is the birth of feminist literary criticism within the American academy. Thus,

By the beginning of the eighties, the feminist intervention had radically altered the image of Woolf and begun to establish its authority; it was no longer feasible for critics either to ignore Woolf’s polemical work, including *Three Guineas*, or simply to disparage it. The text had entered the critical domain, where it evoked responses that had as much to do with its feminist critics as its feminist message. In the ensuing debates, the battle over anger in women’s public discourse emerged once again, but now the stakes were less the authority of Woolf’s text than the authority of feminist critique and its ability to effect institutional change. (355)

While Silver briefly acknowledges the work’s importance in the debates surrounding the peace movement of the 1960s-1980s, she does not, to my mind, adequately assess the importance of the peace movement in resurrecting the work from literary obscurity.⁴⁷ Given that this historical period was defined as much by the threat of war and nuclear proliferation as by the feminist consciousness-raising movement it helped to motivate, the

work's appeal for a young generation of feminist scholars in the 1970s would not have been restricted to its radical version of feminism, but would have included its radical version of feminist pacifism as well. To argue this point is also to assert the inseparability of the work's feminism from its pacifism, and to thereby reiterate a central premise of *Three Guineas*; but it is also to finally ascribe a cause to the angry tone perceived in the work by successive generations of readers: women's historical exclusion from public discourse on the causes of war, "since when before has an educated man asked a woman how in her opinion war can be prevented?" (*Three Guineas* 3).

Jane Marcus has written of the importance of both *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas* as "instruction manuals" for the feminist and pacifist movements, and of the role played by the Vietnam War in stimulating renewed discussion of the relation between war and gender ("Introduction" xxxvii). While ultimately coming down firmly on the side of constructivists, Woolf's straddling of essentialist and constructivist positions in *Three Guineas* would spark a renewal of this familiar debate, energizing discussion among a new generation facing a different war. Sara Ruddick reflects on the personal importance that *Three Guineas* possessed for her during the Vietnam War, a time when "confronted with the prospects of a war I would later come to loathe, I turned to a casual though now famous letter of Virginia Woolf's [to Margaret Llewelyn Davies, identifying war as a "preposterous masculine fiction" that might be stopped only by "some vigorous young woman pulling us together and marching us through it" (L2 76)] to steady myself and direct my thoughts about feminist peace politics" ("Peace in Our Time" 1). The gendered analysis of the causes of war that Ruddick found there inspired her thinking about the possibilities of a feminist maternal peace politics, articulated in her

groundbreaking study, *Maternal Thinking* (1989), a work that continues to shape contemporary debate over the relationship between gender, maternity, and war.

For American and British women protesting nuclear proliferation, atmospheric nuclear testing, and U.S. involvement in the war in Vietnam in the 1960s and 1970s, Woolf's gendered analysis of the causes of war and the path to peace served as a foundation for their protests. Accounts of the period suggest the work's galvanizing function at peace demonstrations and vigils, such as the Women's Peace Encampment at Greenham Common, where the work was reportedly read aloud before groups of protesters.⁴⁸ The work's appeal for various national and international women's organizations of the period is also evident. The most well known of these, Women Strike for Peace (alternatively, "Women for Peace"), was comprised of housewives and mothers concerned that radiation in the milk supply would endanger their children. Maternalist appeals played a central role in the mid-century peace movement, and were particularly effective at recruiting women not otherwise apt to involve themselves with peace politics, as Lisa Yaszek has shown: other organizations identified with a maternalist politics at this time included Women's International League of Peace and Freedom (WILPF), American Women for Peace, and the War Resisters League (WRL).⁴⁹ Other women's antiwar organizations adopting a gender-based approach at this time included Betty Friedan's National Organization for Women (NOW), Dr. Helen Caldicott's Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament (WAND), Jeanette Rankin's eponymous Jeanette Rankin Brigade, and the radical feminist group, Redstockings.

While *Three Guineas* supplied the match with which women were to light the fuse of their antiwar protests and provided kindling in the form of its gender-based arguments,

its usefulness to the present generation of war protesters lies in the breadth of its feminist pacifist analysis and in the radical organizational model it proposes. Connecting the tyranny of the private and public spheres, the perpetuation of war with the perpetuation of imperialist and capitalist regimes, and the economic and educational advancement of women with the cause of peace, Woolf encourages her readers to resist facile, overly simplistic analyses of the causes of war and, instead, to recognize it as a product of a vast web of social and political forces. She calls upon readers, moreover, to erase the patriarchal “chalk marks” of nationality, ethnicity, and religion that have divided humans, one from another, for millennia—a position familiarized by postmodernist theories of globalization, but anticipating transnationalist approaches to literary study—and so challenges us to subvert the various identities that have been used to propagate war. Such realizations are evident in the willingness of contemporary women’s groups to tackle a broader range of issues related to war; many of these groups have expanded their antiwar or antinuclear platforms to embrace concerns about women’s education, reproductive rights, economic rights, and professional opportunities; environmental sustainability; and human rights. Some of these newer groups also eschew traditional notions of political organization in favor of loosely connected coalitions or networks that facilitate productive interactions and relationships, thereby promoting women’s active participation in the public dialogue over war. This pursuit of an alternative organizational model is consonant with Woolf’s vision for a Society of Outsiders, which she identifies as a loose conglomeration of individuals working independently toward the common goal of peace.

Many of the women’s antiwar groups active today at the national or international

levels operate according to the parameters established by Woolf in *Three Guineas*. Women's Action for New Directions (WAND), for example, formerly called Women's Action for Nuclear Disarmament, has expanded its focus in recent years from nuclear disarmament to women's political empowerment and the elimination of violence in the private and public spheres. The group's slogan of "Women. Power. Peace." and its insistence on the connection of domestic violence, militarism, and war, is one in keeping with Woolf's arguments about how gendered power dynamics impact women in the public and private spheres (www.wand.org). Women Against War, founded after the U.S. invasion of Iraq, similarly links expanded educational opportunities for women with the cause of peace, and connects acts of violence in the private and public spheres. The group's mission statement expresses their belief that "Equal rights and opportunities for women are an essential requirement for creating a peaceful world. We need to make ending violence against women a central concern of the peace movement. We need to educate people about the special impact of war and violence on women and children" (www.womenagainstar.org). The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) similarly identifies war as the result of complex, interrelated causes, including racism, sexism, homophobia, classism, domestic violence, environmental exploitation, economic injustice, violation of "fundamental human rights," and misappropriation of "world resources," and maintains that addressing these root causes is essential to the prospects of a lasting peace (www.wilpf.org).

Women in Black, founded in 1988 to protest the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, significantly refers to itself not as an organization, but "a means of mobilization and a formula for action." With groups worldwide, the purpose of this

“international peace network” is to “stand in silent vigil to protest war, rape as a tool of war, ethnic cleansing and human rights abuses all over the world” (“Women in Black”). Women in Black is a member organization of the Coalition of Women for Peace, a coalition of Israeli and Palestinian women’s groups working for an end to the Israeli occupation; the establishment of a just, equitable, and peaceful coexistence between Israelis and Palestinians; and the advancement of women’s rights. Other member organizations of the Coalition of Women for Peace include Bat Shalom, The Fifth Mother, Machsom Watch, Noga-Feminist Journal, Neled: Women for Coexistence, New Profile, TANDI, and WILPF, the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom-Israel (www.coalitionofwomen.org). Women in Black is also part of the International Network of Women’s Solidarity Against War, also known as the Women in Black Network. Central to the Network’s philosophy is a repudiation of both militarism and nationalism in a spirit consonant with Woolf’s philosophy that “her” country was “the whole world.” Accordingly, the Network states the commitment of its members to “overcome ethnic divisions and barriers, both symbolically and physically” and to “respect ‘otherness’ and differences” in an effort to build “a solidarity network among women across state, national, ethnic, and all other boundaries and divisions” (“International Network”). Particularly interesting in respect to Woolf is the Network’s structure: assisted by internet technology, it operates according to many of the principles recommended by Woolf, namely, a decentralization of power:

There is no 'center' or board of directors of the network. . . . The primary activity of the network thus far has been the aforementioned conferences. Throughout the year, communication is maintained by e-mail, which enables us to spread

alternative information, mostly about developments in critical areas. We also maintain contact through visits and participation at various conferences.

The network of women's solidarity against war—The Women in Black Network—was established outside all official structures and spaces. It is maintained by the persistent efforts, mutual support, and financial assistance of the members of the network. The ninth conference marked the beginning of direct involvement in international institutions; we are trying to reclaim them as forums that belong to all the citizens of the world. (ibid.)

Another woman-centered network, Women Waging Peace, is part of the Initiative for Inclusive Security, which seeks to involve women at every level of the peace-making process, as recommended in United Nations Security Council Resolution 1325. The group's rationale for women's participation is a mixture of essentialist, maternalist, and constructivist arguments, a fact that suggests how little consensus has been reached on this question during the seventy years since the publication of *Three Guineas*. Women are hailed as being “generally . . . more collaborative than men and thus more inclined toward consensus and compromise,” while their role as mothers allows them “to cut across international borders and internal divides” (“The Vital Role of Women”).⁵⁰ Women's positive contributions to peacemaking are assured not solely by virtue of their womanhood or motherhood, however, but by certain assumptions about how war specifically impacts women: often disproportionately affected by war in physical, psychological, sexual, and economic ways, they are “highly invested in preventing, stopping, and recovering from conflict” in ways that men are not, given that

Women are motivated to protect their children and ensure security for their

families. They watch as their sons and husbands are taken as combatants or prisoners of war; many do not return, leaving women to care for the remaining children and elders. When rape is used as a tactic of war to humiliate the enemy and terrorize the population, they become targets themselves. Despite—or because of—the harsh experiences of so many who survive violent conflict, women generally refuse to give up the pursuit of peace. (ibid.)

Women are also well situated for peacemaking, they continue, by virtue of their having been oppressed for the greater part of history, which has made them adept at adaptation and innovation, the very skills required in the peacemaking process—an argument that reiterates Woolf's own in *Three Guineas* about the virtues of women's "unpaid for" education. "Ironically," the group writes, "women's status as second-class citizens is a source of empowerment, having made women adept at finding innovative ways to cope with problems. Because women are not ensconced within the mainstream, those in power consider them less threatening, and allow women to work unimpeded and 'below the radar screen'" ("The Vital Role of Women"). The group extends Woolf's argument about the merits of social and political exclusion, however, through an emphasis on the important role played by insiders' perceptions of Outsiders: while exclusion may make women more "innovative," an important part of its value to the peacemaking process lies in men's perception that women are somehow "unthreatening" because they operate from outside existing social structures.

The mission statement of Code Pink, the most visible of women's antiwar groups to emerge from the present war in Iraq, also bears the imprint of Woolf's legacy. The group has become so singularly synonymous with protest of the war in Iraq that, as

Zachary Coile of *The San Francisco Chronicle* writes, “When a lawmaker's office is stormed, a hearing is disrupted or a protester is handcuffed on Capitol Hill these days, it's a safe bet the activist being hauled away will be female and wearing pink”(“Those Pesky Peaceniks”).⁵¹ The group aligns itself with a firm constructivist position in its call to action:

We call on women around the world to rise up and oppose the war in Iraq. We call on mothers, grandmothers, sisters and daughters, on workers, students, teachers, healers, artists, writers, singers, poets, and every ordinary outraged woman willing to be outrageous for peace. Women have been the guardians of life—not because we are better or purer or more innately nurturing than men, but because the men have busied themselves making war. Because of our responsibility to the next generation, because of our own love for our families and communities and this country that we are a part of, we understand the love of a mother in Iraq for her children, and the driving desire of that child for life. (“CODEPINK: Call to Action”)

“Guardians of life” only by default, women can apply the domestic values of “nurturing, care, and compassion” to deconstruct the notion of the “Other” that is so essential to the prosecution of any war. And while this process of deconstruction derives from the domestic sphere, and thus must come from women, it is not restricted to women. Like Woolf’s Society, Code Pink is inclusive, inviting “every ordinary outraged woman” and man committed to the strengthening of these values to “withdraw consent from the warmongers” and engage in acts of individual dissent:

We call on all outraged women to join us in taking a stand, now. And we call upon

our brothers to join with us and support us. These actions will be initiated by women, but not limited to women. Stand in the streets and marketplaces of your towns with banners and signs of dissent, and talk to your neighbors. Stand before your elected representatives: and if they will not listen, sit in their offices, refusing to leave until they do. Withdraw consent from the warmongers. Engage in outrageous acts of dissent. We encourage all actions, from public education and free speech to nonviolent civil disobedience that can disrupt the progress toward war. (ibid.)

The emphasis here, as in *Three Guineas*, is on affirming the efficacy of coordinated, broadly defined, individual actions in putting an end to war.

Just how “wide” the circle surrounding Woolf’s polemic has grown in the seventy years since its publication can be seen in its thorough saturation of popular culture. A look at precisely *how* the work occupies the popular imagination, being co-opted for multiple rhetorical and ideological purposes within various public and critical discourses, reveals that contemporary audiences grasp the intricacies of Woolf’s arguments in ways that many of her immediate audience could or would not. Its name, for example, has been adopted by various charitable funds, trusts, and organizations devoted to women’s educational and professional advancement and even by a blogger concerned with international women’s issues, while passages from the book appear in articles on women’s media, women’s leadership, women’s property rights, women’s sexuality, environmental sustainability, world citizenship, and the women’s peace movement. Hailed as one of the “books that matter” by a feminist blogger, the work has spawned critical and colloquial responses, contemporary re-writes, photographic exhibitions, and

theatrical adaptations. Given that such texts are held by postmodernist textual theory to constitute versions of the work itself, it will be useful to look at how they expand and alter the work's original meanings over time.

Several organizations acknowledge their conscious debt to *Three Guineas* through their choice of name. The San Francisco-based *Three Guineas Fund* (www.3gf.org), for example, takes as its motto Woolf's call to "Take this one guinea then and use it to assert . . . the great principles of justice and equality and liberty." Recognizing the importance of women's economic equality in promoting a better world, Cate Muther has founded an organization that "promotes social equity by expanding access to economic opportunity for women and girls" by providing grants to innovative programs benefiting single mothers, young girls, and women of all ages. Her logic bears the direct influence of Woolf's thinking, in that "Women's disempowerment is limited to no place or time; the problem is historic, systemic and global. Its resolution calls for what Woolf envisioned: women around the world becoming educated, economically independent and equal participants in civil society" (Muther). At least two other organizations committed to educational purposes also share the work's name: Harvard Law School's Three Guineas Fellowship Alumnae-in-Residence Program, which is aimed at "inform[ing] and educat[ing] women law students about the life of women lawyers . . . [and] on the issues that confront women in the legal profession" ("HLS") and The Three Guineas Trust, an English trust providing charitable grants and funding for research on autism and learning disabilities ("The Three Guineas Trust").

The work's meanings have proliferated in ways that would have pleased Woolf as its arguments have been expanded and adapted in response to the pressures of

globalization in the twenty-first century. A blog on international women's issues, "Three Guineas," for example, provides an introduction to obstetric fistula intended to raise awareness of its causes and repercussions for women in developing nations. Responsible for eight percent of maternal deaths worldwide, countless stillborn births, and women's social ostracism, the issue would have been of immediate interest to Woolf, given her interest in women's reproductive rights and health and maternal mortality rates in *Three Guineas* and the *Three Guineas* scrapbooks ("An Introduction"). The work's title is also invoked in the title of a 2001 article in the *Times of India*, "A Room of One's Own and Not Just Three Guineas," which reports recent efforts in that country to draft a bill "to ensure a woman's right to her matrimonial 'dwelling place'" upon divorce or the death of her spouse—an issue that would also have interested Woolf, given her concern for the economic wellbeing of mothers, wives, and widows (Devidayal).

Woolf's procession of educated men also forms the basis for a recent article on women's leadership, and for the model of feminist leadership, "leadership as friendship," the author proposes in it. Presupposing widespread dissatisfaction with current, "masculine" models of leadership, the author constructs a new model, like Woolf's *Society of Outsiders*, based on women's experience as Outsiders:

The leadership challenges are enormous—an unconscionable rich-poor gap, in this country and world-wide, ghastly wars and internecine strife, violence of all types and degrees, and environmental destruction that threatens the sustainability of all, to name only a few. Underlying these tragedies are conceptions of the self as separate from others and the world. The challenges call for new ways to think about and practice leadership, or as Woolf (1938) said, "by finding new words and

creating new methods. . . .

Since metaphors structure both perception and action, conceptualizing leadership as friendship provides a stance toward/with the world that can contribute to shaping new actions and ways of thinking. That friendship stance is grounded in perceptions of connection and interdependence from which emerge a sense of responsibility and care. This conceptualization of leadership as friendship extends the responsibilities of leadership beyond one's own group. (Perreault)

Both the means and the ends of the “leadership as friendship” model are in keeping with Woolf’s ultimate goal in *Three Guineas*: the finding of “new words” and the creating of “new methods” by which the arbitrary “chalk marks” separating groups and nations can be erased. An interesting application of Woolf’s theories of the Outsider to the current position of women in the Middle East appears in another recent article, in which the author extends Woolf’s concepts to women’s present struggles for liberation in the Middle East:

Women's experiences of the last two decades in Afghanistan and elsewhere in the region have made it abundantly clear that meaningful change for women only will begin when the clerical grip on political institutions and law-making processes is broken and a clear separation of state from religion is materialized. . . . In this context, a most urgent question would be, What is the most reasonable and effective way to defend the rights of women in Islamic cultures to autonomy, dignity and self-fulfillment? (Moghissi)

The “choice of gender-conscious women from the region is clear,” she writes. “The choice is to free ourselves from "unreal loyalties" which spring from pride of nationality,

religious pride, family pride and all other sorts of pride, as Virginia Woolf wrote over half a century ago” (ibid.).⁵²

But it is Woolf’s dictum on women’s freedom from the constraining forces of nationalism—that “As a woman, I have no country; As a woman, I want no country; As a woman, my country is the whole world”—that has traveled the farthest of her pronouncements, both literally and figuratively. “My Country Is the Whole World” was the name given to a 2005 traveling photo exhibition of past and present women peacemakers curated by the Peace Museum in Bradford, England. The quote’s appearance in various other locations and contexts suggests that while an expansion of its significance has taken place in the popular imagination, the general direction of this expansion is consistent with its original usage. Despite the varied uses to which the quote is put, each use bespeaks an ideological underpinning consistent with Woolf’s own, and a further development of her ideas as laid out in *Three Guineas*—whether the need to reform journalistic practices in the interests of peace, to advance women to positions of leadership, to encourage women to reclaim their bodies from patriarchal control, or to eschew nationalism in favor of world citizenship.

This line has found a more consistent usage as a rallying cry among the contemporary women’s peace movement. It was cited on the eve of the U.S. invasion of Iraq in a letter written to *Ms.* readers by Robin Morgan, Ellie Smeal, and Gloria Steinem. The letter celebrates the successes of the women’s movement in advancing the cause of peace; counseling their readers that “this is no time for despair,” the authors call for “new definitions of security that fully comprehend the power of Virginia Woolf’s great lines, written in another time of carnage: *‘As a woman I have no country. As a woman I want*

no country. As a woman my country is the whole world” (“No Time for Despair”). The Ontario Women’s Justice Network similarly referenced the quote in their call to women to protest the war in Iraq on International Women’s Day 2003 (Cross). The line also appears prominently in narratives *about* the contemporary peace movement, such as Eliza Featherstone’s 2003 article on Code Pink and other feminist peace organizations in *The Nation*, and Robert Koehler’s 2005 article on maternalist politics within the women’s peace movement, which includes a discussion of the actions of Cindy Sheehan, The Raging Grannies, and the Committee of Soldiers’ Mothers of Russia. It would appear that the phrase has become as much an essential reference point within contemporary discourse *about* the peace movement, as *within* the contemporary peace movement itself.

Three Guineas has even been subjected to theatrical adaptation and rewriting in recent years, marking perhaps more than anything else the work’s continuing fascination and political relevance for contemporary audiences. Director Nenad Colic, of Belgrade’s Blue Theatre group, called his group’s production, “The Fantastic Gospel According to Virginia,” “an anti-war performance which waited for its moment to happen.” Using for its text a combination of *Three Guineas* and *The Waves*, Sophocles’ *Antigone*, and quotations from Albert Einstein, the play premiered in Belgrade, Serbia in 2003 and was performed in 2003-4 in Bosnia, Poland, and Germany (“The Fantastic Gospel”). Several responses to, and even a rewriting of, *Three Guineas* have emerged within the past few years, all indicating the present moment as an ideal time for a reevaluation of her ideas. Faced with another war, these writers wonder how women’s greater economic and professional equality with men today might alter Woolf’s belief that women *could* prevent war, or at least alter her vision of *how* they might do so. With women occupying

more numerous and prominent positions in the military and government, and voting to authorize the invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, Ellen Goodman asks whether women ought now to be considered “insiders on the war.” She asks, is women’s ability to function as Outsiders contingent on their continued exclusion from positions of power? (Goodman) Carol Anne Douglas posed a similar question fifteen years earlier in “Ms. Woolf, We Are Returning Your Guineas,” in which she alleged that women have failed to fulfill the conditions specified by Woolf. Women’s increased participation in the military during the 1990s, she writes, suggests their inability “to ensure that the educational institutions will remain free of the military-industrial establishment or that women will refrain from forming the ‘unreal loyalties’ you deplored to patriarchal institutions such as the nation state, the corporations, and the military” or to “guarantee that educated women will not participate in the battle actions and defense industries that are engaged in large-scale killing” (Douglas).

Douglas’s assessment is updated in the 2002 “A Letter to Virginia Woolf,” which details women’s professional accomplishments as well as their frequent failure to practice their professions in a way that prevents war: “There are thirteen women serving in the U.S. Senate now, and nine of them voted for the war, along with sixty-four of the men. That’s about 70% of the women and 73% of the men. Not much difference. . . .” As this letter makes clear, *Three Guineas* proves itself all the more relevant in today’s climate not *in spite of* how the world has changed since 1938, but *in light of* those changes. The question that Woolf asked in 1938, whether women would join in the procession of educated men, remains as yet unanswered and unanswerable. For even while many women continue to work as Outsiders for the causes of peace and justice, women’s

greater economic and professional parity with men means that the virtues of “poverty, derision, and freedom from unreal loyalties” taught to their grandmothers and great-grandmothers grow dimmer with time. And thus it is that *Three Guineas* enters the new millennium: as an “instruction manual” by which modern women can know the history of their exclusion, and thereby the source of their greatest political strength.

If the following blog posting is any indication, then Woolf’s message *is* being absorbed, and the need for Outsider action understood, by a younger generation of women. “Four Fivers,” described as “a 21st century re-write of Virginia Woolf’s *Three Guineas*,” appears beneath the catchy, colloquial heading “Stop war-mongering with 20 quid and a bit of Woolf.” The piece, posted in July 2006 by a “twentysomething, british” blogger who identifies herself only as “Natasha,” updates the names of the organizations and the monetary denominations while retaining the essence of Woolf’s argument: women’s economic independence is the key to ending war.”⁵³

The composition and reception histories detailed here suggest how saturated Woolf’s discourse was, and is, in the multitude of issues that surround pacifism. In Chapter Three, I go on to examine how the feminist pacifist discourse presented in the published text of *Three Guineas* is itself saturated by the tradition of nineteenth and early-twentieth-century feminist pacifist thought in England. Taken together, these chapters suggest the broader historical and cultural continuum in which *Three Guineas* may be seen to operate through its pre-publication, publication, and post-publication states. The subject of Chapter Two is also an outgrowth of the histories relayed in the present chapter: it considers methods by which the rich array of texts that emerge from these histories may be variously theorized and displayed in posteclectic textual editions.

Chapter Two: Touching the “Untouchable” Text: Notes Toward a Posteclectic Edition of *Three Guineas*

Virginia Woolf’s oeuvre straddles the modernist and postmodernist periods, reflecting and impacting the sensibilities of both. Although she died at the very beginning of the period that would come to be known as postmodernism, her voracious appetite for technical innovation meant that she was participating in its project in its infancy, using polyphony and pastiche as early as her 1931 novel, *The Waves*. She continued to develop her use of such techniques in *Between the Acts*, published posthumously in the summer of 1941, the year often designated as the “start” of the postmodern period. My primary concern is not with Woolf’s postmodernism *per se*, but rather with using her location at the crossroads of modernism and postmodernism, and at the center of both cultural discourses, to advance the argument that new editions of Woolf’s works should be undertaken with greater attention to contemporary postmodernist theories of textuality and textual editing. For, as Hans Walter Gabler concluded in a 2006 review of James Haule’s and J. H. Stape’s recent collection, *Editing Virginia Woolf*, the task of “*editing Virginia Woolf* quite simply still remains to be undertaken” (334; italics in original).

While Woolf’s work as a whole can be situated between the poles of modernism and postmodernism, the textual editing theories and practices used to prepare editions of her works remain firmly rooted in a modernist, essentialist view of textuality that emphasizes final authorial intention and the production of emended, definitive editions of texts. This approach, established W.W. Greg’s

influential 1950 essay “The Rationale of Copy-Text,” and subsequently developed through the work of Thomas Tanselle and Fredson Bowers, is identified as “modernist” in light of assumptions shared by proponents of New Bibliography and New Criticism as to the nature of a work of art as a “well-wrought urn, at once unitary, authoritative, and superior to historical contingency, the product instead of an autonomous creative artist” (Bornstein, *Representing Modernist Texts* 5). D. C. Greetham identifies both as “exemplary modernist practices” in their “organicist, artefactual view of literature and a single unitary consciousness” in which the work of art “is perceived in spatial terms of closure and completion rather than postmodernist open-ended fragmentation” (*Theories of the Text* 141).

Several shifts have taken hold within textual editing during the past twenty-five years that have helped, in various ways, to destabilize the hegemony of eclecticism in Anglo-American editing: the rise of social textual criticism, introduced in the early 1980s with Jerome McGann’s *A Critique of Modern Criticism* and D. F. McKenzie’s *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts*; the widespread implementation of textual versioning in modern editions such as the Cornell Wordsworth and the Cornell Yeats; and the westward migration of Continental genetic editing theory and practice, made palpable by Hans Walter Gabler’s 1983 synoptic edition of *Ulysses*.⁵⁴ Over the last quarter century, the general direction of textual editing has been away from modernist, eclectic editions that offer emended, clear reading texts, and toward postmodernist editions that eschew the concept of final authorial intention in favor of showcasing the instability and plurality of a given work as witnessed in its multiple textual states. An

important part of this shift was the historicizing of the literary work advocated by Jerome McGann, whose seminal work destabilized the notion of “final authorial intention” by redefining the authoritative text as “always one that has been socially produced” and the central practice of literary criticism as “a complex structure of analysis which considers the history of the text in relation to the related histories of its production, reproduction, and reception” (McGann, *Critique* 75, 123). While the practice of versioning predates McGann’s work by nearly four centuries,⁵⁵ McGann’s redefinition of the literary work as composed of “a series of specific ‘texts’” (*Critique* 52) was instrumental in theorizing a “versionist” sense of textuality that located the existence of the literary work “not in any one version, but in all the versions put together” (Bornstein, *Material Modernism* 6).

Precisely how each individual version relates to another, and how each part relates to the work as a whole, is contingent upon one’s theoretical dispensation; as Brenda Silver shows in “Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice,” structuralists and feminist theorists alike have provided their own distinctive metaphors for defining these relations. The structuralist position, expressed most notably by genetic theorists Hans Zeller and Hans Walter Gabler, is that each version exists as “a discrete semiotic system . . . [that] yields a synchronic linguistic pattern”; when viewed chronologically as a whole, “the totality of the versions yield the diachronic pattern of the work” (Zeller, “A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts” 245). These distinct versions can then be read for what Hans Zeller calls their “lateral divergence patterns,” given that “the forms reflect the divergent patterns of varying purposes and intentions rather than an ancestral series in which

we are trying to track down the author's final intentions" (McGann, *Critique* 62). In contrast to this notion of a work comprised of discrete versions, feminist theory offers that of the "palimpsest," which Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar define as a work "whose surface designs conceal or obscure deeper, less accessible (and less socially acceptable) levels of meaning" (qtd. in Silver, "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice" 204). With its emphasis on versions as evidence of concealment, the concept of the work as palimpsest—used by literary critics Susan Stanford Friedman, Christine Froula, and Louise DeSalvo—encourages an "archeological" (Silver 206), vertical approach to textuality.⁵⁶ Moving between the surface text and its "submerged" versions, feminist critics "blur the boundaries between planes of existence (or versions), not . . . distinguish or emphasize them" as structuralists do in emphasizing a work's synchronous dimension (ibid.). "One the construct of the palimpsestic work is in place," Silver continues, "critics can begin to read within its parameters without necessarily distinguishing between the different versions" and "what was once perceived as the single, integral work . . . becomes multiple, intertextual," a "composite" text (206). Given its usefulness for advancing Woolf's reputation as a feminist, pacifist, socialist, and anti-imperialist, this palimpsestic view of textuality has become a commonplace of Woolf studies over the last thirty years, particularly useful in discussing works for which a significant number of pre-publication versions exist, as is the case with *Three Guineas*. Thus, it is not unusual for a writer discussing that work to move seamlessly between evidence drawn from the first edition of the work, the scrapbooks, and the early version of "Professions

for Women,” to name only a few of the many early versions of the work that might be cited.⁵⁷

Once divorced from the constraints of authorial intention, the editing of individual versions can be undertaken according to numerous theoretical premises. As utterances emanating from a particular temporal moment, versions possess their own value outside of their relation to the final published version of a work; assuming “the autonomy and the validity of each steady state of the text as it changes in confused, unpredictable ways, through patterns which the author may never have foreseen, let alone ‘intended’” (Parrish, “The Whig Interpretation of Literature” 349), the editor may prepare an edition that highlights the historical, material, and cultural circumstances surrounding the composition or production of a particular version of a literary work to produce, in McGann’s words, a “polemical edition” that “embodies a particular ideological view” (Greetham, *Theories of the Text* 445), or a parallel-text edition that uses facing page displays to showcase versional differences, such as Fredson Bowers’s edition of Whitman’s *Leaves of Grass*, Michael Warren’s *King Lear*, or the Norton Critical edition of Wordsworth’s *Prelude*.⁵⁸ Post-eclectic textual editions concern themselves primarily with the display of versions and variants, calling attention to “the tension existing between differentiated states. . . . at what occurs in the transition between texts and how our critical locus may not be on one text or another text, but at the point of transition between those texts” (Grigely 48, 49). John Bryant similarly calls for a “poetics of revision” attentive to “the degree of difference, or the distance, between two texts” (62). Ultimately, modernist and postmodernist approaches to textual editing are

diametrically opposed in their methods of handling textual variants: where modernist, intentionalist approaches to textual editing emphasized a separation of text and apparatus that subordinated the latter in favor of a clear reading text, a post-eclectic, postmodernist approach to textual editing refuses this distinction, preferring textual open-endedness to closure and the display of variants to their concealment. In this way, “variance becomes not a quality to be subsumed in the ideal . . . but, on the contrary, the innate condition of textuality and of the editing that reflects this condition” (Greetham, “Editorial and Critical Theory” 18).

While it is commonly observed that a considerable time lapse exists between the articulation and implementation of theories of textual editing, the lapse has been considerably longer in Woolf’s case than in that of several of her fellow modernists. Posteclectic editions of modernist authors have been in existence for several decades: Hans Walter Gabler’s 1983 genetic edition of *Ulysses*, which utilizes a diachronic, synoptic apparatus for the display of textual variants; Valerie Eliot’s documentary edition of *The Wasteland*, which features photofacsimile reproductions and transcriptions of the holograph and typescript versions of the work; the documentary Cornell Yeats, which similarly includes photofacsimile reproductions and transcriptions of each poem; and an archival edition of *Ezra Pound’s Poetry and Prose: Contributions to Periodicals*. While the fact that post-eclectic approaches have been reserved exclusively for the editing of white male modernists is likely the natural outcome of their having enjoyed a larger share of scholarly attention, for a longer period of time, than their female, non-white, and non-Western counterparts, this fact is worthy of mention and further attention.

That editions of Woolf's works have not been undertaken with greater attention to contemporary, posteclectic approaches to textual editing is all the more surprising in light of the important role played by her works in the development of those theories. In "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice," Brenda Silver has ably documented the intersection of feminist literary criticism, Woolf studies, and textual editing that is seen as having originated with the 1976 publication of the *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*. This issue marked a watershed in Woolf studies, establishing the central role that her manuscripts would come to occupy for future feminist scholars and leading directly to the publication of the holograph versions of her novels and *A Room of One's Own* over the course of the next sixteen years. Of particular interest to a discussion of *Three Guineas* is the emphasis in this issue on the multiple pre-publication versions of *The Years*, which included photofacsimile reproductions of what have come to be known (after a comment made by Leonard Woolf) as the "two enormous chunks" that Woolf deleted from the book at the galley stage. Equally important, however, was the critical discussion that accompanied this documentary display and modeled ways of reading versioned works: as Silver observes, "the interpretative readings framing the texts move easily between the manuscript, galley, and published versions, as well as taking seriously Woolf's assertion that *The Years* and *Three Guineas* were 'one book'" ("Textual Criticism" 202). At the same time that this distinctly feminist reading practice was being modeled by Woolf scholars, feminist literary theory was making its own contributions to textual theory, most notably in Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar's notion of the text as "palimpsest." Thanks to this early work on Woolf's

manuscripts, “the language used to talk about the manuscript versions and their relationship to the published text also began to shift, reflecting shifts in the idea of the ‘text’ within the broader critical and theoretical environment, in particular the deconstruction of the concept of a stable, unitary text,” Silver remarks (“Textual Criticism” 204).

While this historical moment may be credited with profoundly shaping the future direction of Woolf studies and, more generally, of women’s studies, its importance to the future of textual criticism has been less frequently observed: this is, I believe, largely because the symbiotic relationship between Woolf studies and textual studies established at that moment would dissipate soon thereafter and, thus, would prove itself a moment of less importance to textual scholars than to Woolf scholars.⁵⁹ With so much substantive work to be done on Woolf’s oeuvre, and so many texts that needed to be brought into public view, Woolf scholars with a predilection for textual editing committed themselves to producing editions of Woolf’s works that conformed as closely as possible to her final intentions as a way of accessing the “real” or “true” Virginia Woolf. Several additional factors account for the fact that, prior to 1992, when those works published during Woolf’s lifetime came temporarily out of copyright, few “serious attempts to edit [her] individual texts according to contemporary scholarly practice” had been made (Briggs, “Between the Texts” 147). These include a preoccupation with the content of the holographs—with what they could offer in terms of ideologically-inflected readings of Woolf—over their form; an overwhelming interest in “the excavation and reconstruction of Woolf’s creative processes” (Briggs, “Between the Texts” 148);

and the fact that few of Woolf's early editors had been trained in theories and practices of textual editing, rendering them "hardly equal to the task of formulating appropriate textual policies, far less of implementing them" (Briggs, "Between the Texts" 147). The result is that

Unlike Eliot's, Virginia Woolf's writings have received a variegated range of editorial activity, marked at the same time, however, by lack of coordination, uncertain or absent principles, lack of methodological awareness and mutual incomprehension among the several concurrent editorial enterprises. . . . The transcripts of Woolf's manuscripts that have been made available reflect little or no concerted thinking as to the nature of transcriptions. (Gabler, "Review" 338)

It is important to recall that several editions of modernist works utilizing a post-eclectic approach (including Valerie Eliot's 1971 edition of *The Wasteland* and Hans Gabler's 1983 edition of *Ulysses*) had been, in fact, available as possible models to early and later editors of Woolf's works. Failure on the part of Woolf's early editors to contemplate, let alone engage, posteclectic editorial paradigms in creating their editions means that "it is not merely the editing, but also the thinking about editing Woolf that needs to be undertaken from scratch" (Gabler, "Review" 337).⁶⁰

Just as Silver traces the intersection between Woolf studies, feminist theory, and textual studies during a given period beginning in 1976 and ending roughly in 1991 (when the essay was published), Briggs rehearses the intersection between Woolf studies and textual editing practices in a series of articles covering the period between 1992 and 2004.⁶¹ Briggs extends Silver's analysis to consider the material

and editorial underpinnings of the reprints undertaken by Hogarth Press, Blackwell's Shakespeare Head imprint, Penguin Classics, World's Classics, Everyman, Macmillan, Routledge, Virago, Verso, and Triad Grafton following the lifting of the copyright on her works in Britain (Briggs, "Editing Woolf" 67).⁶² Assessing the editing of Woolf's works collectively rather than individually, her main objection to the editions produced since 1992 is that they fail to "identify the range and difficulty of the problems created by her processes of revision" ("Between the Texts" 144), and particularly by her processes of *post*-publication revision. Citing numerous instances in which careful attention to the various impressions of Woolf's work has yielded evidence of significant variation, she calls on scholars to commit themselves to collating all the various impressions and editions published by the Hogarth Press during Woolf's lifetime. In evaluating "the respective merits" of the Hogarth Press, Shakespeare Head, Penguin, and World's Classics editions "as edited texts," and "the way in which the task of text-editing was interpreted within the various series" (160), Briggs's main interest lies in the choice of copy-text and the kinds and amount of supplementary material appended to each edition. Of the editions produced against the lifting of copyright, Briggs identifies several of note: G.P. Wright's 1990 edition of *Mrs. Dalloway* for the Hogarth Press is called "exemplary" and "important" for "providing a much-needed collation of later British editions of the novel (157, 160) and Stella McNichol's editions of *Mrs. Dalloway*, *To the Lighthouse*, and *Between the Acts* for Penguin called "exceptional in listing selected readings of later British editions" (162).

While post-publication revisions within the British line of transmission are important for the insight they promise to supply into Woolf's habits as a reviser, and are understandably compelling for suggesting the existence of new vistas within Woolf studies, one is left feeling that Briggs unnecessarily delimits broader discussion on how Woolf's works might be edited according to contemporary text editing theory by restricting her discussion to the treatment of post-publication revisional variants. I would argue that a more formidable obstacle lies in the persistence of the eclectic approach within these series as a whole. Evidence of this abounds, well beyond Hogarth's self-determined "definitive" editions and Blackwell's "authoritative" ones, throughout the four series, manifesting itself most clearly in a general insistence on the separation of text and apparatus and a preoccupation with clear reading texts that conform to authorial intention.⁶³

The editions produced by Hogarth, Blackwell, Penguin, and World's Classics consistently privilege the production of clear reading texts derived, with very few exceptions, from the first British editions of Woolf's works, which are generally seen as possessing the greatest textual authority. Even those few cases that Briggs identifies as exceptions to this rule are driven by this quest for an authorial text: thus, Gillian Beer selects the Uniform Edition as copy-text for her World's Classics edition of *The Waves* "on the grounds that it corrected earlier misprints" (Briggs, "Between the Texts" 161, note 39), while Susan Dick, Morris Beja, and J. H. Stape select her marked up American proofs as copy-text "on the grounds that these provide an exact record of her intentions, uncontaminated by further editorial intervention, and thus serve as a reliable guide to her writing practice" (Briggs

163).⁶⁴ In the event that evidence of pre-publication versions is acknowledged, it is appended to the text in the form of reproductions or transcriptions of selected manuscript materials or as a table of variants.⁶⁵ While the use of appendices supply valuable historical, biographical, and/or compositional context for the work at hand and thereby help promote a historicized, socialized view of the work that takes revisions into account, it can also be said to simultaneously reproduce hierarchies that privilege text over paratext and that distinguish text from apparatus, thereby instantiating the practice of “institutionally sanctioned forgetting” (Grigely 30) encouraged by eclectic editions. In contrast, an edition that integrates pre-publication versions into the reading text itself, such as Hans Gabler’s synoptic edition of *Ulysses*, can be thought of as collapsing the hierarchies between text and apparatus, and between versions of a work.

Rather than produce an edition that reproduces through documents the evolution of a given work, like the Cornell Yeats or Valerie Eliot’s facsimile edition of *The Wasteland*, or that incorporates pre-publication versions into the reading text, holograph versions of Woolf’s novels are invariably produced in separate editions. In addition to reproducing the text/apparatus distinction noted above, separating pre-publication versions from published versions results relegates them to a separate and “unequal” status. This editorial practice inevitably impacts *how* one encounters versions of a work, making interversional comparison at the local level (such as that facilitated by parallel text and genetic text editions) decidedly more difficult than comparison at the global level. Because these editions frequently limit themselves to the reproduction or transcription of the single, most complete pre-publication version,

they reproduce the synchronous dimension of a given version at the expense of the diachronous dimension of the work as a whole.⁶⁶ Feeling ourselves fortunate, which we undoubtedly are, to have these materials transcribed and commercially available, Woolf scholars seem generally, and blissfully, unaware of how this practice presupposes and perpetuates a particular view of textuality, and impairs a more expansive view of the evolution of her works.

My objective in analyzing Briggs's reading of these series to the extent that I have is to demonstrate how deeply entrenched the eclectic, intentionalist approach to textual editing is, even among the most textually forward-thinking Woolf scholars, and to identify the kinds of confusion regarding editorial goals and responsibilities that may arise as a result. Briggs's own rationale (as general editor of the Penguin series) for selecting the British first edition as copy-text as "a practical way of shedding the accumulated errors of later editions" ("Between the Texts" 143-44) exemplifies a practice central to the eclectic approach to textual editing: what Gerald Grigely calls "textual eugenics," the impulse to "purify" the text by stripping it of its corruptions (27-28). Elsewhere, Briggs distinguishes between "good" and "bad" reprint series, identifying the former as "a carefully edited text with a helpful introduction and notes" and the latter as one that "reproduces a corrupt, much reprinted text with no supporting material at all" ("Editing Woolf for the Nineties" 67): a dialectic found in Naomi Black's reference to her edition of *Three Guineas* for Blackwell's as "a 'good' text, one that is properly edited, annotated, and placed in context" ("Not a Novel" 27). In a review of James Haule's and J. H. Stape's *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the*

Modernist Text (2002), the first book-length study dedicated to the subject of editing Woolf, Briggs laments the contributors' failure to consider the importance of "the appropriate choice of base text, the procedures for analyzing textual transmission, the editorial responsibilities of emendation—and how technical information of this kind is to be presented in a 'user-friendly' way" ("Review" 327), concerns aligned more with an eclectic, intentionalist view of textual editing than with contemporary posteclectic ones.

In what perhaps can only be described as a fitting illustration of postmodernist notions of multiplicity, plurality, and simultaneity, these traditional views of textuality coexist with more contemporary ones in her writings. For example, recognizing that the task of textual editing is ultimately always contingent upon an author's idiosyncratic writing and revising practices, she argues that new editions of Woolf ought to reflect the "multiplicity and indeterminacy [that] are features of Woolf's writing, reflecting her constant readiness to experiment" and that "ideally an editor would try to reproduce these elements, to achieve that quality of simultaneity that the very structures of her later novels reach out for," an effect which she maintains might be achieved by the use of hypertext in electronic editions ("Editing Woolf" 71) or in parallel electronic texts ("Between the Texts" 164). Her theoretical position here is closely aligned with Hans Gabler's; asserting the potential usefulness of genetic criticism in constructing a new edition of Woolf's work, he argues that a postmodernist approach to editing her works need be situated within a realization of authorial identity as that which is wholly contingent and always constructed: thus, he finds that "a future Woolf edition would need to

generate its editorial rationale and presentational formats out of a thorough analytic realisation of the modernist—the multi-generic, cross-referential, continuous, segmental, constructivist, playful, culturally saturated—text ‘Virginia Woolf’” (“Review” 343).

Within the past three years, both Briggs and Gabler have undertaken further exploration of what a genetic edition of Woolf’s work might look like. Gabler’s 2004 essay in *Woolf Studies Annual* is the most comprehensive attempt thus far to apply contemporary textual editing theories to Woolf’s work. “A Tale of Two Texts: Or, How One Might Edit Virginia Woolf’s *To the Lighthouse*” is instructive in modeling the kinds of questions that Woolf scholars will have to ask in constructing future editions: its appearance in print in this journal surely signifies the raising of the editorial bar in Woolf studies, and may even suggest the start of a new chapter in the historical narrative of the intersection between textual studies and Woolf studies that I have been tracing here. Fittingly, there is no better way to begin this new chapter in the history of Woolf studies than with the project that Briggs was co-directing with Peter Shillingsburg at the time of her death in 2007, and which is the most comprehensive attempt thus far to apply contemporary textual editing *practices* to Woolf’s work: an electronic genetic edition of the “Time Passes” section of *To the Lighthouse*, the first genetic edition of the work of a twentieth-century British woman author ever to be undertaken. However limited in scope, the project stands as a kind of experimental test (text) case with a view toward future postmodernist editions of Woolf’s works: “this approach could be extended from a short section of ‘To the Lighthouse’ to the novel as a whole,” the

editors write. “It could be a model for exploring *literary archaeologies* in the future.”⁶⁷

Touching the “Untouchable” Text

If Woolf’s oeuvre were to be conceived of metaphorically as a house comprised of textual “rooms,” then one might observe that some rooms are in better condition than others. After taking possession of the house of Woolf in the late 1970s, feminist scholars undertook a full-scale renovation of these rooms, offering common readers and scholars alike what, in many instances, was to be the first glimpse of her works. Our debt to these early textual designers and renovators is vast. The relative outdatedness of the renovation, after the lapse of thirty years, is a matter of far less concern, however, than the fact that the initial renovation was never completed, as is true of *The Years* and *Three Guineas*.

Thus, walking through the house, down the corridor constructed by Woolf during the thirties, one would encounter a series of rooms that have begun to show signs of wear in spite of being structurally sound: in the rooms representing *The Waves*, *Flush*, and *Roger Fry*, for example, slight fractures are visible in the plaster where the house has continued to settle; the topmost layer of paint has crackled, making painted walls resemble elaborate, inscrutable puzzles, while papered walls slowly shed their skins in broad strips, revealing the seams where piece had been laid against piece years back. Filled with outdated, though sturdy and serviceable, furnishings, one might comfortably pass an evening or afternoon there in reading. In marked contrast is the condition of those two rooms—actually two interconnected

rooms—that lie just beyond these, rooms that have undergone only the most tentative attempts at renovation. Of all those in the house, the rooms representing *The Years* and *Three Guineas* are in the most extreme state of dilapidation, bearing remnants scattered here and there of a renovation begun and abandoned, long ago. Here one longs for the comparative luxury of the neighboring rooms in which one can read, for one must do a considerable amount of work—patching holes, plastering walls, replacing boards with window panes, supplying the room with furniture—before one can read here. And as the remnants of renovation make clear, the task is altogether daunting. Such a state of disrepair might lead one to conclude that within Woolf studies, and among textual scholars, *Three Guineas* remains something of a pariah, something of an “untouchable text.”

Given the centrality of *The Years* and *Three Guineas* to the feminist critical project, it is unclear why, thirty years after the feminist recuperation of Woolf began, no complete transcription of the holograph or corrected typescripts of either *The Years* or *Three Guineas* has yet been published. Building from Briggs’s more general observation that, prior to 1992, Woolf scholars were “hardly equal to the task of formulating appropriate textual policies, far less of implementing them” (“Between the Texts” 147), these same scholars may have been particularly ill-equipped to manage, let alone display, the diverse, fragmentary manuscript evidence that exists in the cases of *Three Guineas* and *The Years*. Accordingly, what documentary evidence has been compiled and published thus far has been undertaken in piecemeal fashion: by Mitchell Leaska, who supplied transcriptions of Woolf’s manuscript notes for her LNSWS speech, of the speech itself, and of *The*

Pargiters, the “novel-essay portion” of *The Years*; Grace Radin, who supplied facsimile reproductions and transcriptions of the “two enormous chunks” deleted from the galleys of *The Years*, as well as other selected passages; and, most recently, by Merry Pawlowski and Vara Neverow, who have created an online edition of reading notes and scrapbooks thematically relevant to the conception and composition of *The Years* and *Three Guineas*, and that includes digital reproductions of documentary materials, transcriptions, abstracts, and contextual commentary (*Reading Notes*). While there is a certain appeal to the collaborative component of this venture—and it is one that would have delighted Woolf as well—the piecemeal nature of these projects is neither expedient nor immediately useful for gaining a more complete sense of the development of these works. Complete transcriptions of the holographs need to be produced in order to foster deeper insight into the origins of these, her two most politically ambitious works. But editorial attention to *Three Guineas* must extend beyond simple acts of transcription if it is to suggest something beyond the synchronous dimension of an individual textual state and something of the social and cultural context in which it was conceived, composed, published, and transmitted. Thus a new edition of *Three Guineas* seems to be in order: one capable of displaying the varied texts of which it is comprised, whether those texts may be thought to include only pre-publication documents, as geneticists maintain; to include only those documents that have reached the publication stage, as is maintained by proponents of a socialized view of textuality; or to include post-publication documents, such as recently advocated by Gerald Grigely and John Bryant. These three views of textuality are represented in the three

models that I suggest as possibilities for a posteclectic edition of *Three Guineas*: a parallel text edition, a genetic edition, and a fluid-text edition. While these editions embrace diverging perspectives on what constitutes a viable document, what they have in common is their ability to physically accommodate “other” versions of *Three Guineas*, allowing us in each instance to make interversional comparisons that yield distinctive, significant results.

Notes Toward Versioning Three Guineas

I should first like to address several questions of immediate concern to any editor wishing to undertake a posteclectic edition of *Three Guineas*: that of the number and kind of pre-publication documents that we know to be in existence; that of which of these documents may be said to constitute a version of that work; and that of where the boundaries of the text might be said to lie.

No complete holograph or typescript draft, nor any proofs, of *Three Guineas* are known to exist. We are fortunate, however, that those holograph and typescript fragments housed in the Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection of English and American Literature of the New York Public Library, are of a rather substantial size, a fact frequently downplayed in discussions of the materials. Immediately one attempts to tabulate the number of extant holograph and typescript pages, however, one is confronted by the question of precisely *what* may be said to constitute a version of *Three Guineas* and precisely where the boundaries of the work are situated. In light of the work’s complex compositional history, feminist scholarship on *Three Guineas* generally presupposes that the boundaries of the work extend beyond its holograph and typescript

drafts, though there is little consensus about the precise location of those boundaries. Thus, in identifying “the sequence of texts that produced the final volume” of *Three Guineas*, Naomi Black identifies seven stages, or versions, of that work:

- Version 1: Woolf’s manuscript notes for the LNSWS speech**
- Version 2: Woolf’s corrected typescript of the same**
- Version 3: “the talk as published posthumously” as “Professions for Women” in 1942**
- Version 4: the interchapters of *The Pargiters***
- Version 5: “Women Must Weep”**
- Version 6: British first edition of *Three Guineas***
- Version 7: American first edition of *Three Guineas* (“Not a Novel” 30-32)**

Black’s analysis is conservative in that she restricts herself to considering only those versions that have appeared, at some point, in print, as she herself admits: this allows her to circumvent the more vexed, and more interesting, question of how many unpublished versions of that work might be said to exist. Her assumption, moreover, that the work’s boundaries are coterminous with its publication, rather than extending beyond the moment of publication, allows her also to circumvent the question of whether subsequent texts that extend the logic and analysis of *Three Guineas* might also be regarded as versions of that work. Jane Marcus adopts a more expansive view of versioning that includes unpublished, pre-publication documents, including reading notes and scrapbooks; excised passages, including the interchapters of *The Pargiters* and excised portions of *The Years*; and works both previous and subsequent, though thematically linked, to *Three Guineas*, including “A Society,” *A Room of One’s Own*, and the introduction to *Life As We Have Known It* (“Introduction” xlv, lxv).⁶⁸ Anna Snaith suggests that the correspondence received, and in many cases, responded to by Woolf following the publication of *Three Guineas* should be considered an “extension of the text” itself, as “part of the huge body of evidence for the links between patriarchy, war

and fascism, the links between public and private tyrannies” (*Virginia Woolf* 128).⁶⁹ Provided that one conceives the boundaries of the work to be sufficiently broad on both ends, one might also reasonably add to these her little-known essay, “The Plumage Bill” (1920), “Two Women: Emily Davies and Lady Augusta Stanley” (1927), *Flush* (1933), “Reviewing” (1939), “Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid” (1940), and “Why?” (1942), all of which share thematic and rhetorical similarities with *Three Guineas*. Such an expansive view of textual boundaries is consistent with postmodernist notions of textuality and intertextuality, in which “the materials of which the peaks of ‘finished’ literary works are composed are seen to be interlinked, symbiotic, and in continuous, interrelated flux” and in which “relationships within and between the author’s writings form, as it were, an *authorial* intertextuality, a continuum of authorship” (Eggert 66).

Various schools of thought exist as to what constitutes a version of a literary work, with debate generally centering on whether a version ought to be determined by the number of variants or by the textual significance of those variants, whether versions need have a material basis, and whether versions must be authorial. On the one hand is the geneticists’ view that a version is “constituted by a single variant” (Zeller, “A New Approach” 237) and forms a discrete semiotic system comprised of interlocking linguistic parts that exist only in relation to one another. A common objection to the structuralist view is that it fails to impose any qualitative criteria and therefore produces versions that are otherwise insignificant. Other textual theorists have attempted to establish qualitative criteria by which to base their determinations, proposing criteria that hinges on the content and function of a given text. Peter Shillingsburg maintains that the process of distinguishing versions demands that we “calculate first whether the content

had a sufficient stability as an ‘entity’ to be called a Version, and next to calculate how much of a change or what kind of change in content is required before a *different* Version, rather than an *improved* Version, results” (70; italics in original).⁷⁰ Thomas Tanselle, Siegfried Scheibe, and John Bryant adopt content-based criteria, distinguishing variants that substantively affect the work from those that do not. What constitutes a version, Bryant writes, is that a text be “isolatable as a distinctive phase of creation and are not merely a handful of minor variants or accidents” (70). In attempting to define what is understood as a “distinctive phase of creation,” Bryant finds useful Scheibe’s concept of revisions that function as “turning points” in the overall development of the work, those “decisive change[s]” that occur early in the work’s composition, as opposed to the changes made later on in the revision process that “that tend to involve fine-tunings of already conceived texts” (74). He also finds helpful Tanselle’s distinction between “vertical revisions” that transform the work substantively and “horizontal revisions” that “refine the expression of a passage without changing the drift or general effect of the whole” (85). Content, rhetorical function, and authorial intention ultimately intersect, however, in the criteria that Bryant adopts: revealing not only “substantial differences in the nature and impact of the text” (89), versions must display “a *strategic* pattern of revision evincing some *reconception of the function of the work itself*” that evidences an author’s “attempt to manipulate a readership differently”; as a result, each version can be seen to possess a “definable *rhetorical impact*” that “necessarily alter[s] our reading of a work” (90; italics in original).

A second debate concerns whether a version need have a material basis. The materialist position, adopted by social text theorists Jerome McGann, D.F. McKenzie,

and Jack Stillinger, identifies a version with its physical documents. This view is implicit in Donald Reiman's position that "if holograph mss or authoritative transcriptions of the work survive in sufficiently distinctive states, they themselves ought to be published as versions" (178). Thomas Tanselle, Peter Shillingsburg, and John Bryant, on the other hand, argue that versions need not exist in physical form, but can include mental or conceptual states that lead to the development of the work. Equating the version with "the conception or aim of the Work at a point of Utterance" (Shillingsburg 51), Peter Shillingsburg distinguishes among potential, developing, and essayed versions. While often physically unrecoverable, a potential version "refers to the abstract incipient ideas about the Work as it grows in the consciousness of the author," and may include "abstract conceptual concepts in the mind of an author," as well as notes or preliminary drafts (51, 82). In contrast, developing versions are said to consist of "trial drafts in some material form" and essayed versions of "completed manuscripts or revised texts" (82). Potential versions may also include what Bryant refers to as "inferred versions," for "even though many versions are undeniably attached physically to documents, documents can also reveal multiple *inferred versions* that are nevertheless historically real even though they can only be speculated upon and constructed out of partial evidence found in the document" (79). Bryant extends Shillingsburg's classification by including versions that result from revision or adaptation made at the post-publication stage, a view of textuality consonant with that of Gerald Grigely, who argues in *Textualterity* that works of art undergo continuous transformation and "reconfiguration" throughout their lifetime (46-47). Bryant distinguishes between three kinds of versions, each corresponding with a particular stage of textual production, which he classifies as the creation, publication, and

adaptation stages. Versions at the creation stage, he argues, may include ideas expressed in journals and letters that reveal the evolution of the work's concept, various forms of "scribbling" including notes and prewriting, as well as working drafts, circulating drafts, fair copies, and typescripts (90-91). Versions at the publication level may include those "physical documents emerging from the first phases of print reproduction—copy-editing, galleys, and page proofs; magazine issues, first editions, and corrected copies of editions" (92), while those at the adaptation level may include translations, productions, films, and other forms of non-authorial adaptation made after the publication of a work (93).

Clearly, this multitude of criteria will have an important impact on any future editorial reconstruction of *Three Guineas*, given the fragmentary nature of her holograph and typescript drafts and the preponderance of *avante-texts* that exist in relation to that work. Given the above criteria, an editor would possess the authority to identify Woolf's holograph and typescript drafts as distinct versions of the work provided they differ by at least one variant (Zeller); that they are "sufficiently distinct" from one another (Reiman, McGann, Stillinger); or they reveal a significant alteration in both the work's direction and the author's rhetorical purpose (Bryant). Clearly, then, an editor would be authorized to recognize as versions of *Three Guineas* any physical document that demonstrates difference of any kind from any other document, whether the notion of difference is constructed in linguistic, rhetorical, material, or substantive terms. What is particularly important, moreover, is that these textual theories authorize editors to recognize as versions various kinds of *avante-textes*. Thus, between Shillingsburg's notion of "potential versions" and Bryant's concept of the "creative stage," an editor would be authorized to version Woolf's "abstract conceptual concepts" in relation to the work,

such as those expressed in her diaries and letters; various forms of “scribbling,” including her reading notes, preliminary forms of writing, and early drafts; and physically nonexistent versions that can be inferred from authorial corrections. Even the three volumes of scrapbooks would have authority as a version under the conceptual view of textuality, as their contents may be said to infer the overall development of the work; one might even argue that each item contained in the scrapbooks ought to be regarded as a version under the terms established by Shillingsburg and Bryant. Letters received in response to *Three Guineas* that suggest an ongoing conversation between Woolf and her correspondent are authorized by Bryant as belated evidence of Woolf’s “concept” of the work, and as readerly “remakings” of the work through the processes of reading and interpretation.

On the other hand, an editor would possess little authority for including as versions of *Three Guineas* those works that share a primarily thematic, rather than linguistic, resemblance to one another. Whether this is as it should be is perhaps cause for further discussion and theoretical emendation. And, while one may be able to authorize the versioning of “Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid” and “Reviewing” as a direct extension of the conception of *Three Guineas*, and as products of the dialogue that grew out of that work, a more pressing obstacle, and cause for discussion, is how such versions would be displayed, and to what ends. How, for example, is the editor to indicate the relation of the published version of *Three Guineas* to “Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid,” two texts that are utterly distinctive in terms of their language? In managing texts whose relation to one another is primarily one of linguistic difference, the editor’s task becomes that of displaying textual similarity as opposed to variation: a defense of one’s

process of versioning, rather than the tracing of textual genesis. Such a shift necessarily would have an immediate impact on the kinds of editions produced—for if texts can be sufficiently aligned as versions by virtue of thematics, politics, style, or rhetorical flourishes, then the edition produced as a result will be less an edition of a given work than an edition of a particular feature, aspect, or style identifiable across several works. Thus, rather than an edition of *Three Guineas*, one might have an edition of Woolf's pacifism, or Woolf's irony, or Woolf's subversive use of the epistolary format: editions in which the text under reconstruction is not that which has been written, but what can be read in that which has been written. Such an uncoupling of the textual edition from the work undergoing editing would indicate a further, and perhaps inevitable, collapse of the boundaries distinction between literary and textual theory and between literary criticism and textual studies.

In some respects, it appears that such expansive theories of versioning have outstripped our ability to accommodate them in a format other than an electronic one. Indeed, an edition that is to incorporate each of Woolf's innumerable references to the project in her diaries and letters over the course of a decade, each individual reading note collected in her twelve volumes related to the project, each item collected in her three volumes of scrapbooks, each distinctive holograph and typescript version of each of the several works thematically related to *Three Guineas*, each published version of the work, each imprint of each published version of the work (as Briggs would have us include), and each cultural appropriation, adaptation, or "textual remaking" that occurs over the course of the text's lifetime (as Bryant would have us include, thereby constantly

expanding the size of the edition)—an edition that is to incorporate all of these documents cannot be accommodated by anything *other* than an electronic edition.

It seems likely that the number of available versions will continue to proliferate, as theorists become more attentive to the existence of multiple versions within a single document, an argument possessing a certain postmodernist appeal. As John Bryant has recently observed in a discussion of “complicated” manuscripts, “the versions invariably lie one over the other in what appears to be a wilderness of cancellations, insertions, and transpositions. Each revision site may bear the traces of distinctly different conceptions linked to different versions. Moreover, the archaeology of the revision site is such that one may not be able to discern the exact sequencing of the revisions” (77). As boundaries both between and within versions collapse, and the number of versions increases exponentially even as its conceptual value wanes, it seems logical to assume that textual editors will come to rely increasingly if not exclusively on producing electronic editions that are capable of displaying the potentially endless play of textual variation.

In this light, it will seem strange that I have chosen to limit my discussion of a posteclectic edition of *Three Guineas* to print editions. This choice is not based on any objection to electronic editing, but on a curiosity as to how much textual weight a print edition may be made to bear, as to how one might accommodate the proliferating number of textual versions permitted by contemporary textual theory without having recourse to the textual amenities supplied by electronic editing. While my examples of each are necessarily limited in scope, the genetic and fluid-text editions that I propose below offer themselves as possible solutions to the problem of how one might represent, and facilitate the navigation of, complex textual states within the confines of book technology. I must

admit, moreover, that a certain fascination with posteclectic print editions is generated by contemplating the models already in existence: just how *would* one construct a parallel-text edition, or a genetic edition, of *Three Guineas*? How might *Three Guineas* pose challenges to the model of the fluid-text edition proposed by John Bryant? How effortlessly does *Three Guineas* surrender itself to existing models of posteclectic textual editing, or how violently does it chafe against the boundaries implicit in those models? And what new vistas emerge from each posteclectic print edition of *Three Guineas*?

Notes Toward a Parallel-Text Edition of Three Guineas

It is widely recognized that a considerable degree of variation exists between British and American first editions of Woolf's works. "Extensive and substantial" textual differences are particularly marked among her mid-career writings, although they can also be found in later works, including *Three Guineas* (Briggs, "Between the Texts" 151). Brenda Silver and Julia Briggs attribute this textual phenomenon to Woolf's practice of marking up British and American proofs separate from one another, which allowed her to "knowingly send out different versions, different texts" (Silver, "Textual Criticism" 196) and thereby to create "two distinct lines of textual transmission" (Briggs, "Between the Texts" 152).⁷¹ Briggs elsewhere attributes intention to this practice, arguing that it was Woolf's love of "multiplicity and indeterminacy" and her "constant readiness to experiment" ("Editing Woolf" 71) that led her to produce multiple versions rather than a closed text that represents her final intentions. "The opportunity of publication in both Britain and American held out for Woolf the veritable *jouissance* of going public simultaneously with alternative, yet equally valid textual realisations of her

narratives of essays,” Hans Gabler writes in a discussion of Woolf’s changes to the “Time Passes” section of *To the Lighthouse* (“Editing Virginia Woolf” 340). The question of whether a postmodernist view of textual difference obtains in the case of *Three Guineas*, or whether a historico-cultural explanation of textual difference may be more appropriate in relation to that work, will be discussed below.

At least three distinct versions of *Three Guineas* appeared within Woolf’s lifetime: a significantly altered, abridged version published as “Women Must Weep—Or Unite Against War” in the May and June 1938 issues of the *Atlantic Monthly*; a British edition, published by the Hogarth Press on 2 June 1938; and an American edition, published by Harcourt Brace on 25 August 1938.⁷² The most recent edition of *Three Guineas* to include a list of textual variants, the Shakespeare Head edition, identifies 34 variations in wording between the British and American first editions and the existence of four passages that appear only in the endnotes to the American edition. Given that these results have been produced through computer collation, which has been shown to be demonstrably inaccurate in regard to Woolf’s other works, one must assume that this represents the *minimum* number of textual differences that can be said to exist.⁷³ While providing readers direct access to textual variants (and thus a welcome addition to editions of Woolf’s work), the practice of representing textual variation as lists of raw data is problematic in that it focuses attention on the quantity of variants rather than on the qualities (function, content) of those variants. The same list of variants is subject to wide discrepancies in the interpretive realm: for while Briggs regards differences between the American and British versions to be “extensive and substantial” (“Between the Texts” 151), Black identifies the texts as being “almost identical” (“Not a Novel” 32).

How Naomi Black reproduces such faulty claims in her introduction to the Shakespeare Head edition is worth briefly mentioning here as a kind of warning. A political scientist and a feminist, Black proves herself an apt illustration of Briggs's claim that Woolf scholars have been generally inept at traditional modes of textual criticism. While Black's introduction is remarkably strong on the facts relating to the work's composition and reception history, as well as aspects of its feminism, it is remarkably weak in those areas more traditionally grounded in literary and textual criticism; as a result, while one rarely finds cause to dispute her facts, one finds ample opportunity to dispute her analysis of those same facts.⁷⁴ Her analytical weaknesses are particularly evident in her discussion of textual variation in *Three Guineas*, and in her defense of her choice of copy-text⁷⁵, in which she reveals herself to be confounded utterly by the differences between the three published versions of the work:

Unfortunately examination of the three 1938 versions is uninformative at best, and at the worst thoroughly confusing. The shortness of the list of variants (Appendix B) shows just how similar the texts of the first English and American editions are. As to the serial, 'Women Must Weep', it is only a quarter in length compared to the book texts, was substantially rewritten and does not include any notes or other documentation of sources. ("Introduction" lxiii)

This description is offered in lieu of any substantive interversional comparison. Her interest in the variations is restricted to their usefulness for determining the sequencing of the versions, and thereby for helping her to establish one version as

more “authoritative” than another, although her confusion in this regard is also evident.⁷⁶ While her analysis of the four passages does not conclusively support her explanation as to why they appear only in the American edition (ie. that they were written at a later stage, while Woolf was correcting the American proofs), Black misses an opportunity to consider that Woolf might have consciously added those passages for the benefit of her American readership, and thereby limits the scope and complexity of her interversional comparison.⁷⁷

A final note on this edition: while Julia Briggs laments the execution of the Shakespeare Head editions of Woolf’s novels for their more general neglect of post-publication textual variants, the Shakespeare Head edition of *Three Guineas* fails, in terms of its textual editing practices, on a far more serious count. One is made continuously aware of a decided hesitancy on Black’s part to engage with the subject of textual difference at the publication stage, as can be seen in any number of comments made in, or about, her edition of the work: “The texts of the first editions of *Three Guineas* are *very* similar, with a *few* exceptions, *few* of which are noteworthy” (241); “*Most* errors are shared by the two texts; *other* mistakes are rare and randomly distributed” (ibid.); “*almost all* differences relate to punctuation, and *most* of these are related to the complicated patterns of double and single quotation marks (lxiv); “a computer collation has shown that the texts are *almost* identical” (“Not a Novel” 32); “the Massachusetts Historical Society has two pages that *seem* to include a galley proof marked up to serve as instructions to proofsetters at the *Atlantic Monthly*” (lxxv, n96); “the photographs are placed *slightly* differently in the two editions but they are in the same order; the endnotes are *virtually* identical except for

pagination” (“Not a Novel” 51; italics mine). Such an extensive use of qualifying statements has several effects on the reader, the editor, and the work itself: it renders virtually meaningless the very statements that it qualifies; it impairs the editor’s credibility, creating doubt as to his or her editorial judgment; and it falsely emphasizes interversional similarity at the expense of interversional difference, thereby promulgating a misrepresentation of the work as a unified, unproblematic whole.

A future editor of *Three Guineas* might wish to take on the challenge of interversional variation as a starting point for a posteclectic edition of the work. The edition that seems most appropriate for displaying variation among published versions of this work, and for thereby stimulating much-needed “constrastive study” (Roland 18) of these versions, is the parallel-text edition. Rather than tracing the genesis of the work through its various pre-publication documents (as in a genetic edition), or highlighting the significance of revision in the evolution of the work (as in a fluid-text edition), the parallel-text edition would highlight and display difference through the use of a facing-page display. While the more localized, condensed forms of variation that one finds in the British and American first editions could be quite easily displayed using marginal notes or footnotes within a variorum edition, the more extensive, substantive differences between “Women Must Weep” and either of the first editions would be better accommodated within the format of a parallel-text edition.

The decision to include “Women Must Weep” within a parallel-text edition of *Three Guineas* recommends itself on multiple counts. On a practical level, it would

make immediately available to a new generation of readers a text that has not been reproduced since its initial appearance in the *Atlantic Monthly*, done so in a format designed to display its differences from the versions with which they are already familiar. By choosing to include “Women Must Weep” in a parallel-text edition, an editor also necessarily shapes the kinds of questions that will be asked of the work. Given that parallel-text editions can foreground historical and social theories of text production in trying to “plausibly explain the state of difference” between two texts (Roland 4), this choice of edition will help generate questions of the ultimate importance to Woolf: whether the variation is understood to be a product of political, social, cultural, bibliographic, or personal pressures, or some combination thereof, a socialized view of these texts divests the author of sole authority over her work, and promulgates a view of textual authority as that which is located in a “social nexus” (McGann, *Critique* 48). Moreover, the choice to display this work alongside a first edition of *Three Guineas* would help advance analysis of that work beyond claims that it is merely an abridged, Americanized version of *Three Guineas*, a position that seems untenable in light of its considerable differences from even the American first edition. Stripped of this common explanation of the work,⁷⁸ alternative readings of the variation multiply: in addition to encouraging readers to engage in close textual readings to determine the extent of variation and to determine how linguistic variation is connected to matters of tone and voice, a parallel-text edition of “Women Must Weep” will engage readers in considering how and why that work employs a rhetorical strategy different from the first American edition, and in determining how much, and why, the content varies as it does within both American versions.

As should already be evident from the above discussion, my choice of a first edition to place alongside “Women Must Weep” would be the American first edition. This decision is based on several assumptions, some already partially articulated. First, it is based on the assumption that the amount of variation between texts will be the greatest when the longest and shortest versions are placed alongside one another. As discussed above, preliminary electronic collations of the first American and British versions reveal the American edition to be the longer of the two, based on its inclusion of four additional passages. While the choice of the British first edition would arguably allow us to examine the ways in which “Women Must Weep” may have specifically targeted an American audience, such a comparison could easily be made if an editor were to supply British variants at either the margin or the foot of the page on which the American first edition is displayed. (The greater number and size of passages that one would have to footnote in the reverse case further recommends displaying the longer American edition.) Displaying two American versions alongside one another immediately complicates any reading based on the above arguments. For while it seems logical to assume that Woolf wrote “Women Must Weep” with her audience’s American-ness in mind, this assumption alone cannot account for the complex textual differences that are evident in the both American versions of the work.

The notion of “Women Must Weep” as an abridged work is itself not without its problems: given that no proofs exist for any of the texts under discussion, and the fact that Woolf was engaged in correcting the proofs for “Women Must Weep” roughly around the same time that she was correcting the proofs for both editions of

the book, we are unable to determine just how much “Women Must Weep” should be viewed as the result of abridgement and excision, nor how much the book versions might be the result of extensive additions made to “Women Must Weep.” This certainty that “Women Must Weep” is an abridged version of the longer work is no doubt attributable to our familiarity with abridged editions of works; and yet the evidence supplied by extant documents and references to the timeline of these works in no way precludes the possibility that “Women Must Weep” could be the earliest, rather than the latest, manifestation of the work that would be published soon thereafter in book form as *Three Guineas*. Given the uncertain ordering of the parts that comprise the whole, a parallel-text edition of the first American edition of *Three Guineas* and “Women Must Weep” would allow us to examine both the earliest and latest manifestations of the work, variously conceived, and thus promote multi-directional, and perhaps even recursive, “radial” forms of reading.⁷⁹ While presenting these texts in a more recognizable format than either the genetic or fluid-text editions that I will discuss below, the physical form of the parallel-text edition nevertheless invites the reader to engage in postmodernist play, a tendency inherent within this kind of edition, as Meg Roland has recently pointed out.⁸⁰

The textual passages that I have chosen to represent in parallel-text format [Fig. 1] on the following pages prove themselves substantially different from one another. Both passages begin with the speaker’s description of the figure of the Dictator in the photograph at which both reader and speaker are presumably looking. From this moment of shared similarity, the passages diverge: in “Women Must Weep,” the photograph “imposes itself” upon the letter, as if materializing from

Figure One. Sample passage of a proposed parallel-text edition of Virginia Woolf’s “Women Must Weep—Or Unite Against War,” *Atlantic Monthly* (May and June 1938) and *Three Guineas*, first American edition (Harcourt Brace, August 1938)

“Women Must Weep—Or Unite Against War,” pages 758-59	<i>Three Guineas</i> , first American edition, pages 168-70
<p>He is called, in German or Italian, <i>Führer</i> or <i>Duce</i>—in our own language, Tyrant or Dictator. And behind him lie ruined houses and dead bodies—women and children as well as men.</p> <p>That is the picture that has imposed itself upon this letter. It would seem that it is the same picture that has imposed END PAGE itself upon your own letter—the same picture, but looked at inevitably from a different angle. We are both agreed that the picture is the picture of evil; we are both determined to do what we can, you by your methods, we by ours, to destroy the evil which that picture represents. And we may both be wrong, not only in the methods by which we attempt to destroy that evil, but in our judgment.</p> <p>Many men of the highest education maintain that the picture is a picture, nor of evil, but of good. War, it is argued, brings out the noblest qualities of mankind. The Dictator, it is claimed, is neither a menace nor a monster, but, on the contrary, the consummation of manhood. He is the embodiment of the State; the State is supreme; both men and women must obey its commands, whether they are just or unjust. Obedience is all.</p> <p>On the other hand, some men also of the highest education maintain that the picture is the picture of evil. War is inhuman, horrible, unnatural, beastly. The dictator is a monster. His commands must be disobeyed. The State is not supreme. The State is made of human beings—of free men and free women, who must think for themselves.</p>	<p>He is called in German and Italian <i>Führer</i> or <i>Duce</i>; in our own language Tyrant or Dictator. And behind him lie ruined houses and dead bodies—men, women and children. But we have not laid that picture before you in order to excite once more the sterile emotion of hate. On the contrary it is in order to release other emotions such as the human figure, even thus crudely in a coloured photograph, arouses in us who are human beings. For it suggests a connection and for us a very important connection. It suggests that the public and the private worlds are inseparably connected; that the tyrannies and servilities of the one are the tyrannies and servilities of the other. But the human figure even in a photograph suggests other and more complex emotions. It suggests that we cannot dissociate ourselves from that figure but are ourselves that figure. It suggests that we are not passive spectators doomed to unresisting obedience but by our thoughts and actions can ourselves change that figure. A common interest unites us; it is one world, one life. How essential it is that we END PAGE should realize that unity the dead bodies, the ruined houses prove. For such will be our ruin if you, in the immensity of your public abstractions forget the private figure, or if we in the intensity of our private emotions forget the public world. Both houses will be ruined, the public and the private, the material and the spiritual, for they are inseparably connected. But with your letter before us we have reason to hope. For by asking our help you recognize that connection; and by reading your words we are reminded of other connections that lie far deeper than the facts on the surface. Even here, even</p>

What judge is there to decide which opinion is right, which wrong? There is no judge; there is no certainty in heaven above or on earth below. All we can do is to examine that picture as clearly as sex and class allow; to bring to bear upon it such illumination as history, biography, and the daily paper put within our reach; and to examine both reasons and emotions as dispassionately as we can.

That is what we have attempted. The Society of Outsiders—to give it too pompous a name—is the result. The rules—to speak too pedantically—are an attempt to embody the findings of that inquiry. At length, then, we have reached what must serve, temporarily at least, for an answer to your question. Given our sex, our past, our education, our traditions, the best way in which we can help you to prevent war is to keep those rules. The best way in which we can help you to prevent war, as society is at present and as we are at present, is to remain outside your society.

now your letter tempts us to shut our ears to these little facts, these trivial details, to listen not to the bark of the guns and the bray of the gramophones but to the voices of the poets, answering each other, assuring us of a unity that rubs out divisions as if they were chalk marks only; to discuss with you the capacity of the human spirit to overflow boundaries and make unity out of multiplicity. But that would be to dream—to dream the recurring dream that has haunted the human mind since the beginning of time; the dream of peace, the dream of freedom. But, with the sound of the guns in your ears you have not asked us to dream. You have not asked us what peace is; you have asked us how to prevent war. Let us then leave it to the poets to tell us what the dream is; and fix our eyes upon the photograph again: the fact.

Whatever the verdict of others may be upon the man in uniform—and opinions differ—there is your letter to prove that to you the picture is the picture of evil. And though we look upon that picture from different angles our conclusion is the same as yours—it is evil. We are both determined to do what we can to destroy the evil which that picture represents, you by your methods, we by ours. And since we are different, our help must be different. What ours can be we have tried to show—how imperfectly, how superficially there is no need to say.[49] But as a result the answer to your question must be that we can best **END PAGE** help you to prevent war not by repeating your words and following your methods but by finding new words and creating new methods. We can best help you to prevent war not by joining your society but by remaining outside your society but in cooperation with its aim.

nothing, while in the first American (and British) editions, the speaker actively “lays” it before the reader: a textual change that ascribes to the speaker a greater degree of agency. As a result of this simple change, the speaker in “Women Must Weep” immediately moves on to an exposition of the differences that inhere in acts of looking, admitting that “many men of highest edition” hold favorable views of war and fascism. Recognizing the ultimate relativity of what constitutes good and evil, the speaker’s emphasis on alternative ways of viewing the world makes the predominant characteristic of the passage one of humility, and its predominant function the modeling of tolerant attitudes toward the “other.” The passage, moreover, possesses a rhetorical function distinct from the other, as a way of justifying the existence of the Society of Outsiders. Given that “there is no judge; there is no certainty in heaven above or on earth below,” the speaker maintains that ethical determinations are to be made on an individual basis as a result of the processes of dispassionate reasoning, self-examination, and cultural awareness: presented as the outcome of such processes, the “rules” proposed by the Society of Outsiders are subject to instant validation.

If the previous passage is primarily driven by the speaker’s exposition of the differences in viewing the photograph, the second passage is primarily driven by an exposition of the speaker’s motives for presenting the photograph and contains several additional passages that dramatically alter the content, tone, and rhetorical function of the passage as a whole. By changing the circumstances in which the photograph makes its appearance in the text, Woolf gives her speaker the opportunity to finalize the connection between the “tyrannies and servilities” of the public and private spheres, as realized in the figure of the Dictator. The speaker articulates as a

second motive the desire to promote a greater self-awareness of the ways in which “we are ourselves that figure,” thus destabilizing the self-Other binary that is ultimately responsible for war. Moving beyond the “good” and “evil” dichotomy of the “Women Must Weep” passage, the photograph of the Dictator is invested in this passage with the ability to signify our connectedness as human beings; and in this unity lies hope itself:

But the human figure even in a photograph suggests other and more complex emotions. It suggests that we cannot dissociate ourselves from that figure but are ourselves that figure. It suggests that we are not passive spectators doomed to unresisting obedience but by our thoughts and actions can ourselves change that figure. A common interest unites us; it is one world, one life.

This vision “of a unity that rubs out divisions as if they were chalk marks only,” of “the capacity of the human spirit to overflow boundaries and make unity out of multiplicity,” is without question Woolf’s most optimistic and poetic meditation on the possibility of peace, and her most extensive articulation of how such a state of peace might be achieved through the dismantling of the Self/Other binary.

Given that both passages appear near the end of their respective versions, it seems reasonable to assume that variation in each passage suggests some shifting intention on Woolf’s part as to how to end each text. The variations discussed thus far suggest that by emphasizing interpersonal difference, Woolf may have wished only to validate the fruits of her own intellectual labour, the Society of Outsiders, as an example of the kind of efforts that must be exerted to determine one’s own ethical stance. Her emphasis on unity, and her active de-emphasis of difference in the second

version of the above passage—in which the entire passage is reduced to the introductory clause, “Whatever the verdict of others may be upon the man in uniform—and opinions differ”—suggests that by the time she was writing this version, she perhaps felt less of a need to defend or justify the Society, and more need to provide some cause for optimism, some vision of unity in a world becoming increasingly characterized by disunity.

The parallel-text edition allows one to imagine the possible direction of the textual revisions that one sees. One might approach such a task expecting full well to find evidence in support of the theory that “Women Must Weep” is an abridged version of *Three Guineas*; yet, interversional comparison suggests that the reverse may actually be the case. If “Women Must Weep” were, in fact, a condensation of the first edition, one would expect to find the same content in both versions, expressed in compressed form in “Women Must Weep.” Rather, one discovers that the first American edition contains a passage that appears to be a condensed form of one that appears in “Women Must Weep,” and includes additional passages, of which no trace appears in the article. Taken together, these facts suggest the possibility that the passage from “Women Must Weep” is actually an earlier version of the passage found in the first American edition, and that the first American edition bears traces of the revisions, additions, and condensations undertaken by Woolf in order to shift the direction of the book from disunity to unity.

Notes Toward a Genetic Edition of Three Guineas

A genetic edition of *Three Guineas* recommends itself for its superior ability to display the work's progress through its multiple pre-publication stages; by synthesizing inter- and intraversional variation in its textual display, a genetic edition of *Three Guineas* would allow readers to trace the evolution of specific passages through various sequences of composition and revision. A synoptic apparatus, similar to that adopted in Gabler's genetic edition of *Ulysses*, seems particularly well suited for displaying the numerous holograph and typescript fragments that have survived in relation to the work. By placing variant readings in close proximity to one another, a synoptic display of pre-publication documents allows readers to trace the sequential development of a specific line or short passage, and thus to attend to the diachronous dimension of the work, and to reconstruct a particular level of the work, and thus to attend to its synchronous dimensions. Placing the synoptic text opposite a reading text based on the first American edition of the work would allow further comparison between pre-publication states and the work in its most expansive, published state.⁸¹

A synoptic display of pre-publication materials relating to *Three Guineas* would need to limit itself to those documents bearing a distinct linguistic relationship to published versions of the work, for the reasons discussed above. For, while textual theory would allow us to admit as "versions" of the work *avant-textes* with no direct linguistic correlation to the published version (including reading notes, excerpts of letters and diaries that reveal the conceptual nature of the work, scrapbooks, etc.), accommodating these materials within the constraints of the synoptic apparatus would be practically impossible. Rather than simply append transcriptions and facsimiles of these documents

as paratextual material, however, the appendix might be constructed as a reading text in its own right, with its own set of textual notes referring the reader back to those places in the synoptic or reading text in which Woolf made use of the materials and notes that she had gathered. An editor's notes would allow the reader to move easily from reading or synoptic text to the appendix, and from the appendix to the reading or synoptic text, facilitating multi-directional reading and allowing the reader to trace the work's genesis forward from its moments of inception, or backward from its moments of inscription.⁸²

I propose, then, that the following holograph and typescript fragments be used as the basis for a synoptic text of *Three Guineas*, the rough equivalent of 291 pages of pre-publication drafts.⁸³

HOLOGRAPH AND TYPESCRIPT FRAGMENTS IN THE BERG COLLECTION

- M28 "Fragment, with the author's ms. corrections. Holograph, 90 p. Sept. 21 [n.y]"
- M28 "Fragment, with the author's ms. corrections. Typescript, 49 p. Sept. 21 [n.y]"
 "Holograph and typescript with the author's ms. corrections, both fragments. Loose pages in loose leaf folder. [n.y.] Sept. 21 ms. 90 p.; 49 p. With 21 miscellaneous typewritten pages and 2 holograph pages laid in at end. Varies considerably from London, Hogarth Press, 1938 edition. Corresponds roughly to p. 25-30, 87-260, and to p. 34-82 in the typescript."
- M29 "Fragment(s). Typescript, [71] p. [June 28, 1937?]"
 "The second guinea. Later typescript. Paginated irregularly: 73-135, 217, 253. 1937 June 28. Typescripts. 57 p.; 12 p.; 2 p. Corresponds to the following passages in the published version: p. 73-134; 139; 145, 296-301; and 2 unidentified passages. Varies from the published text."
- M40 "Fragment, holograph. Women Must Weep. 23 p. [n.d.]"
- M42 "Fragment, holograph. 9 p. Aug., 1936."
 "Holograph fragment. A summary of 3gs. n.d. ms. 23 p. With holograph notes, on page dated August 1936, 9 p.; Differs from text as published in the *Atlantic Monthly*, May, June 1938."⁸⁴
- M127 "Fragment. Typescript. 1 p. [n.d.]"
 "Typescript fragment, paginated 174. n.d. Typescripts. 1 p. Corresponds to p. 193-194 of 1938 edition."

HOLOGRAPH FRAGMENTS IN THE MONKS HOUSE PAPERS, UNIVERSITY OF SUSSEX

- MH/B16
- a. "Reading notes for the above [*Three Guineas*]. 27 pp manuscript in loose leaf form." Contains 2 holograph pages.
 - b. "Manuscript including notes for *The Burning of the Vote*, a Comedy. 10pp manuscript in loose leaf form." Contains 10 possible holograph pages.
 - c. "Notes about Women, War and other subjects. 10pp manuscript in loose leaf form." Includes 7 possible holograph pages.
 - d. "10pp manuscript in loose leaf form. Dated 2 August [1937]. (Begins---"The Dramatist is in action from the very first word . . . This refers to Congreve, but later pages relate to *Three Guineas*.)" Contains 3 holograph pages.
 - e. "Notes on 'the inflated brown bug'; notes on William Holtby; 'Letters to a Friend'; and notes for *Three Guineas* (?). 8pp manuscript in a spiral back notebook covered by Virginia Woolf." Contains 3 holograph pages.

There is some debate as to the possible existence of another, fuller, manuscript apart from the fragments housed in the Berg and the Monks House Papers. The document at the center of this curiosity is the manuscript of *Three Guineas* that Woolf donated to the American Guild for German Cultural Freedom at the request of May Sarton in February 1939 (L6 314, 319). The circumstances surrounding the document are as follows. In a letter dated 15 January 1939, May Sarton requested that Woolf donate a manuscript for an upcoming auction to benefit the American Guild for German Cultural Freedom, the American sister organization of the German Academy of Arts and Sciences in Exile.⁸⁵ "In New York an association for taking care of refugees from Germany has been having auctions of mss.," Sarton wrote. "Prince Lowenstein asked me to see if I could persuade Julian [Huxley], H. G. [Wells] and you to part with a written fragment of yourself for this purpose. It seems rather horrible, but also necessary as anything that *can* be done *must* be

done for these people” (Sherman 148). Woolf responded in a letter dated 2 February 1939:

I tear up my manuscripts when I have any; but in fact I make such wild sketches in hand writing alter so completely on the type writer that a manuscript of mine is mostly nonsense. And I dont like to sell nonsense; nor do I think it would sell; for no sane person could make head or tail of it. Still, I promise that I will rout among my papers and see if there’s some page not too incoherent. If so I’ll do violence to my horror of this groping and send it to the address you give. (L6 314)

A subsequent letter to Elizabeth Bowen makes clear that Woolf did, in fact, donate a document related to *Three Guineas*, presumably a manuscript or a manuscript fragment, to the Guild: “I’ve a nice letter from someone called something Jones who bought 3 Guineas, I hope for a large sum. Will you thank her, if you see her” (L6 319). Woolf’s comment suggests that she may have donated a manuscript document that was considerably larger than the “single page” that Sarton had requested, and to which Woolf had committed herself in the previous letter—for had she donated a single page, or even ten pages, of manuscript, it seems unlikely that Woolf would have made reference to someone having “*bought Three Guineas*,” a comment that invokes the work in its entirety. Furthermore, it seems unlikely that the sale of a page, or even ten pages, would be capable of generating the “large sum” of which Woolf says she is hopeful.

A recently translated, first-hand account of the activities of the German Academy in Exile supplies some context for the auction of Woolf’s manuscript. The event, which took place on 19 February 1939 at New York’s Hotel Delmonico, was said by *The New York Times* to have created “unprecedented interest” within the press itself (Zuhlsdorff

131). Included in the auction were manuscripts donated by Thomas Mann, Sigmund Freud, Albert Einstein, Bertold Brecht, Lewis Mumford, John Erskine, and Thomas Wolfe; musical scripts by Arnold Schonberg, Kurt Weill, and Gershwin; and original scores by Liszt, Strauss, Wagner, and Bellini, among others (Zuhlsdorff 130-32). Some fifty to sixty items were sold, totaling sales of \$5000: these include \$300 received for the manuscript of Mann's essay, *Dieser Friede (This Peace)*; \$200 for Freud's manuscript of *Der Prometheus-Komplex*; and \$100 for the manuscript of Einstein's 1938 Commencement Speech at Swarthmore College. The highest amount, \$1700, was received for Wolfe's "bulky manuscript" of *Look Homeward, Angel*. Based on the above figures, which account for \$2300 of the auction's total earnings, we know that the sale of Woolf's manuscript certainly brought an amount less than \$2700, and probably brought an amount far less than that, given that some forty-six to fifty-six other items were also sold, thereby placing the average sale price of each item between \$48 and \$58. Although earnings from the auction were far below what had been anticipated, the auction itself was considered to be successful in that it helped raise awareness of the plight of the German community in exile (Zuhlsdorff 132).

Despite Woolf's explicit claim, made to Elizabeth Bowen, that "someone called something Jones . . . [had] bought 3 Guineas" at the auction, no record of the sale, or the donation, exists among the archives of the German Academy in Exile and the American Guild for German Cultural Freedom.⁸⁶ Rather, a typed list in the *Exilarchiv* indicates that Woolf had donated a copy of *Jacob's Room*, designated "item 146" in the auction's printed catalogue and which reads, "WOOLF, VIRGINIA: Jacob's Room, Hogarth Press, 1922. Sm. 8vo, orig. cloth. Charles Whilbey's subscription copy, with AUTHOR'S

AUTOGRAPH INSCRIPTION, dated Oct. 1922." I consider it highly unlikely, however, that Woolf herself actually donated this item. In the first place, Sarton's request for a page of manuscript, "a written fragment of yourself," for what she specifically calls an "auction of manuscripts," is quite explicit, and the ensuing dialogue about manuscripts reveals that Woolf had clearly understood her request. Further, if Woolf had failed to find a coherent page of the *Three Guineas* manuscript, she might just as easily have donated a page of any another, as Sarton does not request a page from any particular manuscript. Woolf's concern that her item should earn the Guild "a large sum," moreover, makes it all the more unlikely that she would have chosen to donate an autographed first edition, which would have brought a smaller, rather than a larger, sum than a manuscript. (Add to this her awareness that autographed first editions of *Flush* and *The Years*, which had attained unprecedented success in the American market, would have been likely to fetch a larger sum than a first edition of *Jacob's Room*.)

Even more compelling, and obvious, evidence lies in the item description itself: for how would Woolf have come to possess an autographed, subscription copy of a book belonging to one "Charles Whilbey"? I contend that an error made in the cataloguing of this item has obscured what may be the true course of events. Given the ease with which transpositions occur in typing, it is possible that the cataloguer transposed the letters "b" and "l" in recording the name "Whilbey" and that the copy, in fact, may have belonged to renowned British biographer, essayist, literary reviewer, and columnist Charles Whibley, who was a friend of T. S. Eliot.⁸⁷ While it is understandable that the archives should credit Woolf with this donation, it seems more likely to have been donated by the estate of Charles Whibley. That the manuscript of *Three Guineas* should go unmentioned in the

auction catalogue does not preclude the possibility, of course, that Woolf actually donated one, especially in light of her remark to Bowen. It does, however, encourage us to seek out possible explanations for the catalogue's omission. A feasible explanation is simply that the manuscript had not been received at a date early enough to be included in the catalogue. From the date of Woolf's response to Sarton, we know that Woolf could have sent the manuscript only *after* 2 February 1939; and given that she anticipated having to "rout among my papers" to find something suitable, it seems likely that several days may have elapsed before she actually put it in the mail. And to this should be added the time it would have taken for a parcel to make the trip from Rodmell, Sussex to New York. Barring the discovery of additional clues, however, it seems that we are unlikely to obtain a more definitive answer as to the specific nature of what Woolf donated, the identity of the purchaser, or the current whereabouts of the item.⁸⁸

The specific "whereabouts" of the holograph and typescript documents related to *Three Guineas* even *within* Woolf's archives is itself a fraught issue, particularly in the case of Woolf's manuscript fragments. Navigating the appearances of complex manuscript materials is a fundamental challenge that awaits the genetic editor, as Louis Hay notes:

We must come to grips with their heterogeneity, since they are diverse by nature: sometimes they are the testimony of the original stimulation, sometimes the record of the remote memory like notes, notebooks or diaries; sometimes they document early operations like projects, workplans or scenarios, sometimes they are the instruments of revision such as sketches, early versions and most often rough drafts. Their polymorph structure is yet another challenge, as manuscripts

have no respect for the convention of linearity, overflowing the page into multiple spaces. The ways in which the text is laid out on the page, with marginal notations, additions, cross-references, deletions, alteration, in different handwriting styles, and with drawings and symbols, texture the discourse, increase the significations and multiply the possible readings. (“Does ‘Text’ Exist” 70)

In Woolf’s case, the confusion surrounding manuscript documents is only compounded by the use of clumsy nomenclature (like “fragments” and “notes”) by indexers on both sides of the Atlantic. As is indicated by my underlined additions to the entries found in the Monks House Papers index above, holograph fragments, misidentified as reading notes, are interspersed throughout the documents in this collection. For example, MH/B16e, indexed as “Notes on ‘the inflated brown bug’; notes on William Holtby; ‘Letters to a Friend’; and notes for *Three Guineas* (?),” actually contains three pages of a holograph fragment; MH/B16c, indexed as “Notes about Women, War and other subjects,” similarly contains several pages of a holograph fragment interspersed with reading notes, while an additional four pages of holograph can be found interspersed with the reading notes contained in MH/B16a, which has been indexed, “Reading notes for the above [*Three Guineas*].” In light of such misidentifications, any collation of *Three Guineas* documents requires a careful re-evaluation of the documents contained in both repositories, particularly among those items indexed as reading notes.

A further editorial difficulty is posed by the Berg’s use of the word “fragment” to describe their holograph and typescript documents, which invariably oversimplifies them by giving the impression of a continuously paginated, larger fragment. One might, for

example, reasonably infer the existence of a larger, continuously paginated document from the description of M28 as a “Fragment, with the author’s ms. corrections. Holograph, 90 p. Sept. 21 [n.y],” while the document is, in reality, “an assemblage of texts, a polytext of seriated texts and versions” (Grigely 99) comprised of passages that Woolf appears to have compulsively rewritten. Precisely how to deal with such “fragmented fragments” in terms of versioning and textual display poses a significant challenge to the textual editor of Woolf’s work. As a habitual reviser of her work, Woolf would reach a particular stage in the composition of a passage only to return immediately to its beginning, rewriting and correcting it as if realizing what she wanted to say only through these successive attempts to say it. For example, we see versions of the “adultery of the brain” passage beginning on pages 1, 5, and 80; versions of the “intellectual liberty” passage beginning on pages 67 and 70; versions of the “outsiders” passage beginning on pages 11 and 15, and so on. Such patterned rewriting scattered throughout the holograph draft may be instances of what Hans Gabler calls “wave-crest moments” in Woolf’s writing, moments that evidence the existence of “progressively revised passages of text” within a single document.⁸⁹ Gabler’s observation of the typescript of *To the Lighthouse* holds true for the longer holograph and typescript fragments of *Three Guineas* found in M28 and M29:

The typing up of first drafts (done in pen and ink) in the manner indicated resulted in typescripts that look as if they were carried forward on a wave: stretches of pages consecutively and singly numbered alternate with stretches of sheets typed for a second or third time with identical page numbers. At such wave-crest moments in the accumulating typescript, the identically numbered pages can be

identified as first, second, or third typings of the same, progressively revised passages of text. (“A Tale of Two Texts” 15)

Figures 2, 3, and 4 are facsimile reproductions showing Woolf’s progressive revisions of a particular passage of *Three Guineas* at the “early typescript” stage; each page is “identically numbered” by Woolf as “page 45.” A transcription of each passage, with Woolf’s manuscript corrections, accompanies each facsimile reproduction. The passages included as *Figures 2 and 3* can be found within the “21 miscellaneous pages” that follow the longer, forty-nine page M28 typescript “fragment,” while *Figure 4* is part of the forty-nine page typescript “fragment” itself.

From a structuralist view of versioning, even the slightest variation among these three typescript fragments would classify them as distinctive textual versions. Given that genetic editions are theoretically entrenched in the structuralist view of textuality, this is the assumption that I have adopted in working with these fragments. The passage that appears as *Figure 2* (consecutive page 51 of the M28 typescript) can be identified as the earliest of the three typescript fragments under consideration here. This determination is based on several factors: the presence of a long passage (beginning, “Now there would be no need to say this so emphatically and pictorially . . .”) not found in any of the other versions under consideration; the presence of the independent clauses “this is butter” and “this is the best butter,” both absent from the other versions; and the incompleteness of the phrase “ribbons colours &c,” to which other words appear to have been added in subsequent versions. The passage that appears as *Figure 3* (consecutive page 53 of the M28 typescript) can be identified as an intermediate typescript fragment. This determination is based on several manuscript corrections that Woolf made at this stage,

Figure Two. Early typescript version (consecutive page number 51 of the M28 typescript)

Most carefully graded system of ribbons colours &c, the social, professional and intellectual station of the wearer. If you # ll excuse the humble comparison your dress resembles the tickets on grocers shops: "This is margarine; this is butter; this is pure butter; this is the best butter; this is the finest butter in the market." [[Now there would be no need to say this so emphatically and pictorially unless you wished to create emotions of admiration in those who see you.]] Now it seems to us that the reason why you go to this expense and discomfort to assume uniforms that are always gaudy and often uncomfortable must be twofold; that you wish to <inspire> [make people] admire <?> you; and that [their] admiration is bribe by which you [recompense] <reward> yourselves for doing what is distasteful to you. Thus I am led to suggest that if our sex, whose admiration, according to many high authorities both legal and literary, is of the highest value to you were to say that the cut, colour and pattern of your military uniforms no longer pleased them, but seemed on the contrary ridiculous and distasteful, one of the inducements which now leads young men to turn themselves into soldiers would be lacking. And without soldiers war would become increasingly difficult.

< additions indicated by Woolf>	[<word added, then deleted by Woolf>
<?word?> uncertain reading of an addition indicated by Woolf	
[deletion indicated by Woolf]	^Material deleted at a subsequent stage^
[xxx] Woolf's typeover of deleted text	?word? indicates uncertain editorial reading
//Woolf's marginalia//	# blank space in typescript
[[indicates text bracketed by Woolf]]	
{authorial and non-authorial changes made at a stage subsequent to the typescripts}	

Figure Three. Intermediate typescript version (consecutive page number 53 of the M28 typescript)

Dress, as we <wear> use it, <is ?comparatively?> has besides its simple function of covering the body, two other attributes---that it creates beauty for the eye, and that it attracts the admiration of men. [Now] <But> your dress in its immense elaboration and splendour has obviously another function: by a most carefully graded system of ribbons, colours, badges, stars, it serves to advertise the social professional and intellectual station of the [xxxx] wearer. If you will excuse the humble illustration your dress <has also the office of> resembles the tickets in grocers shops: <///fulfils//> "This is margarine: this is butter: this is pure butter: this is the finest butter in the market" It is this function<---the advertisement function--->of your dress that seems to us most singular <.> [because] <F>[f]or many centuries we have been taught that all such advertisement is unbecoming and immodest, and have been denied the use of it.

< additions indicated by Woolf>	[<word added, then deleted by Woolf>
<?word?> uncertain reading of an addition indicated by Woolf	^Material deleted at a subsequent stage^
[deletion indicated by Woolf]	?word? indicates uncertain editorial reading
[xxx] Woolf's typeover of deleted text	# blank space in typescript
//Woolf's marginalia//	
[[indicates text bracketed by Woolf]]	
{authorial and non-authorial changes made at a stage subsequent to the typescripts}	

Figure Four. Late typescript version (consecutive page number 7 of the M28 typescript)

Dress, as we use it, is comparatively simple; besides the prime function of keeping the body covered it has two other attributes—that it creates beauty for the eye, and that it attracts the admiration of the other sex. But your dress in its immense <elaboration> [xxx] and splendour has obviously another function: by a most carefully graded system of ribbons, colours, badges and stars, it serves to advertise the social professional and intellectual station of the wearer. It you will excuse the humble illustration your dress fulfills the same purpose as the tickets in a grocers shop: "This is margarine; this is butter; this is pure butter: this is the finest butter in the market." It is this function---the advertisement function--of your dress that seems to us most singular. // Why, if you possess a quality, do you wish to advertise the fact// For many centuries we have been taught that such advertisement is unbecoming and immodest; and have been until a few years ago denied the use of it.

< additions indicated by Woolf>	[-<word added, then deleted by Woolf>
<?word?> uncertain reading of an addition indicated by Woolf	^Material deleted at a subsequent stage^
[deletion indicated by Woolf]	?word? indicates uncertain editorial reading
[xxx] Woolf's typeover of deleted text	# blank space in typescript
//Woolf's marginalia//	
[[indicates text bracketed by Woolf]]	
{authorial and non-authorial changes made at a stage subsequent to the typescripts}	

including the addition of “is comparatively,” “fulfills,” and “the advertisement function,” all of which are incorporated in the subsequent typescript version. This intermediate version is distinguishable from the later typescript version based on the presence of several words that are absent from the third version, notably “wear” and “the splendour.” The passage that appears as *Figure 4* (consecutive page 7 of the M28 typescript) clearly represents the textual state closest to that of the published version. This version adopts changes made to the preceding version, including the addition of the phrase “the advertisement function,” and includes other changes that will be retained in the published version, including “simple” and “prime.” Changes made subsequent to the latest typescript stage are offset by braces in the synoptic reading text, seen in *Figure 5*.

Each successive version is overlaid upon one another in the synoptic text in the left-hand column of *Figure 5*. The following guidelines will help the reader navigate the synoptic display, using it to reconstruct both the diachronous and synchronous dimensions surrounding this particular textual moment. As noted above, changes made subsequent to the typescript stage are enclosed in braces, thereby separating authorial changes (made in Woolf’s own hand) from those of a potentially more questionable authority (made, for example, by typists, copyeditors, or proofreaders). Readers interested exclusively in revisions traceable directly to Woolf can easily bypass this braced content. Similarly, words or phrases present at any stage of the typescript that were removed at a subsequent stage are enclosed in carets. Each version is assigned its own distinctive typeface indicating the stage at which a word or phrase first appears in the work: thus, *simple* indicates that the word “simple” first entered the passage at the late typescript stage. The use of brackets and angle brackets in conjunction with a given

Figure Five. Sample passage of a proposed genetic edition of *Three Guineas*, with facing-page synoptic and reading texts

Early typescript stage (page 51 of the M28 typescript): <i>Courier</i> Intermediate typescript stage (page 53 of the M28 typescript): <i>italicized Courier</i> Late typescript stage (page 7 of the M28 typescript): <i>italicized, bold-faced Times New Roman</i> <i>Three Guineas</i> , first American edition, 1938 Times New Roman	
< additions indicated by Woolf> [word added, then deleted by Woolf > <?word?> uncertain reading of an addition indicated by Woolf [deletion indicated by Woolf] ^Material deleted at a subsequent stage^ [xxx] Woolf's typeover of deleted text //Woolf's marginalia// ?word? indicates uncertain editorial reading # blank space in typescript [[indicates text bracketed by Woolf]] {authorial and non-authorial changes made at a stage subsequent to the typescripts}	
Synoptic Text (incorporating early, intermediate, and late typescript stages and the first American edition) (VERSO)	Reading Text (<i>Three Guineas</i>, first American edition, 1938, pages 24-27) (RECTO)
<p>{For} dress, as we ^<wear>^ use it, <is comparatively> simple ^;^ {.^} ^has^ {B}esides ^its simple^ the prime function of covering the body, ^keeping the body covered^ it has two other ^attributes^ offices—that it creates beauty for the eye, and that it attracts the admiration of ^the other sex^ ^men^ {your sex}. {Since marriage until the year 1919—less than twenty years ago—was the only profession open to us, the enormous importance of dress to a woman can hardly be exaggerated. It was to her what clients are to you— dress was her chief, perhaps her only, method of becoming Lord Chancellor.} [Now] <But> your dress in its immense elaboration <elaboration> [xxx] ^<and splendour>^ has obviously another function^: ^ {.^} ^by a most carefully graded system of ribbons<, > colours<, > ^&c,^ badges, and stars, ^ {It not only covers nakedness, gratifies vanity, and creates pleasure for the eye, but} it serves to advertise the</p>	<p>For dress, as we use it, is comparatively simple. Besides the prime function of covering the body, it has two other offices—that it creates beauty for the eye, and that it attracts the admiration of your sex.¹</p> <p>Since marriage until the year 1919—less than twenty years ago—was the only profession open to us, the enormous importance of dress to a woman can hardly be exaggerated. It was to her what clients are to you— dress was her chief, perhaps her only, method of becoming Lord Chancellor. But your dress in its immense elaboration has obviously another function.</p> <p>It not only covers nakedness, gratifies vanity, and creates pleasure for the eye, but it serves to advertise the social, professional, or intellectual standing of the</p>

social<,>professional{,} ^and^
 {or} intellectual station
 {standing} of the [xxx] wearer. If
 you will excuse the humble
 ^comparison^ *illustration*,
 your dress ^resembles^ ^<has
 also the office of>^
 //fulfills// **fulfills the same**
 ^purpose^ {function} as the tickets
 ^on^ in **a** grocers {grocer's}
 ^shops^ **shop**^: ^{.} {But, here, instead
 of saying} 'This is margarine;
 ^this is butter;^ this ^is^
 pure butter;^this is the best
 butter;^ this is the finest
 butter in the market.^.^` {,} {it
 says, 'This man is a clever man—he is
 Master of Arts; this man is a very clever
 man—he is Doctor of Letters; this man is a
 most clever man—he is a Member of the
 Order of Merit.'} ^[[Now there
 would be no need to say this
 so emphatically and
 pictorially unless you wished
 to create emotions of
 admiration in those who see
 you.]] Now it seems to us
 that the reason why you go to
 this expense and discomfort
 to assume uniforms that are
 always gaudy and often
 uncomfortable must be
 twofold; that you wish to
 <inspire> [make people]
 admire <?> you; and that
 [their] admiration is # bribe
 by which you [recompense]
 <reward> yourselves for doing
 what is distasteful to you.
 Thus I am led to suggest that
 if our sex, whose admiration,
 according to many high
 authorities both legal and
 literary, is of the highest
 value to you were to say that
 the cut, colour and pattern

wearer.²

If you will excuse the humble illustration,
 your dress fulfils the same function as the
 tickets in a grocer's shop.

But, here, instead of saying 'This is
 margarine; this pure butter; this is the
 finest butter in the market,' it says, 'This
 man is a clever man—he is Master of Arts;
 this man is a very clever man—he is
 Doctor of Letters; this man is a most clever
 man—he is a Member of the Order of
 Merit.'

<p>of your military uniforms no longer pleased them, but seemed on the contrary ridiculous and distasteful, one of the inducements which now leads young men to turn themselves into soldiers would be lacking. And without soldiers war would become increasingly difficult. ^ <i>It is this function <---the advertisement function---</i> > of your dress that seems to us most singular<.> ^// Why, if you possess a quality, do you wish to advertise the fact//^ ^ [because] <F>[f] or many centuries we have been taught that ^all^^ {In the opinion of St Paul,} such advertisement, at any rate for our sex, {was} ^is^ unbecoming and immodest^, ^; ^and have been^ until a {very} few years ago {we were} denied the use of it.</p>	<p>It is this function—the advertisement function—of your dress that seems to us most singular.</p> <p>In the opinion of St Paul,³ such advertisement, at any rate for our sex, was unbecoming and immodest; until a very few years ago we were denied the use of it.</p> <p>¹See appendix, page 12. ²See appendix, pages 3, 22, 29, 43. ³See appendix, pages 16-18.</p>
---	--

typeface indicates the stage at which Woolf gave these instructions: thus, <wear> indicates that Woolf's instruction to add this word occurs at the intermediate typescript stage and [because] indicates that Woolf's instruction to delete this word occurs at the intermediate typescript stage. The use of carets in conjunction with a typeface indicates the last stage at which a word or phrase occurs: thus, ^**the other sex**^ indicates that this phrase made its final appearance at the late typescript stage.

The advantage of such a display lies in its flexibility and its comparative usability. Once familiar with the typefaces and sigla, one can read the synoptic text for evidence of either textual variation or similitude. While variation is more prominently displayed

through the juxtaposition of sequential variants, textual similitude can also be inferred from the use of distinctive typefaces, thereby allowing the reader to access the work's diachronous and synchronous dimensions. Take the following line as an example:

If you will excuse the humble ^{^comparison^} *illustration*, your dress ^{^resembles^} ^{^<has also the office of>^} *//fulfills//* **the same** ^{^purpose^} ^{function} **as** the tickets ^{^on^} *in a* grocers ^{grocer's} ^{^shops^} *shop*

The reader interested in tracing the genesis of this passage through its textual variants will see that “comparison,” present at the early typescript stage, is replaced with “illustration” at the second stage; “fulfills,” which Woolf identified in the intermediate stage as one of two possible replacements for the early typescript’s “resembles,” is only adopted at the late typescript stage; and that “purpose,” added at the late typescript stage, was replaced with “function” at a subsequent stage, and may therefore be a nonauthorial revision. Knowing that variants are presented in a distinctive typeface that corresponds to the stage at which they entered the passage, and that any phrase or word absent from a subsequent version would be indicated by carets, the reader interested in reconstructing the synchronous dimension of a given level of the typescript would be capable of doing so. Thus, a reader attempting to reconstruct the later typescript stage would be able to infer that the passage had read “illustration” from the intermediate stage onward; that the proposed phrase, “has also the office of,” simultaneously appeared and disappeared at the intermediate stage, in favor of the word “fulfills,” which is adopted at the late typescript phase; and that the word “purpose” appears for the last time in the late typescript stage. In this way, the reader would be able to correctly reconstruct the following sentence of the late typescript stage from the coding and typefaces used in the synoptic text alone: “*If you*

will excuse the humble illustration, your dress fulfills the same purpose as the tickets in a grocers shop.”

While allowing readers access to both dimensions of the work, the genetic edition is only as successful as the number of textual states it incorporates, and the number of symbols and typefaces it uses, are limited. That this is true is evident in the charges of inaccessibility and incomprehensibility leveled at Gabler’s synoptic edition of *Ulysses*. While sufficiently manageable in the sample passage I have supplied, the use of a synoptic apparatus to display textual genesis in *Three Guineas* would become increasingly unwieldy and potentially incomprehensible with the inevitable inclusion of additional pre-publication documents. Readability of the synoptic text would be impaired, as would the reader’s ability to make judgments and inferences based on the data being supplied. But a more pressing problem lies in what is lost by the relentlessly democratic nature of the synoptic display, which equalizes all variants and refuses to distinguish their relative significance to the work at hand.

With no room for editorial commentary, and no additional space in which to contemplate the effects or significance of a particular sequence of revisions, the sample synoptic text under consideration cannot bring to the reader’s attention the shift in content, tone, and intention that is the result of revisions made between the early and intermediate typescript stages. The early typescript contains a passage in which Woolf ponders the psychology of the man in uniform: a passage that clearly defines her repudiation of an essentialist view of gender. Wondering why men go to the “expense and discomfort to assume uniforms that are always gaudy and often uncomfortable,” she concludes that the resulting admiration of women is a “bribe by which you [recompense]

<reward> yourselves for doing what is distasteful to you.” The removal of this passage from the intermediate typescript moves the speaker away from imaginative sympathy for men and softens her indictment of women in this spot, while its replacement with an analysis of the “advertisement function” of men’s dress distances the speaker from the object of her view. More than a loose assortment of variants, this sequence of revisions achieves a distinct rhetorical effect, thus suggesting an altered, or shifting, intention on Woolf’s part. A marginal note made at the late typescript stage further complicates the matter of how one might interpret this sequence of revisions: for there she has hastily scribbled the line, “Why, if you possess a quality, do you wish to advertise the fact”—a comment that suggests a persistent, or perhaps simply an intermittent, desire to reintroduce the subject of men’s psychology that had been removed at the intermediate typescript stage. Given that such interpretive cruxes do exist among the pre-publication versions of *Three Guineas* and given the weight they may bring weight to bear on our understanding of Woolf’s pacifism, a genetic edition relying on synopticism to trace textual genesis may prove itself largely incapable of decanting the rich juices that have been editorially extracted from ripened textual fruits.

Notes Toward a Fluid-Text Edition of Three Guineas

Among the questions demanding consideration by the would-be textual editor is how active a role it will be necessary for him or her to take in displaying textual variation. The answer given will be shaped by factors as diverse as personal temperament, the degree of difficulty posed by the number or nature of the documents to be presented, his or her desire to advance a particular reading of the work, and his or her assumptions as to the temperament and skill level of the future audience. Given that any

textual edition is a monument to the editor's assumptions and beliefs about, and desires for, his or her text, audience, and ideological view point, each variable necessarily informs my view that the genetic edition is of limited usefulness in "discerning patterns of revision and revision strategies from one physical version to the next" and in "speculating upon modes of revision that might suggest multiple inferred versions contained within each physical version" (Bryant 71-72), concerns central to a posteclectic edition of *Three Guineas*. Take, for example, my objection to the "relentlessness" of the synoptic display, which refuses to privilege one variant above another: such a claim makes plainly apparent my own ideological approach to the work, itself relentlessly fueled by the presentation of selected textual fragments and revision sequences that support my ideological positioning. In light of my earlier demonstration of how readers *can* use the apparatus to reconstruct and interpret sequences of revision, my objections to the comparative uselessness of the genetic edition in this regard seem at best unfounded and at worst misleading. Underlying this objection, however, one may discern a degree of uncertainty as to my audience, as to whether readers actually *are likely* to use the apparatus in this way, to engage actively in the reconstruction of the work. Gerald Grigely reminds us:

Texts draw attention to themselves not by screaming at us, but by their insolicitude. This is a warning sign: a passive text can be passive only by hiding that which is not seen and which must be sought out on the part of the reader. This seeking, or reading, involves certain activities that are fundamentally editorial and curatorial in nature: collecting, assembling, sorting, working our way through the variorum of our textual assemblage so as to construct what is ultimately named a

text. This text is unique in the sense that it is our personal text, for in the process of assembling it (as in our editorial and curatorial operations) we participate in the construction of it. Our participation marks our engagement in textual remaking.

(156)

What is at stake in the active reconstruction of *Three Guineas*? What will be lost should its texts remain passive, should readers refuse their editorial and curatorial roles? Clearly, my own claims as to the limitations of the genetic edition are also informed by a belief that the ideological stakes are particularly high in this case, and that what stands to be lost, or go uncovered, are two interrelated versions of Woolf, *Woolf the pacifist* and *Woolf the midwife of contemporary feminist pacifism*. And my belief in the importance of these versions is informed by my own historical and cultural moment, my national identity, my geographic location, and my desire and need to believe in the possibility of peace and the legitimacy of pacifism as a social ideology. This is as it should be: as George Bornstein and others have noted, any edition is always contingent on the historical and cultural moment of its production (Bornstein, "Introduction," *Palimpsest* 2). Given my interest in promoting a particular politicized view of Woolf, it seems inevitable that my own choice for a post-eclectic edition of *Three Guineas* would permit a considerable amount of editorial intervention in the presentation of textual variants, thereby effectively collapsing the distance between text editing theory and literary theory within the form of the textual edition itself. On this and several other counts, John Bryant's concept of a fluid-text edition recommends itself for a posteclectic edition of *Three Guineas*.

The fluid-text edition is predicated on a postmodernist view of fluidity as “an inherent condition of any written document and in writing itself,” a condition that aligns it with textual instability and indeterminacy (Bryant 1, 6). The fluid-text edition showcases the fluid condition of the work by mapping selected “revision sites” onto a base version of the work, which are then accompanied by a “revision sequence” and “revision narrative” that supplies a possible explanation for the particular revision made at that site (151). Selecting and narrating selected revision sequences, the editor of the fluid-text edition assumes an active role, and voice, in the text, creating a paratext with a potentially powerful ideological function. It is the task of the fluid-text editor to “expose readers to the *distances between* multiple versions,” to “map out the variation, chart paths from one version to another, and enable users to lead themselves along those paths” (123), to “convert the bewildering array of data in their encoded textual apparatuses into pleasurable *revision narratives*” (144). Thus, the fundamental task of reading the fluid-text edition is in “comparing the versions of a text, . . . reading the differences between the versions, . . . reading distance traveled, difference and change” (ibid?). In *Figure Six*, one can see that the immediate advantage of a fluid-text edition of *Three Guineas* lies in the clarity with which it presents and narrates the act of authorial revision.

As *Figure 6* also makes clear, revision narratives presuppose a certain degree of authorial intention, regarding each revision as “material evidence of *shifting* intentions” (9). While Bryant’s call for a modified recuperation of the notion of authorial intention may seem to reside uneasily with the aims of an otherwise posteclectic edition, his use of the term is thoroughly inflected by postmodernist notions of simultaneity and multiplicity, and reflects the realization that “even a given author at a given moment

Figure Six. Sample passage of a proposed fluid-text edition of *Three Guineas*

Reading Text

 “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. “Our” country still ceases to be mine if I marry a foreigner. “Our” country denies me the means of protecting myself, forces me to pay others a very large sum annually to protect me, and is so little able, even so, to protect me that Air Raid precautions are written on the wall. Therefore if you insist upon fighting to protect me, or “our” country, let it be understood, soberly and rationally between us, that you are fighting to gratify a sex instinct which I cannot share; **to procure benefits which I have not shared and probably will not share** ^{ms141}; but not to gratify my instincts, or to protect either myself or my country. For,’ 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.’”

Revision Transcription of M28, Sequence, and Narrative RSm141

She would [?engage?] <bind> herself to keep free as far as possible from [th]? mixed emotion based loyalty [upon] in her brothers case upon **gratitude for benefits received, & expectations of benefits to come**, which make the alloyed <emotion called> patriotism, Since, compared with him, she has received so little from England //<benefit of a maternal kind>; she is [in] [without any effort] on her part, in a position where she is able to love England much more disinterestedly

1. gratitude for **benefits** received, & expectations of **benefits** to come [M28, page 14]
2. **benefits** which I have not shared and probably will not share [first Am. ed, page 128]

RNm141. The shift in emphasis in this revision sequence from the benefits received by men [step 1] to those denied to women [step 2] is both rhetorical and substantive. While the subject of men’s benefits is raised as evidence of their investment in nationalist and patriotic sentiment in the holograph version [step 1], Woolf’s emphasis on women’s lack of benefits in the first American edition [step 2] transforms it into part of the outsider’s rationale for her anti-war position. The difference between the two usages in the context of the surrounding passages, akin to that between “telling” and “showing,” also significantly impacts the direction and intention of the passage: for where the holograph version *explains* the outsider’s position, the first American edition *shows* the outsider *how to explain* her position. The difference suggests that, in the course of revising the work, Woolf consciously took on the responsibility of *teaching* Outsiders rather than simply preaching the doctrine of Outsiderism.

often displays not a monolithic singularity of purpose or desire, but rather a multiplicity of them embodied in a multiplicity of intentions” (Bornstein, “Introduction” *Representing Modernist Texts* 8). It is this “multiplicity of intentions” that can be discovered within the single variant, as Bryant explains:

A cancellation or insertion in manuscript is the visible sign of altered intentions. When we observe a revision, we “see” the vestige of a writer’s changings, and in this way the writer’s absence takes on more presence, or more precisely, we begin to perceive layerings of absence. A revision has a beginning, middle, and end, and its end does not negate the beginning or middle. A revision occupies space and reflects the passage of time; it reveals options and choices; it has direction. It is a chord of dissonances and harmonies, and not a single note. A writer’s revision presents us with multiple texts vying for position on the page. (12-13)

Rather than a unified object *objet d’art*, constructed in a linear fashion from a set of unified intentions, Bryant’s work of art is conceived as the product of tensions, contradictions, confusions, and simultaneities. Wrestling the concept of “authorial intention” from its roots in textual eclecticism, Bryant retools it to advance a fundamentally postmodernist view of the literary text and textuality.

Bryant extends the boundaries established by other textual theorists in ways that further render his fluid-text edition suitable for a posteclectic edition of Woolf’s work. For example, he extends Jerome McGann’s socialized view of textuality to pre-publication states, arguing that revision should be viewed as a fundamentally “social act” impacted by forces external to the self (58-59). Because writers “cannot avoid internalizing the problem of their socialized conditions,” he argues, “the ‘first’

communicative exchange in writing occurs not at the moment of editorial production, but at the writing desk, and in the writer's mind" in "individualized moments of social 'eventuality'" (54). This extension of McGann's socialized view of textual production to pre-publication states is particularly appealing for an edition of Woolf in that it would enable an editor to consider the influence of social factors—the existence of "social negotiations occurring in the creative process that are materially evident in ms revisions" (53)—on the direction of her revisions, particularly those revisions that diminish the political or polemical content of a given passage, and that may shed further light on the question of self-censorship within her revision practices.

Bryant's conception of a fluid-text edition also usefully extends the material boundaries imposed by a genetic view of the work to include nonauthorial revisions and post-publication adaptations and cultural revisions. Broadly defining the work of art as "a physical manifestation of the alternating currents of individual and society over time" (61), it becomes necessary to extend our view of what may be said to constitute a text. In a position that resonates with Jerome McGann's notion that a work "incorporates, however invisibly, all of its accumulated history" (*The Textual Condition* 123) and Gerald Grigely's postmodernist notion of "textuality," which maintains that "the uniqueness of the unique art object or literary text is constantly undergoing continuous and discontinuous transience as it ages, is altered by editors and conservators, and is resituated or reterritorialized in different publications and exhibition spaces" (1), Bryant argues that the "cultural revision" of a work over its lifetime produces additional texts of that work (108). Bryant envisions the fluid-text edition as combining book and screen technologies, with the print component mapping only selected revision sites and the

electronic component mapping all revision sites and displaying post-publication adaptations and cultural revisions of the work. Such an edition would be particularly appropriate for *Three Guineas*, in light of its complex reception history and legacy discussed in the previous chapter. The inclusion of post-publication versions of *Three Guineas* would allow us, in turn, to map shifting interpretations of the work, along with the “*shifting intentions*” of its readers, from the start of its lifetime through to the continuously shifting present moment, while the adoption of the fluid-text model would allow us to map, and shape, the shifting interpenetrations of book and screen technologies in textual editing.

Chapter Three: Isolating the Interpersonal: *Three Guineas* as Cultural Dialogue

In *Cultures of Peace*, renowned sociologist and peace theorist Elise Boulding writes of the “constant interpenetration” of the public and the private realms, of the intrapersonal and interpersonal, in the shaping of society. She maintains,

Society does not exist apart from the activities and environments that sustain, shape, and reshape it. The ceaseless culture-creating activity that characterizes the social body involves interaction at every level, from the intrapersonal (the inner life of the individual human being) to the interpersonal—in household, neighborhood, and community on through successive levels of civic organization from city to the United Nations, and finally to interaction with the planetary lifeworlds of which we are a part. (1)

Woolf’s admission that her thinking was to be her particular form of “fighting,” and her recognition that “a republic might be brought into being by a poem” (“Royalty” 140), suggests a keen awareness of how thinking and writing constitute powerful “culture-creating activities” that can help not merely to “sustain” society, but to “shape” and “reshape” it. Boulding’s vision of how cultural activity operates at the social level encourages us to consider how, as Woolf’s own attempt to create a peace culture, *Three Guineas* is produced through a similar kind of “interaction,” or dialogue, taking place “at every level.”

This chapter considers only several of the innumerable interpenetrating, overlapping dialogues that constitute the work of *Three Guineas*. Woolf’s extensive record of the composition of that work in her diaries and letters, discussed in Chapter

One, and the surviving drafts of the work, discussed in Chapter Two, can be read as evidence of Woolf's extensive intrapersonal dialogue about the political issues that shaped the 1930s. As has already been suggested, Woolf quite often worked out her political positions and views during the very act of writing, using letters, diary entries, and early drafts as "scrap paper" on which to work out the mathematics of her own political equation. Consider, for example, the sequence of manuscript revisions that exist for the passage in which Woolf's speaker contemplates the potential effect of "250, or 50, or 25" people "pledged not to commit adultery of the brain." The published version of the passage reads:

Now suppose, Madam, that there were 250, or 50, or 25 such people in existence, people pledged not to commit adultery of the brain, so that it was unnecessary to strip what they said of its money motive, power motive, advertisement motive, publicity motive, vanity motive and so on, before we unwrapped the grain of truth, might not two very remarkable consequences follow? Is it not possible that if we knew the truth about war, the glory of war would be scotched and crushed where it lies curled up in the rotten cabbage leaves of our prostituted fact-purveyors; . . . if newspapers were written by people whose sole object in writing was to tell the truth about politics and the truth about art we should not believe in war, and we should believe in art. (97)

This passage underwent at least three successive rewritings in the first four pages of what appears to be a continuously paginated holograph fragment contained among the Berg's collection of holograph fragments (M28). The revisions to this passage, displayed in *Figure 7*, reveal Woolf still to have been working through questions of the utmost

importance to her work during the very act of composition: namely, *how many* people need bind themselves to this oath in order for its twin aims to be achieved? *Who* may bind themselves to this oath? And *to whom* is this directive being addressed

Figure Seven. Successive revisions of “adultery of the brain” passage of *Three Guineas*

<p>“For Sir it is [deleted: <i>quite</i>] certain that if there were among us not two hundred, but even one hundred or fifty daughters of educated men who would keep their word. . .”(M28 holograph 1).</p>	<p>“For think, Sir, how much fifty or twenty or ten people, [<i>illegible insertion</i>] of either sex, could do, now, if they pledged themselves not to commit adultery of the brain” (M28 holograph 2).</p>	<p>“For think what could be done by a small [deleted: band] number--- one hundred, fifty [deleted: <i>or</i>] even twenty people” (M28 holograph 4).</p>	<p>“Now suppose, Madam, that there were 250, or 50, or 25 such people in existence, people pledged not to commit adultery of the brain” (<i>Three Guineas</i> 97).</p>
---	---	---	---

As these revisions show, Woolf vacillated over the perennial question of *how many* people it takes to reach a critical mass. In the first passage, Woolf modifies an earlier insistency by deleting the word “quite” from the phrase “quite certain,” but still manages to convey a sense of certainty through her use of the qualifiers “not” and “but even” (“not two hundred, but even one hundred or fifty”). In the second passage, she drastically and somewhat mysteriously (in a moment of optimism?) reduces the number of people from 200, 100, or 50 to 50, 20, or 10. Equally mysterious are the subsequent revisions that gradually increase these numbers to an amount—250, 50, or 25—closer to that of the first passage: a move that may suggest her renewed confidence in the earlier idea, or a gradual fading of the sudden flash of political optimism revealed in the second passage. The revisions above also importantly reveal the direction of her thinking about questions of political agency, gender, and audience. For while the *who* of the political action is

restricted to daughters of educated men in the first passage, it is expanded to include “either sex” in the second passage; all reference to gender is abandoned in favor of “people” in the third and fourth passages in what may be viewed as an attempt to broaden her working base. That the implied audience, too, should undergo a gender transformation in these revisions, morphing from a male audience to an audience of unspecified gender and, finally, to an audience that is distinctly female, suggests that while Woolf was moved to include men among those who might participate in the various peace culture-creating activities she describes, it is specifically women to whom the details of these activities must be directed.

Recognizing that the intra- and interpersonal dimensions, like the public and private spheres, can only ever exist in a kind of “constant interpenetration,” I wish, nevertheless, to suspend reality in this chapter, to forego further discussion of the intrapersonal dimension in an attempt to isolate the interpersonal side of Boulding’s cultural equation as it manifests itself in *Three Guineas*. This chapter, then, will consider how the work variously, alternately, and simultaneously participates in cultural dialogues that register at the local, national, international, and global levels. Like other highly referential works of modernism—Pound’s *Cantos*, Eliot’s *Wasteland*, and H.D.’s *The Sword Went out to Sea (Synthesis of a Dream)*, to name but a few—*Three Guineas* is fundamentally dialogical; unlike these works, which are engaged primarily with mythic systems and structures, *Three Guineas* engages literally and figuratively with Woolf’s own contemporary culture, in constellations ranging from the familial and local (its arguments a dialogue with Julian Bell, Leonard Woolf, Aldous Huxley, and Clive Bell), to the national (its photographs a dialogue with Britain’s religious and civic leaders and

its arguments a dialogue with Britain's patriarchal peace movement), to the international (its serialization as "Women Must Weep" a dialogue with an isolationist, American audience), to the global (as a dialogue with ardent nationalists on the need to recognize the claims of global responsibility). By necessity, this chapter can offer only a partial consideration of the ways in which *Three Guineas* engages in a cultural dialogue with feminist pacifists of the present and the recent past; with Britain's patriarchal peace movement; and with those British institutions of Church and State that she held to be responsible for the perpetuation of war.

Dialogical Pacifism

Recognizing that women's literary works "continue each other, in spite of our habit of judging them separately" (*Room 84*) and that women writers actively "think back through their mothers," Woolf herself invites us to regard women's "culture-creating activities" as part of a historical continuum and tradition. Woolf also recognized, however, that "masterpieces are not single and solitary births," but "the outcome of many years of thinking in common" (*Room 68-69*), statements which attest to women's writing as a fundamentally collaborative process, in which women might be said to think "across" to their sisters, as well as "back through their mothers." Through the extensive weaving of allusion and citation into the text and notes of *Three Guineas*, Woolf can be seen as engaging in both retrospective and lateral types of thinking, creating a fundamentally dialogical text that variously relies upon, extends, modifies, and challenges the logic of feminist pacifism.

Woolf insisted, as have many feminist pacifists before and after her time, that the causes of feminism and pacifism were linked through patriarchal power structures, and *Three Guineas* untangles the complex ways in which patriarchy is implicated in the perpetuation of war, the oppression of women, and the glorification of masculinity. As Jane Marcus has demonstrated, the writings of Woolf's Quaker aunt, Caroline Emelia Stephen, on the connection between war, oppression, and material greed served as inspiration for Woolf's connection between patriarchy and capitalism in *Three Guineas* ("Niece of a Nun" 205, note 9). Woolf's thinking about the connection between war and masculinity may also have been influenced by the writings of Charlotte Perkins Gilman, whose 1913 article, "The New Mothers of a New World," makes the connection quite explicit: "We are tired of men's wars. We are tired of men's quarrels. We are tired of men's competition" (qtd. in Liddington, *Road* 67). In *Mothers of Men and Militarism* (1915), Frances Hollowes similarly identifies war as "a masculine invention" (Liddington, *Road* 92), a phrase that recalls Woolf's reference to war, in a 1916 letter to Margaret Llewelyn Davies, as a "preposterous masculine fiction" (*L2* 76).

Woolf's critique of men's love of decoration, medals, and ceremony, which places her text in conversation with Elizabeth Robins's *Ancilla's Share* (1924), has its roots in early twentieth century feminist pacifist thought, which frequently emphasized how war provided the occasion for widespread glorification of masculinity and heroism. Bertha von Suttner's famous pacifist novel, *Die Waffen Nieder!* (1889), was among the first to explicitly mark a connection between the glorification of soldiering and the perpetuation of war (Liddington, *Road* 41). Criticism of men's "every form of glorious ostentation, with the loudest possible accompaniment of noise" (qtd. in Liddington, *Road*

66) can be found as well in Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *The Man-Made World, or Our Androcentric Culture* (1911). Frances Hollowes would link this kind of ostentation specifically with masculinity in her 1914 pamphlet, "Women and War: An Appeal to the Women of All Nations," noting: "Whatever there is of glory, it is for *man*. The fascinations of war, its pomp and pride of uniforms, gold lace, medals and pensions are for *men*" (qtd. in Liddington, *Road* 90).

Precisely because military uniforms and medals possessed the power to glorify soldiering, many women's organizations became attentive to, and critical of, how dress and finery were being used to seduce young boys into military occupations. Thus, the Liverpool and Birkenhead Women's Peace and Arbitration Society in 1894 denounced "the creation of Boys' Brigades for military training in the schools" (Cooper, "Women's Participation" 56), while two women's peace organizations of the interwar period, The Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) and the Women's Cooperative Guild (WCG), objected to the proliferation of militarism in the civilian sphere, with WILPF fighting the growth of military drills in schools, war films, and Officer Training Corps (Liddington, *Road* 142) and the WCG fighting the militancy of the Boy Scouts (Black, "VW and the Women's Movement" 187) as well as war films and books (Liddington, *Road* 143). That "their condemnation of militarism extended even to the Boy Scouts, the Girl Guides, and the Church Lads' Brigades, as well as to Armistice Day celebrations" (ibid.) is all the more interesting in light of the fact that one of the photographs Woolf includes in *Three Guineas* is that of Robert Baden-Powell, founder of the Boy Scouts.

It was precisely this male love of finery that would become a central refrain in *Three Guineas*. The individual actions that Woolf identifies as essential to change offer an alternative to the perpetuation of the status quo, thus entailing a discussion of how the status quo perpetuates war. Much of *Three Guineas*, therefore, is given over to a discussion of how education and professional life assist in the perpetuation of war. The common theme binding Woolf's criticism of these institutions is male vanity: love of decoration and self-advertisement, whether academic, military, or professional, are inducements to competition, jealousy, and self-promotion, all of which lead directly to war. Woolf's attention to male costumes and ceremony in the text and photos of *Three Guineas*, as well as the numerous articles and photographs pasted into her scrapbook, should be viewed as an important contribution to this ongoing discussion. Woolf extends the feminist pacifist critique of uniforms, medals, and ceremony by including in her text photographs of the religious and political leaders of her own day, holding these figures up for inspection and incrimination, making them objects of ridicule, and showing how such vanity invariably leads to war.

The model of independent social action that Woolf advocates for her Society of Outsiders has its roots in the writings of two aunts, Caroline Emelia Stephen and Anny Thackeray. The idea that women might work anonymously and secretly, yet collectively, is one that has been traced to Caroline Emelia Stephen's mystical writings, which supply Woolf with a vision of collective individualism.⁹⁰ Anny Thackeray's "utopian feminism" appears also to have influenced Woolf's thinking about the importance of individual action, and of women's particular relationship to peace, for "if *all* women set their faces against war, it would do more than all the peace conventions" (qtd. in Lee, *Virginia*

Woolf 76). In her own time, Woolf's affiliation with the Women's Co-operative Guild, the "most uncompromisingly pacifist of women's groups of the inter-war period" (Black, "The Mothers' International" 467) would have supplied her with "doctrinal and organizational support for pacifism," and "the idea of the power that can be exerted by a group of 'outsiders' with integrity and a disdain for praise or subsidies" (Black, "VW and the Women's Movement" 188). Woolf's 1930 introduction to *Life as We Have Known It* explores the mechanics of how independent social action leads directly to change:

As membership grew and twenty or thirty women made a practice of meeting weekly, that one house became a street of houses. . . . and at last the street becomes a town. . . . and then the town becomes a country; it becomes England; it becomes Germany and America; and so from debating questions of butter and bacon, working women at their weekly meetings have to consider the relations of one great nation to another. . . . It was thus that they were to ask, as the years went by, for peace and disarmament and the sisterhood of nations. (qtd. in Black, "VW and the Women's Movement" 187-88)

This notion of a "sisterhood of nations" would become a central part of Woolf's vision in *Three Guineas*, where she would argue for the outsider's renunciation of nationalism, citizenship, and patriotism in favor of connection with all humankind in her famous lines, "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* 109).

The Women's Co-operative Guild grew out of a need within the British Co-operative Movement to reach women homemakers, and expanded from a domestic to an international organization in 1921 with the founding of the International Co-operative

Women's Guild, also known as The Mothers' International. In an attempt to latch on to "anything specifically feminist that could tap the structural causes of war, something that was truly international rather than merely related to women, or to conditions inside each national state" (Black, "The Mothers' International" 473), the organization extended the logic of domestic consumer co-operation to international co-operation, thus providing "just such a rationale for women's peace action" (ibid.) Naomi Black has aptly summarized the philosophy used to support a connection between international consumer co-operation and peace:

For co-operators, international conflict was caused by states' disputes over resources, just as class warfare occurred domestically. At both levels, violence could be prevented by the functional separation of individuals into their capacities of workers, consumers, and employers or owners. Their interests would then be shared rather than opposed, while the resulting expansion of prosperity would ease any temporary tensions. Under such conditions, human beings would stop settling disputes by force, just as they would give up competition and the profit motive. And women were logically among the chief movers in this development, internationally as well as nationally. (Black, "The Mothers' International" 473)

The Guild's emphasis on the divisive effects of competition and the "profit motive" would figure prominently in Woolf's analysis of the professions in *Three Guineas*, while its emphasis on shared interests would enter into Woolf's formulation that we are united by "one world, one life" (*Three Guineas* 142).

Woolf's vision of a "sisterhood of nations" also can be traced back to a tradition of "international citizenship" within early feminist pacifist thought. Heloise Brown

identifies “international citizenship” as one of “four distinct strands” that dominated pacifist feminism in the 1870s and 1880s, and which also included free trade radicalism, Evangelical feminism, and moderate internationalism (6). Early pacifist feminists who embraced international citizenship, like Florence Fenwick Miller and Henrietta Muller, combined an interest in promoting sisterhood, questioning the expansion of imperial power, recognizing “an international community,” and redefining patriotism, since “the truest interests of the nation were seen to be bound up with the interests of ‘civilisation’ and humanity, and therefore could function as a means by which to rise above national differences” (Brown 6-7). Bertha von Suttner had expressed the desire for “a new kind of patriotism, one based on an international sense of justice” (Costin 302), which she saw as possible only through improved educational opportunities for women. In her own time, Woolf’s internationalist impulse may have been influenced also by Frances Hollowes’s call for “a world’s League of Women” (Liddington, *Road* 92) in *Mothers of Men and Militarism* (1915), and by the rally cry of the anonymously published *Militarism Versus Feminism: An Enquiry and a Policy Demonstrating that Militarism Involves the Subjection of Women* (1915): “‘Women of all nations unite!’; that should be the new cry—not ‘Woman has no country!’ but ‘Woman must have every country!’” (qtd. in Liddington, *Road* 100). In their call for a united front that extends beyond national boundaries, and their clipped style and staccato rhythm, the lines warrant comparison with Woolf’s own similar oath.

Woolf’s supranational impulse also reflects the emergence at the outset of the Great War of an international feminist pacifist movement. The International Congress of Women for Permanent Peace, held in April 1915 at The Hague, brought together more

than 1100 delegates from twelve countries, including Germany, Belgium, Britain, the United States, and all of the neutral European countries (Vellacott, "Women" 116).⁹¹ From this inaugural meeting was born in 1919 the first and most prominent international women's peace organization, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) (Foster 13). The WILPF Constitution included among its aims the "determination to study, make known, and help abolish the political, social, economic, and psychological causes of war, and to work for a constructive peace" (qtd. in Foster), aims that can be productively compared with Woolf's own project in *Three Guineas*.

The 1915 Congress was inspired by the perceived "need to introduce into political affairs a whole set of values which had been relegated to women and hence excluded, along with the women, from public decision-making" (Vellacott, "Women" 118), a social feminist argument that locates women's political power in their different social training and position than men. The social feminist argument figured prominently in the struggle for women's suffrage, with women's rights advocates arguing that, once granted the right to vote, women's different values and experiences would be capable of ending war. Predicated as it is on the belief that the education and traditions of the private house are central to the prevention of war, Woolf's Society of Outsiders is founded on the same social feminist logic as the suffrage movement, the international feminist pacifist movement, and the British Co-operative Movement. Such arguments were in wide circulation in Woolf's time: the authors of *Militarism Versus Feminism: An Enquiry and a Policy Demonstrating that Militarism Involves the Subjection of Women* (1915) maintained that women's political value lay in that "*She* may speak where *man* dare not" (qtd. in Liddington, *Road* 100). Maude Royden similarly noted that women were more

likely to bring a fresh perspective to the question of peace because they “have none of the traditions which make it difficult for men to see sense” and haven’t “been trained in the old ways” (qtd. in Oldfield, *Women Against the Iron Fist* 57-8). Women’s strength, according to Royden and later to Woolf, was to be found in the psychological insight derived in the “private world of family life” (Oldfield, *Women Against the Iron Fist* 58).

Although Woolf draws on social feminist arguments in her text, she revises them in claiming the right to earn a living to be more important to women’s freedom, and to the cause of peace, than the right to vote. This clarification was prompted by the criticism, frequently leveled at women in the thirties, that women had failed to prevent war in spite of having attained the vote. Woolf’s elaborate answer to this allegation, that women could prevent war only when they had the economic independence that would allow them to voice their own opinions and experiences, bears the influence of Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s *Women and Economics* (1899), which similarly argues that women must have economic independence, and not mere political rights and suffrage, to be free (Liddington, *Road* 35).

Woolf’s insistence on the inseparability of the feminism and pacifism, and her refusal to subordinate the former to the latter even with war on the horizon, is a gesture that links her to a tradition of resistance enacted during the Great War by feminist pacifists like Catherine Marshall; Sylvia Pankhurst, who founded the East London Federation of Suffragettes in response to the WSPU’s turn toward conservatism; Charlotte Despard, who defected from the WSPU to become leader of the pacifist Women’s Freedom League; and Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence, a founder of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (Carroll, “Feminism and Pacifism” 7).⁹²

Helena Swanwick, too, connected women's interests with peace, maintaining that "every suffrage society ought to be a pacifist society" and locating "the desire to dominate" behind all acts of violence (qtd. in Vellacott, "Feminist Consciousness" 123); Maude Royden similarly identified women's interests as incompatible with war, identifying all militarism as "essentially anti-feminist" (Oldfield, *Women Against the Iron Fist* 57). The thinking of another feminist pacifist contemporary, Vera Brittain, was sympathetic to Woolf's own, in her recognition that "the struggle against war . . . is fundamentally inseparable from feminism, socialism, slave emancipation, and the liberation of subject races" (Bennett 194), the very point that Woolf would argue forcefully in *Three Guineas*. Unlike her close friend Vera Brittain, whose pacifism became increasingly aligned throughout the thirties with organized religion and an essentialist view of gender, Winifred Holtby would offer a secular perspective on war that connected it with fascism and gender. Her *Women and a Changing Civilization* (1935) traces the impact of Nazism on women's rights, while her 1934 play *Take Back Your Freedom* has been described as "one of the earliest attempts of the 1930s to see the causes of war as related to the construction of masculinity and femininity" (Shaw 231). According to her biographer, Holtby also perceived the close connection between writing and political action and described herself as "trundling the little wheelbarrow of propaganda across the world" (Shaw 230).

Despite the affinity of her concerns with "many historical women's campaigns for peace" (Hussey, "Living in a War Zone" 4), Woolf's trajectory in the 1930s ran counter to the pacifist feminist societies of her time, which were becoming increasingly detached from feminist concerns just as she was becoming more so; for her, like the early feminist

pacifists, the issue of how to prevent war could not be discussed without considering the “woman question.” For Woolf, who had been developing her feminist pacifist polemic since 1931, a separation of the issues would have been not only anathema, but impossible. Woolf’s refusal to take part in women’s peace organizations is best explained by the fact that such organizations have historically subordinated feminist issues to pacifist issues, as Berenice Carroll explains:

In general the women’s peace organizations and women active in mixed groups in the peace movement for many decades gave little priority either to feminist concerns or to women’s representation in the top echelons of the peace movement as a whole, preferring to concentrate attention on what is often called “the issues,” meaning issues of war, peace and disarmament as they have traditionally been defined by the male-dominated leadership. (Carroll, “Feminism and Pacifism” 7)

This certainly was the case with WILPF, which shifted its focus away from feminist issues after women’s suffrage was attained, and toward more exclusively “pacifist” issues, which included working with the League of Nations and embarking on “peace missions” to troubled areas around the world (Foster 17-18). In fact, the connection between feminist and pacifist concerns had so weakened in WILPF policy during the 1920s and 1930s that they considered removing “Women’s” from their official title in 1934 (Foster 18). Thus, Woolf’s insistence on the inseparability of feminism and pacifism at this historical moment marginalizes her interests from even this feminist pacifist organization.

Suffrage societies were often divided on the issue of war. The International Congress of Women who met at The Hague in 1915 was forced to form as offshoot of the

International Women's Suffrage Alliance when the latter refused to endorse the conference because of divided sentiments among its constituents on the subject of war (Foster 10-11). Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst's abandonment of the cause at the outset of the Great War, and their defection from the militant Women's Social and Political Union, is a dramatic example of how some perceptions of women's political interests are compatible with war. Further evidence of this can be seen in the fracturing of the National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies (NUWSS) over the question of support for the Great War.⁹³ Feminist historians have noted that evidence of dissension within the suffrage movement has tended to be written out of official histories in an attempt to gloss over the fracturing of these organizations; for example, the names of dissenting NUWSS members Catherine Marshall, Helena Swanwick, Margaret Ashton, Kathleen Courtney, and Maude Royden, and a proper narrative of their dissent, were excluded from the official NUWSS history written by Ray Strachey and Millicent Fawcett (Vellacott, "Feminist Consciousness" 115, 118, 124).

Criticized in her time and ours for speaking exclusively to her own class of upper-middle class, educated men's daughters, Woolf's thinking along the specific lines of class may have been shaped by the class-based rhetoric of the Women's Co-operative Guild. Margaret Llewelyn Davies' *Death or Life? A Call to Co-operative Women*, published sometime after 1923, appeals directly to working-class women in much the same way that Woolf appeals to the women of her own class:

There is no class to whom the cause of Peace can make a stronger appeal than to International Co-operative Guildswomen, for war casts its dread shadow in a special way on the lives of wives and mothers. Nor is there any class whose ideals

can more effectively undermine the causes of war. For the brotherhood of nations is the religion of Co-operators, and under an International Co-operative system of trade and industry the material interests of the globe are pooled and divided in the interests of all. (qtd. in Black, "The Mothers' International 471)

Woolf may have been inspired by this "Call" to consider how the ideals of her own class might be used to "effectively undermine the causes of war"; thus, *Three Guineas* can be seen as Woolf's "Call to Educated Men's Daughters," in direct response to Davies's "Call to Co-operative Women." It seems likely that Woolf's notion of a "sisterhood of nations" as a "religion for free people" may be a feminist revision of the vision of a "brotherhood of nations" as "the religion of Co-operators." That which "unites" us, in Woolf's revision, is not "the material interests of the globe" so much as our common humanity: our "one world, one life" (*Three Guineas* 142).

Equally important is the way in which the work is constructed according to an oppositional dialogic, as a feminist pacifist response to the apparent misogyny of an overwhelmingly patriarchal peace movement, as well as to the male representatives of those secular and religious institutions that she maintained were responsible for the perpetuation of war. Woolf's insistence on the "remarkable" and "unique" nature of her male correspondent's letter—"since when before has an educated man asked a woman how in her opinion war can be prevented?" (*Three Guineas* 3)—contains a critique of a British peace movement guilty not only of excluding women's interests, but, in many cases, of being overtly misogynist. Woolf would argue that men's frequent hostility toward their sisters, rather than any apathy or indifference on their part (as their brothers would claim), was to blame for the apparent limitations of the British peace movement.

In this way, *Three Guineas* can be seen as a work “constructed in response” to the political voices that surrounded her and “reiterat[ing] the debate on the left over peace and war” (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 690-91), an ideological war frequently constructed along gendered battle lines. It is, moreover, a conversation with fellow pacifists in which “the relative values of the Peace Movement are weighed and measured, twisted and turned inside out. Their arguments are left in shreds, their logic exploded” (Marcus, “Introduction” 51), a real letter masquerading as, and coexisting alongside, a fictional one.

Given that the oppositional dialogic of *Three Guineas* had been well established during the earliest stages of the work’s conception, it occupies a central rhetorical component of the work. The loudest dialogue audible on the pages of the text is one between Woolf and the prominent philosopher and pacifist, C. E. M. Joad, who, as leader of the most influential strain of pacifism in the thirties, utilitarian pacifism, was responsible for proposing and penning the famous Oxford pledge that developed out of the highly publicized “King and Country” debate held at the Oxford Union in early 1933.⁹⁴ She quotes him at length throughout the text as an example of the kinds of criticisms being frequently leveled at women throughout the 1930s: “‘the vote . . . , it was hoped, would enable them [women] to make war a thing of the past. The vote is won,’ Mr Joad continues, ‘but war is very far from being a thing of the past’” (*Three Guineas* 42). Such allegations, in Woolf’s view, were part of a wider fascistic conspiracy to return women to the private house and to divert attention away from the ways in which men perpetuate war: hence, her aim in *Three Guineas* is to illuminate precisely *how* men (with the assistance of women) perpetuate war and to illuminate the elaborate scapegoating

mechanism developed by men in an attempt to erase their own culpability. She allows Joad to incriminate himself while holding his own comments up to analysis:

The sooner they give up the pretence of playing with public affairs and return to private life the better. If they cannot make a job of the House of Commons, let them at least make something of their own houses. If they cannot learn to save men from the destruction which incurable male mischievousness bids fair to bring upon them, let women at least learn to feed them, before they destroy themselves.

(Three Guineas 42-43)

Woolf rejects Joad's assertion that women have failed to organize themselves in the interests of peace because they are "more politically apathetic" or "more socially indifferent" than those of the previous generation. To refute his claim, she reveals the flaws in Joad's logic, "storming" the rhetorical "toolshed" (Marcus, "Storming the Toolshed") to dismantle his argument:

"Is it unreasonable," he goes on, "to ask that contemporary women should be prepared to give as much energy and money, to suffer as much obloquy and insult in the cause of peace, as their mothers gave and suffered in the cause of equality?" And again, I cannot help but echo, is it unreasonable to ask women to go on, from generation to generation, suffering obloquy and insult first from their brothers and then for their brothers? Is it not both perfectly reasonable and on the whole for their physical, moral and spiritual welfare? *(Three Guineas 43)*

She refutes his claim that women have failed to be politically and socially effective by pointing out that "Since the number of societies run directly or indirectly by Englishwomen in the cause of peace is too long to quote . . . it is unnecessary to take Mr.

Joad's criticism seriously, however illuminating psychologically" (*Three Guineas* 159). Any lack of effectiveness, Woolf argues, is a product of the relative poverty of individual women and of women's groups, a fact that she supports by citing the limited income of educated men's daughters and the annual income of the Women's Social and Political Union at the height of its popularity. Woolf's invocation of the figure of Joad, that figure of "red-blooded masculinity" (Hussey, "Mrs. Thatcher" 15), is a testament to the prevalence of hostility toward women's involvement in the public sphere within British contemporary culture: to the "odour" that attaches to the word "Miss" not only in Whitehall, but in the peace movement of the thirties as a whole.

Her invocation of Joad, however, also testifies to men's tyranny in the private sphere, thereby connecting his public misogyny with his private tyranny. She could base this analysis, however, on something more than his view, expressed in *Under the Fifth Rib: A Belligerent Autobiography*, that "Women, I think, ought not to sit down to table with men; their presence ruins conversation, tending to make it trivial and genteel, or at best merely clever" (qtd. in *Three Guineas* 159; MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 2), for she had personal knowledge of him. Joad, in fact, had sat down to tea at Woolf's own table in November 1922, when he accompanied his then-lover, Marjorie Thomson, to discuss the terms of her employment at the Hogarth Press. Woolf's portrait of him in her diary resonates with disdain for his "type": "cocksure, reposing much weight upon the sterling quality of his intellect, & thus dispensing with the graces & amenities, as usual with sterling young men" (D2 213). She remarked that Joad "tipped one of my chairs on two legs, & ate a large tea" and "sticks his little horns manfully into facts" (D2 213-14) and noted, in contrast, Marjorie's psychological perceptiveness and social grace, commenting

that she “was less self assertive [than Joad], passed the cake, praised the dog, & sensitively appraised the situation with antennae quivering, womanlike” (D2 214). In light of this encounter, her sarcastic response to his misogyny in *Three Guineas* takes on new light:

This is an admirably outspoken opinion, and if all who share Mr Joad's sentiments were to express them as openly, the hostess's dilemma—whom to ask, whom not to ask—would be lightened and her labour saved. If those who prefer the society of their own sex at table would signify the fact, the men, say, by wearing a red, the women by wearing a white rosette . . . it is possible that the honesty of the buttonhole would kill a certain form of social hypocrisy now all too prevalent. Meanwhile, Mr Joad's candour deserves the highest praise, and his wishes the most implicit observance. (*Three Guineas* 159-60)

Woolf's involvement with Thomson and Joad, nevertheless, had proven itself indispensable to the economic analysis that Woolf went on to develop in *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas*. When Thomson was left utterly dependent on her job with the Press upon the dissolution of her marriage to Joad in 1924, Woolf reflected how “she depends absolutely” on her weekly three pound wage (D2 316) and “is penniless, except for our pay” (L2 134), and made an attempt to secure for her temporary lodging with Clive Bell in September 1924. As she explained the events in a letter to Jacques Raverat, “[She] came to London, School of Economics, read Shaw, thought she ought to live with a man; did; took up with a clever little bounder called Joad; lived with him; married him; found a letter from a woman in a drawer; left him; now has a room of her own” (L2 155). Woolf's extensive documentation of Joad's misogyny attaches a face to

the generalized “sense of the combativeness that underlay the words and actions of some of the men in the peace movement” (Zwerdling 297-98). Even an absolute pacifist and close friend like Aldous Huxley, it appears, was not immune from such “combativeness”: “After our dinner at Raymond’s with Aldous & the subconscious hostility I always feel there, I’m facing the fact that my next book, *Professions, The Next War*, will need some courage,” she noted (D4 354).

More generally, *Three Guineas* can be viewed as a response to the exclusion of women and women’s interests from the larger peace movement as a whole: a fact reflected in Woolf’s ironic insistence on the “remarkable” and “unique” nature of her male correspondent’s letter, “since when before has an educated man asked a woman how in her opinion war can be prevented?” (*Three Guineas* 3) Woolf perceived the tendency of male-dominated organizations, including pacifist and anti-fascist organizations, to marginalize women’s concerns and interests, a state of affairs that she linked to the marginalization of women’s rights and interests under fascist rule. The newspaper clippings in Woolf’s scrapbooks pertaining to the effects of German and Italian fascism on women’s rights reveal the extent of her concern. Her scrapbook and diary contain a letter on this very point from Princess Elizabeth Bibesco in response to Woolf’s question of “why the woman question was ignored” (D4 273; MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 51) by the anti-Fascist exhibition: “I am afraid that it had not occurred to me that in matters of ultimate importance even feminists cd. [sic] wish to segregate & label the sexes. It wd. [sic] seem to be a pity that sex alone should be able to bring them together” (ibid.)

The irony of such a statement would not have escaped Woolf, who argues that patriarchal society operates on just such a principle: on the power of “sex alone” to bring men together in pursuit of their own interests. Woolf would demonstrate in *Three Guineas* that sex segregation among men was ubiquitous in her own time within the pacifist movement. Such must have been her impression on reading Dick Sheppard’s famous 1934 letter to the press soliciting men’s—and only men’s—signatures for his Peace Pledge. Although membership was extended to women in the following year, membership of the Peace Pledge Union (PPU), the most popular of the period’s pacifist organizations, would remain more than two-thirds male (Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 233). Woolf’s sense of exclusion from the most popular pacifist organization of the period must have been only furthered by the July 1935 PPU rally at Albert Hall, at which only one woman, Maude Royden, was in attendance. For Woolf, the exclusion of women’s voices and interests from this largely masculine organization would have appeared a disavowal of women’s political agency and yet another illustration of women’s exclusion from the public sphere. Woolf directly responds to the exclusion of women from the masculine, conscriptable “we” of the Pledge—“We renounce war and never again, directly or indirectly, will we support or sanction another” (qtd. in Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 177)—by imagining a powerful feminine “we” and by meditating on what “direct” and “indirect” means might serve their purpose. Her advocacy of a Society of Outsiders, to which women should “pledge” and “bind” themselves, can be read partly as a response to the PPU’s gendered approach to peace.

It seems likely, for example, that her thinking about how gender shapes one’s response to war was prompted by “the exclusion of women from every aspect” of her

husband's war book, *The Intelligent Man's Way to Prevent War* (1933), which "ignores women as readers, as contributors, and as possible peace-makers" (Moss Gottlieb 247). One imagines Virginia's sense of quiet outrage at having been excluded from the book's implied audience, and her husband's insistence that "the subject of the prevention of war only becomes the more important for an intelligent man" in the face of fascism (*Intelligent* 8). Advancing a view of war as a "social phenomenon," the prevention of which "depends upon discovering the conditions which cause this behaviour" (10), Leonard's book refuses an invitation to women to assist in the discovery of those causes. Another of his books, *Quack, Quack!*, ignored "the woman question" that was at the very heart of Virginia's interest in fascism, and altogether failed to consider the psychological dimensions of masculine power. Rather, his work identifies the present moment as one characterized by a return to savagery and barbarism, what he calls "quackery," a condition marked by a resistance to reason and intellect and a renewed belief in magic, superstition, and ceremony. In the first section of the book, "Quack, Quack in Politics," Leonard supplies evidence of this return to "quackery" through examples drawn from contemporary British politics and from Continental fascism. Of particular interest to his wife would have been his inclusion of photographs of Hitler and Mussolini alongside photographs of effigies of the Polynesian war god, Kukailimoku. Leonard compares the "terror-producing" expressions on the faces of the three figures, and likens ethnographic accounts of god-worship with contemporary accounts of leader-worship in Germany and Italy. The worship of "savage" war gods is no different from the current frenzy inspired by fascist leaders, he maintains, as both are motivated by fear-inducing displays of power. In June 1935, quarreling between Leonard and Mabel, their domestic help, gave

Virginia the opportunity to examine the psychology of power firsthand. Recounting an episode in which her husband had brought Mabel to tears, Woolf reflects on Leonard's "despotic" tendency, "his desire, I suppose, to dominate. Love of power. And then he writes against it. . . . It is in private a very difficult characteristic" (D4 326).

While *Three Guineas* engages in a kind of oppositional dialectic, it is equally true that it is simultaneously engaged in more playful kinds of dialogue with the writing of her male peers. More than simply an insertion of the feminist perspective into pacifist discourse, *Three Guineas* can be read as a parody of the well-known peace pamphlets of her day. Beverley Nicholls' *Cry Havoc!*, for example, is structured as a letter written to none other than H. G. Wells, while Aldous Huxley's "What Are You Going to Do About It?" and A. A. Milne's *Peace with Honour* are both structured as "answers" to correspondents. The function of parody within *Three Guineas*, and the tensions between and among these works, bears further consideration.

A Photographic Dialogue

It may come as some surprise to contemporary American readers to learn that the first British and American editions of *Three Guineas* contained five black-and-white photographs, four of which bore the image of a different British patriarch.⁹⁵ Omitted from American editions beginning with the 1963 Harbinger edition, and from British ones with the 1968 printing of the Uniform edition, the photographs were correctly restored to the British edition with Michele Barrett's 1993 Penguin composite edition of *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas* and to the American one with Jane Marcus's 2007 annotated edition of the work.⁹⁶ The publishing history of this text in England has

necessarily had a profound impact on Woolf scholarship, with much of the critical work produced prior to 1993 relying on these incomplete editions. The omission of the photographs not only “serves to diminish connections that Woolf strives to make between fascism and patriarchy, foreign and domestic politics, and dominance and hierarchy in the public and private spheres” (Duffy and Davis 128), but obscures an important dimension of the work’s cultural dialogic.

The exclusion of the photographs has been justified by a host of assumptions about how images can and do function in relation to written texts, and about the textual significance of these particular photographs. As Julia Duffy and Lloyd Davis point out:

The exclusion of the photographs implies that they are viewed as expendable—a subsidiary part of the text, illustrative of and dependent on the written word. A generic hierarchy is constructed and enforced, in which a dominant verbal medium is asserted . . . the tacit removal of the photographs smoothes out processes of response and interpretation. With the grounds for a range of different readings foreclosed, the verbal text is naturalized and its editorial discretion concealed. (129)

Because the removal of the photographs by Woolf’s literary executors and heirs has had the effect of producing an ideologically impaired text, stripped of its most subversive political and aesthetic properties, the ideological basis for this editorial decision must be considered, particularly given the contentious political dynamics that have governed the execution of Woolf’s literary estate.⁹⁷ While it is unclear precisely how the photographs came to be eliminated from the editions following Woolf’s death, such an act is consistent with other editorial decisions made by the Woolf estate that have consistently

privileged the publication of her less politically radical writing over her more radical writing.⁹⁸ Given Leonard Woolf and Quentin Bell's disavowal of *Three Guineas*, and of Woolf's feminism and politics as a whole, it seems unlikely that the photographs were omitted because they were "considered insignificant or auxiliary to the written text" or because "their parodic function [was] not grasped" (Duffy and Davis 139), but rather precisely because their "parodic function" *had* been grasped, for

Far from comprising a series of faded and anonymous snapshots of late great men—a misperception enhanced by the distance of time or place, not to mention the somewhat grainy images reproduced in subsequent paperback editions—these men were not only very much alive in June 1938, they were also the reigning "chiefs" of the patriarchal enterprise spanning Empire, Government, Justice, and Religion. (Staveley 4-5)⁹⁹

The subjects of these photographs include the former Prime Minister (and Chancellor of Cambridge University), Stanley Baldwin; the current Archbishop of Canterbury, Cosmo Gordon Lang; the current Lord Chief Justice, Gordon Hewart; the Boer War hero and Boy Scouts founder, General Robert Baden-Powell; and the State trumpeters of the Household Cavalry. Given the high-profile identities of these men, such photographs would have appeared not only "generically and ideologically transgressive" in *form* (Duffy and Davis 139), but "ideologically transgressive" in *content*, and particularly so to her male literary executors and early editors. Omitting the photographs thus serves not merely as "a form of censorship that restores the stability of the discourse" (*ibid.*), but as a form of censorship that maintains the stability of the patriarchy by erasing the text's feminist, socialist, anti-imperialist, and pacifist critiques.

The restoration of the photographs to English editions with Michele Barrett's 1993 edition, accompanied by Woolf's generic labels "A General," "A University Procession," "A Judge," "An Archbishop," and "Heralds," has generated enormous interest in Woolf's use of the photograph in *Three Guineas*, *Orlando*, *Roger Fry*, and *Flush*, and in the visual aesthetic that emerges in her reading notebooks and in the Monks House albums.¹⁰⁰ But Woolf scholars have been slow to consider the ideological implications of her use of the photograph. *Three Guineas* scholarship that emerged immediately following publication of the complete 1993 edition, notably that of Diane Gillespie (1993), Helen Wussow (1994), Naomi Black (1995), and Julia Duffy and Lloyd Davis (1996), focused on the photographs' relation to the written text and the "anonymity" afforded the subjects by Woolf's use of generic labels.¹⁰¹ Given the importance of these subjects to British contemporary culture and politics and to a politically informed reading of the text, it is puzzling that no large-scale historical reading of the subjects has yet been attempted, and that virtually all scholarship since the publication of Staveley's article continues to privilege the photographs' textual and symbolic dimensions over their historical dimension.¹⁰²

Critical discussion since 1998 has been dominated by talk of how the photographs function as humorous illustrations and as visual evidence of Woolf's textual arguments about fascism and patriarchy. While such arguments possess a certain merit, they are predicated on an assumption, difficult to prove, about Woolf's intent—that by including generic captions beneath each photo, she intended to strip them of their historical and cultural specificity—and an assumption about how images can and do function in relation to written text. Thus in her introduction to the 2001 Shakespeare Head edition of *Three*

Guineas, Naomi Black alters only slightly her 1995 reading of the photos as “generic,” symbolic representations of women’s exclusion from the public sphere and her position that “the pictures’ actual subjects are immaterial to their purpose” (Black, “Not a novel” 41-43) when she insists that the “anonymous” photos “make the point that the eminence of men is generic—that the institutions, not the individuals, are the reason for both the panoply and the reality of power” (Black, “Introduction” lvii). Despite knowledge of the subjects’ identities, she remarks that when viewed apart from the text, the subjects “are simply typical public men, if especially ornamental ones” (Black, *Virginia Woolf* 170). Nancy Knowles goes on to duplicate this reading, arguing, “the institutions they represent become more important than who they are” (Knowles 95). Others have similarly reduced the figures to a humorous, symbolic function in the text, calling them “satirical illustrations of the pomposity, arrogance and self-importance that Woolf associated with patriarchal institutions” (Gualtieri 165), “illustrations of masculine spectacle” (“Pawlowski, “Seule” 8), “fetishes of the symbolic. . . . timeless dead icons of patriarchy” that are “immune to deeper readings” (Humm, “Memory” 207, 198), “contemporary British totems” (Duffy and Davis 128), and “trophies from the world of men” (Whittier-Ferguson 99).

Attention to the photographs’ “strong comic dimension” (Briggs 324) likewise diverts attention from the identities of the subjects by focusing attention on their surfaces, further rendering them (both literally and figuratively) an ancillary, decorative, and illustrative role in the text. One finds frequent reference in *Three Guineas* scholarship to the comic effects of “silly men in silly costumes” and “silly hats” (Burton 232, 234), or to those “comic pictures of gentlemen” (Bell, “A Room” 14-15). This emphasis again

conflates textual effects and authorial intent, dictating dangerously through repetition how these images are to be read. One scholar notes, for example, how “illustrat[ing] her comedy with photographs of pompous-looking old men in wigs and gold braid,” Woolf “makes us laugh with her” (Hartley 100, 101), while another argues that “laughter is invited by the five photographs” in order to provide the very opportunity for mockery that Woolf prescribes as an “antidote to dominance” (Neverow, “Freudian Seduction” 58). Elsewhere the photos have been read as a “playful” and “ironic” use of evidence, in contrast with her more “serious” implementation of the photograph in *Roger Fry* (Black, “Introduction” lxi).

Despite scholarly insistence on the comic dimension of the photos, Woolf’s only extant reference to the photographs, a diary entry in which she notes having “collected enough powder to blow up St. Paul’s. It is to have 4 pictures” (*D4* 77), makes clear that the photographs’ primary attraction for her lay in their “explosive,” rather than comedic, potential. In addition to demonstrating that descriptive labels would have been unnecessary for a contemporary audience, letters that Woolf received from various correspondents following the publication of *Three Guineas* suggest that the comic effect of the photos was achieved as a result of their highly specific, rather than their purportedly “generic,” nature. Alfred Sayers, for example, commented on Woolf’s inclusion of “LCJ, Head of Church, Baldwin at their best—a real triumph!” (Snaith, “Wide Circles” 33), while Ray Strachey commended her for “pulverizing imbeciles in high places” (23). And while some respondents commented on the hilarity of the photographs, such as Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence, who applauded them as “a work of genius—simply delicious” (64), Judith Stephen, who called them “delightful” (24), and

another correspondent, who hailed them “a perfect scream” (65), others recognized their subversive, “explosive” potential: Nelly Cecil, for one, regarded the photos as “too amusing and deadly” (35), while another correspondent referred to them as “dangerous stuff. Inflammable material . . . [to] rekindle suppressed and smouldering fires” (73). A review in the feminist journal *Time and Tide* likewise attributed the work’s subversiveness with its photographs, remarking how “there are faces that should remain behind a veil . . . and she has dragged the veil away. A terrible sight. Indecent, almost obscene” (qtd. in Marcus, “No More Horses” 286, note 12). The comments of Woolf’s early readers and reviewers reveal an acute and immediate appreciation for how, by engineering such “an obvious titular effacement of these well-known men,” Woolf was not merely “engaging in subversion,” but “flirt[ing] with sedition” (Staveley 5). An awareness that the work’s reception has differed radically from Woolf’s time to our own compels us to move beyond habituated patterns of response in the hopes of recuperating a readerly appreciation for the photographs’ more seditious, subversive dimensions.

Such an appreciation can only be gained by attempting to understand each figure’s cultural and historical significance for Woolf and her contemporaries. Thus we should recognize each man as “not just a pillar of the establishment, not just a name, not just a representative of the male order of things—but a real person, one whom she had read about in the newspapers, one whom she heard about from relations and friends, and one whom she had watched in action” (Clarke, “Lord Chief Justice” 24). If the photographs appear “gnomic,” “indecipherable,” “impenetrable” (Whittier-Ferguson 99), or “immune to deeper readings” (Humm, *Modernist Women* 207), as some have argued, it is only because readers have heretofore resisted the historical and cultural translation

demanded by the photographs; for like its prequel, *A Room of One's Own*, *Three Guineas* applies nearly constant pressure on readers to tune in to a temporally remote (and for non-British readers, a physically remote) wavelength of historical and cultural knowledge, forcing contemporary readers to become “pargiters” of both texts.¹⁰³ Since an allusion, such as those to the Radclyffe Hall trial buried within *A Room of One's Own*, “is not an echo until it rings a bell in the common reader’s ear as well” and since it “cannot reverberate as an echo without the reader’s recognition of the source of the echo” (Marcus, “Sapphisty” 165, 164), “the critic’s role here is to embody the historical context in which the disembodied voice of Echo can be reconstituted” (Marcus, “Sapphisty” 164). The embodiment, moreover, must be historically accurate: “the critic must help the ghostly echo put on not only a body, but the body she wore in 1928 and 1929. Echo’s voice needs both a literary and historical context” (“Sapphisty” 165).¹⁰⁴ Supplying historical and cultural context for the subjects whose images are reproduced in the *Three Guineas* photographs will be the focus of Chapter Four.

Two aspects of the *Three Guineas* photographs that continue to puzzle critics are their seemingly tenuous, tangential relation to the written text and their paradoxical relation to the text’s absent photos of dead Spanish children and ruined houses. As is obvious from any reading of *Three Guineas*, the photographs that are included as part of the text, those of the British patriarchs, are never explicitly referred to by the narrator, while the photographs that are repeatedly referred to, those of the dead Spanish children and ruined houses, never actually appear in the text. In addition to gratifying Woolf’s keen sense of irony, this paradoxical implementation of visual media had a strong ideological motivation. Her recent, firsthand exposure to atrocity photographs of the

Spanish Civil War—photographs which had been sent to her in the mail—had made her keenly aware of the ideological uses of photography: rather than being used to articulate an argument against war itself, the atrocity photographs being published in British and French left-wing newspapers were being used to garner political support for the Republican cause in Spain and to enlist individuals in the fight against the fascist insurgency being led by Franco. Despite the compelling nature of the cause, it would not have escaped Woolf that these photographs were being used by Republican forces for what would amount in the end to military propaganda. Having seen the younger generation's militant reaction to the same visual propaganda that was only further cementing her commitment to pacifism, Woolf recognized, contrary to Susan Sontag's claim, that the images most capable of putting an end to war—those of death and destruction—are all too capable of engendering yet more death and destruction.¹⁰⁵

Viewed in this way, Woolf's decision to exclude the actual atrocity photographs from her text can be regarded as a textual expression of her pacifism, whereby she refuses to supply the impetus for further militant reactions. By converting visual images to verbal ones, she can modify or erase the graphic details that would likely constitute, in Roland Barthes's familiar terms, the photographs' *punctum*. By erasing the individual details most likely to "pierce" or "wound" the viewer—the expressions on the faces of the dead children, for instance—she restricts the photographs' ability to function as war propaganda by removing those aspects most capable of eliciting powerful emotional responses. The exclusion of actual photographs also allows her strip them of historically and culturally specific details, what Barthes calls the *studium*, in order to further restrict their propagandistic function. Once the subjects' ethnic features and clothing are

carefully hidden from view, the photos can no longer function as propaganda for a particular side of the conflict, but are transformed into generic evidence of the ravages of war and the reality of civilian casualties. The appropriation of these visual images, and their conversion into verbal evidence useful to her pacifist argument, is an important political strategy enacted at the level of the visual. As Jane Marcus argues in “No More Horses,” it is the absence of the actual photographs that marks the very site where Woolf brings the greatest pressure to bear on the text’s meaning.

At the same time, Woolf recognized that certain photographs--newspaper photographs, for instance, which generally possess a lesser degree of *punctum*, or the capacity to “wound” the viewer, than do war photos—could be useful to her pacifist argument precisely because they deliver far less ideological content while still maintaining the capacity to signify endlessly and idiosyncratically, depending on the education, nationality, class, race, religion, and gender of the individual viewer. Unlike the volatile images of the atrocity photographs, the horror of which results from a particular conflagration or engagement, these photos present little risk of fomenting national, ethnic, or sectarian passions and antagonisms, and thus naturally have a very limited propagandistic use. At the same time, their propensity to endlessly signify imbues them with a far greater potential range of meaning than any one author could supply. The inclusion of these photographs marks the site at which Woolf surrenders authorial control over the images, and invites the reader to participate in textual collaboration, a strategy with which she had first experimented in *A Room of One’s Own*.¹⁰⁶ The subjects of the photographs speak by signifying the larger discursive universe in which they are imbedded, while *what* can be heard is contingent upon the identity of the individual

reader. This explains why, located in a time and space distant from that of the text's earliest readers, the subjects of these photographs have been variously perceived by the present generation of Woolf scholars as mute and "silent objects" (Gillespie 38), and also why the text's inherent collaborative style has been obscured. Hearing *what* these photographs might have spoken to Woolf and her contemporaries thus becomes a matter of reconstituting the cultural and historical aspects of the discursive universe inhabited by readers and photographic subjects alike.

This interactive process whereby each reader supplies context for each photograph, bringing all of his or her idiosyncratic knowledge and understanding to bear on its meaning, can be viewed as part of the work's anti-patriarchal, anti-authoritarian aesthetic. Foregrounding the role of the individual reader as a collaborator, Woolf asserts the essentially subjective nature of all narratives and demonstrates what a collaborative history, or documentary, might look like. The photographs can be viewed as solicitations, letters to an audience of potential correspondents, which are intended to generate spontaneous acts of signification that, taken together, might result in a more complete, balanced account of contemporary history. If *Three Guineas* is indeed "constructed by its audience" (Snaith, *Virginia Woolf* 115), then it is, and has always been, constructed anew each and every time it is read. Viewed in this light, Woolf's project might be viewed as part of the social anthropological work being done in the thirties by organizations such as Mass-Observation, and with other contemporary works, like Katharine Burdekin's *Proud Man* (1934) that have been called "first-person ethnographic report[s] on England in the 1930s" (Patai xv).¹⁰⁷ The letters that Woolf received from correspondents in response to *Three Guineas* thus become an important part of her historical project: they are

documents supplying data, each letter a historical record of the particular nuances of a particular reader's textual collaboration. Taken together, the entire correspondence forms a mosaic representing the range of possible meanings inhering in the work. Allowing others to participate in the act of meaning making assures the author that the meaning that is ultimately attached will be one attained by consensus rather than through authoritarian means—an end entirely fitting for an anti-fascist polemic.

Rather than “opaque representations which need the intervention of the text to yield their intended meanings,” as Elena Gualtieri maintains (175), the photographs *are*, in fact, “transparent signifier[s] capable of revealing those truths about historical events which writing cannot speak” (ibid.). By including these photographs, Woolf creates a sub-textual, visual discourse that operates in conjunction with, but whose meaning is not contingent on, written discourse. By allowing the photographs to signify the external rather than simply the internal world of the text, Woolf liberates the image from its servitude to the verbal medium and elevates its textual status, thereby subverting the traditional relationship between the verbal and visual mediums. Given that this traditional relationship is generally constructed in patriarchal terms, Woolf's liberation of the image can be viewed as a significant anti-patriarchal gesture. In a discussion of the photographs' anti-patriarchal content and form, Julia Duffy and Lloyd Davis see Woolf as challenging “the textual conventions through which that culture [patriarchal] is represented and understood” by “both depicting and challenging conventions deriving from a patriarchal system” (129). The “interactive, verbal-pictorial discourse” that results thus “becomes a source of disruption to patriarchal values and meanings” whereby “any presumption of the word's authority over the visual image is disrupted” (Duffy and Davis 129, 130).

Woolf's liberation of the image is one of many anti-authoritarian, anti-patriarchal strategies that have been identified as operating in this text.¹⁰⁸ Teresa Winterhalter's discussion of the interpenetration of aesthetics and politics in the narrative structure of *Three Guineas* is especially relevant to a discussion of Woolf's use of the visual. She maintains that by making aesthetics "the primary feature, indeed the basic grammar, in which she lodges her critique" (252), Woolf "counters the threat of tyranny and fascism most fully by enjoining us to change the way we approach her expository prose" (237) in order to show "how discourse itself is implicated in sustaining the principles of the fascist state": for "if, for Woolf, war is the product of assuming the infallibility of one particular viewpoint, then narration inevitably participates in this dynamic of power" (239). Allowing the photographs to independently signify by refusing to fix their meaning in the narrative—again, a circumstance made possible by their limited propagandistic function—is not only a refusal to take part in the "dynamic of power" that produces war, but an exploration of how visual discourse might be implemented to promote very different ends. Ever alert to the dangerous ideological implications behind such neat attempts at closure, much of Woolf's work resists the impulse toward totalization, instead inviting readers to remain open to multiplicity, plurality, and ambiguity of meaning.

Woolf's adoption of a collaborative approach in writing her history of women's oppression was motivated by a deeply felt distrust for traditional historical and biographical narrative. An avid reader and writer of both genres, she understood how the imposition of a linear narrative on these non-fictional forms necessitates, almost as a matter of course, the foreclosure of alternative narratives, facts, and details that fall outside the parameters of a particular writer's ideological bias. This at least partially

accounts for the misgivings Woolf experienced during the writing of Roger Fry's biography in 1939-40, particularly the difficulty she experienced in transforming the raw materials of letters and writings into a cohesive, objective narrative. Woolf was aware, moreover, that the stakes are higher for women and other social outsiders, since it was their history and reality, and not men's, that are far more likely to be erased in phallogentric biographies and histories. As a result, she devoted herself at both the personal and professional levels to the recuperation of women's history and biography and to recording the "lives of the obscure," particularly those of the unsung working classes.¹⁰⁹ Woolf's attempts at recuperating outsider narratives as a corrective to lopsided phallogentric narratives, both in *Three Guineas* and her earlier works, constitute gestures to expose both the authoritarianism implicit in the act of narrative making as well as the patriarchal foundations of history. That Woolf should include photographs that function as textual spaces in which outsiders can collaborate in the writing of the text is thus entirely consistent with her mission to engage outsiders in the writing of their own narratives, a project of profound ideological and practical importance.

The creation of a collaborative text is also consistent with Woolf's "self-concealing practice as a writer of subversive polemic" (Lee, "Introduction" vii), a self-effacing tendency that can be attributed to a desire to eliminate from her work all strains of didacticism out of an ideological objection to propagandistic writing. Believing didacticism to be an authoritarian assault on the individual's powers of reason, and the exercise of reason to be at the heart of all social change, she viewed propaganda, the "horror of the Aldous novel [*Point Counter Point*]," as leading irrevocably and unmistakably to war. The question that confronted Woolf, unlike her husband, however,

was not *whether* art and politics should commingle—a position she would advocate wholeheartedly in the essay “Why Today Art Follows Politics”—but *how* art could accommodate politics without crippling the reader’s rational powers.¹¹⁰ Her adoption of a collaborative aesthetic, and specifically her use of the visual medium in *Three Guineas*, is in large part motivated by the desire to preserve and nurture her readers’ innate rational capacities.

Practical concerns also played an important role in Woolf’s pioneering of more covert methods for launching her subversive attacks on patriarchy, capitalism, militarism, and imperialism. Several early events in her life would have made her realize the risks attached to subversive speech: she had attended Leonard’s trial in 1906 for “defaming a judge” and watched the Lord Mayor of London in 1915 order her brother-in-law’s pacifist pamphlet, *Peace at Once*, be destroyed. That she was aware of the risks of speaking out against members of the patriarchal establishment in the thirties is revealed, moreover, through numerous references in *Three Guineas* and in several newspaper clippings that she includes in her scrapbook.¹¹¹ She would take an active role in several proceedings regarding free speech in the thirties, speaking out in support of Radclyffe Hall’s lesbian World War I novel, *The Well of Loneliness* and the poetry of Count Potocki de Montalk, both of whom had been charged with obscenity, and in support of Rose Macaulay, who had been charged with libel. In early 1936, she had watched Rose Macaulay dragged in to a libel trial—“a monstrous affair,” Woolf noted (*L6* 16)—for remarks she had made in the *Spectator* regarding Lord de Clifford’s acquittal, when tried by his peers in the House of Lords, on charges of manslaughter and dangerous driving (Clarke, “Lord Chief Justice” 19).¹¹² The case had been heard by none other than Lord

Chief Justice Gordon Hewart, who was widely viewed as having been partial in considering Macaulay's case: Leonard Woolf, for one, saw Hewart's behavior in the case as characterized by "sadistic, vindictive self-righteousness" (qtd. in Clarke, "Lord Chief Justice" 21). Perceiving that the justness of such an indictment as Macaulay's, which Woolf regarded as "a mild & I think justifiable remark" (qtd. in Clarke, "Lord Chief Justice" 20), would provide little protection from capricious patriarchs, Virginia signed a letter in protest of the libel law, which appeared in March 1936 under the title "Authors and the Law of Libel: Plea for Reform" (ibid.).¹¹³

Her firsthand involvement with the curtailing of civil liberties, her familiarity with Labour politics, her position as a prominent publisher, and her role as a pacifist author placed Woolf at the center of contemporary ideological debates over the erosion of civil liberties in the thirties. Key in this debate was the swelter of controversy—"a major political storm" (Street 216)—surrounding the drafting of the Incitement to Disaffection Bill in 1934, which Leonard would actively protest.¹¹⁴ The Bill was a supplement to the Incitement to Mutiny Act of 1797, which had originally been drafted in the wake of two mutinies at Nore and Invergordon, and which was hastened by fears that a revolution like that of the French Revolution might spread to Britain (Street 215). The Mutiny Act allowed for the prosecution of those who

Maliciously and advisedly endeavour to seduce any Person or Persons serving in His Majesty's Forces, by Sea or Land, from his or their Duty and Allegiance to His Majesty, or to incite or stir up any such Person or Persons to commit any Act of Mutiny, or to make, or endeavour to make, any mutinous Assembly, or to commit any traitorous or mutinous Practice whatsoever. (MacColl and Wells 354)

Several changes to the wording of the Bill in 1934 threatened to expand Government control over civil liberties, which was seen as being of particular consequence for pacifists or for those who published pacifist materials: the change from “duty and allegiance” to “duty or allegiance” was regarded by many as “expressly directed against pacifist propaganda, which would not endeavour to seduce a man from singing ‘God Save the King’ (that is, ‘allegiance’), but would endeavour to seduce him from dropping bombs on a town in an enemy country (that is, ‘duty’)” (MacColl and Wells 355). The second change proposed to the Bill was to make an offense the mere possession of “any document of such a nature that the dissemination of copies thereof among members of His Majesty’s Forces” could “seduce any member of His Majesty’s Forces from his duty of allegiance to His Majesty” (ibid.). In other words, “any document. . . which might be used as an incitement to disaffection is regarded in Whitehall as criminal in its very nature, like a forger’s die. If you hold such documents, you hold them at your peril and you must expect no protection from the law in respect of them” (MacColl and Wells 356).¹¹⁵

As many had feared that it might, this Bill led to the suppression of controversial material in books that were aimed at a more general audience. A letter to the editor of *The Times*, signed by Leonard Woolf, Jonathan Cape, Hugh R. Dent, Geoffrey Faber, George G. Harrap, Allen Lane, and Stanley Unwin, revealed to the public a recent instance in which “the proofs of a children’s annual have been returned to the publisher with a letter from the printer saying that certain marked passages could not safely be printed in view of the fact that the Incitement to Disaffection Bill would already be law by the time the annual appeared” and that “the passages in question undoubtedly contain anti-war

propaganda” (“The Disaffection Bill”). The occurrence was particularly troubling in light of the Government’s assurances “during the debates on the Incitement to Disaffection Bill . . . that this Bill was solely designed to enable the Government to deal more efficiently with those who deliberately attempt to spread disaffection among members of H.M. Forces and was not intended to operate, nor would in fact operate, to check the expression of opinion of anti-war propaganda.” The authors of the letter protested against the “vague wording of the Bill,” and maintained that “the result of the Bill, as it stands, to-day, will . . . in the end set up what will in fact be a secret, unofficial, and most embarrassing form of censorship exercised by printers . . . over the publication of any literature of an anti-militarist character” (ibid.).

As a pacifist author and publisher of her own pacifist works, this legislation would have been of particular relevance to Woolf, and her awareness of the Government’s recent, drastic measures to suppress potentially seditious speech may have had some bearing on her decision to incorporate photographs, rather than direct verbal criticism of her subjects, in *Three Guineas*. “Strik[ing] the eye,” as she had called it elsewhere, through these “statements of fact addressed to the eye” would allow Woolf to circumvent charges of inciting disaffection or seditious libel, to which she might otherwise have been subject, by relying on photographs’ natural ability to “speak a thousand words.” Furthermore, this decision to lodge her fiercest indictment of specific British patriarchs and the institutions of Church and State in photographs would protect readers, who might under the proposed Bill have been subject to prosecution for possession of her pacifist manifesto. According to British Common Law, seditious libel is defined as

The expression in some permanent form of opinions made “with an intention to bring into hatred or contempt, or to excite disaffection against the King or the government and constitution of the United Kingdom as by law established, or either House of Parliament, or the administration of justice, or to excite British subjects to attempt otherwise than by lawful means the alteration of any matter in Church or State by law established, or to promote feelings of ill will and hostility between different classes.” (O’Higgins 34)

While few pacifist texts have as their explicit aim that of exciting “hatred” or “contempt,” it can surely be argued that texts like *Three Guineas* that expose the patriarchal and militarist foundations of Church and State certainly possess the potential to “excite disaffection” or to “excite” the desire for radical social change among readers. Had Woolf written her indictments of the particular leaders of Church and State, rather than picturing them “like police posters of the enemies of society” (Marcus, “Thinking Back” 6), Woolf might have laid herself open to charges of seditious libel, particularly given that “in the past, seditious libel was interpreted in such a way that it could catch almost any criticism of the established institutions of society” (O’Higgins 34).

That Woolf wrote *Three Guineas* at the precise historical moment in which Britain was become sensitive to its declining status as an imperial power, and to an increased degree of anti-British sentiment stemming from the growing threat of fascism on the Continent, would have only increased the likelihood that she would have been charged with seditious libel had she launched more overt attacks on the patriarchy. This is particularly so, given that dire circumstances at home and abroad had moved the government in the mid-thirties to embark upon a massive, unprecedented program of

national self-marketing whereby a positive image of Britain could be promoted abroad (Taylor 127), thereby “perpetuat[ing] the appearance of power in the minds of foreigners at a time when hostile propaganda was beginning to expose the harsh realities of Britain’s decline” (Taylor 173). Sir Stephen Tallents, who had served as former secretary of the Empire Marketing Board and helped to establish the public relations division of the BBC and the BBC Foreign Service, was essential to the new pro-British campaign (Grant 34), for in addition to launching major public relations campaigns for the Empire Marketing Board and the GPO, in 1932 he went on to write what would become the seminal text of the period in regard to the dissemination of pro-British propaganda, “The Projection of England” (Ogilvy-Webb 51-4; Grant 34).

In “The Projection of England,” Tallents supplies the guidelines for the new standard of national projection capable of “project[ing] upon the screen of world opinion such a picture of herself as will create a belief in her ability to serve the world under the new order as she has served it under the old” (37). Of the “national institutions and virtues” Tallents deems fitting to project are included “The Monarchy,” “Parliamentary Institutions,” “The British Navy,” “In national affairs--a tradition of justice, law and order,” and “Oxford and St. Andrews” (14-15).¹¹⁶ Identifying cinema as the most direct method of projection, Tallents recognized that pro-British films could perform an important function on the home front as well as abroad. It was this same recognition--- that film might be used to enhance the image of the British empire at home and abroad--- a decade earlier that led to the establishment of the British Empire Film Institute in 1927, whose goal was not only “to promote and develop public interest in British films

throughout the world,” but to promote the British image and British interests as well (MacKenzie 76).

Guidelines for the cinema, enforced by the British Board of Film Censors, were consistent with those established by Tallents in his pamphlet. Overseen by George Redford, Examiner of Plays under the Lord Chamberlain, the Board was headed by “a succession of figures expert in counter-propaganda and censorship techniques,” including Lord Tyrell, former head of the Political Intelligence Department and Permanent Undersecretary at the Foreign Office. It was the Board’s purpose to ensure

That the film industry depicted only a positive view of Britain for overseas consumption and an uncontroversial one for domestic audiences. Controversial politics, disparagement of public figures and institutions, particularly royalty, or anything likely to encourage disloyalty among native peoples in the Empire or otherwise bring British prestige into disrepute were all banned. (MacKenzie 78)

As the heart of “controversial politics,” films possessing pacifist content were especially susceptible to censorship.¹¹⁷ Among the subjects banned in films were “the portrayal of royalty, judges, Ministers or high officials in an unbecoming or undignified manner; no living individual was to be lampooned, or public characters and institutions disparaged”

(MacKenzie 77-78). Similar constraints governed theatre in the thirties: the Lord Chamberlain was authorized to refuse licensing of plays that he deemed “to represent on the stage in an invidious manner a living person, or any person recently dead,” “to do violence to the sentiment of religious reverence,” or “to be calculated to cause a breach of the peace” (Shellard and Nicolson 63).¹¹⁸

That such constraints should govern the projection of visual images in the thirties offers further perspective on how Woolf “flirt[s] with sedition” by including in her text actual images of British patriarchs (Staveley 5), and of the cultural and historical factors that played a part in her development of a new visual aesthetic. “Strik[ing] the eye” with images capable of speaking, Woolf delivers an anti-militarist critique that would likely have been regarded as seditious libel had she used words in place of images. The desire to understand how these images would have spoken to Woolf’s contemporary audience, and why Woolf chose to engage each figure in her own critical dialogue, motivate the historical reconstruction of these figures in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four: Do Not Let Us Praise Famous Men: Doing the Work the Text

Demands of Us

Private Reading Lessons

In *A Room of One's Own*, Woolf's narrator reflects upon how "women have served all these centuries as looking-glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size" (35). To that power, she attributes the fate of kings, the founding of empires, and the persistence of war, remarking how "without that power probably the earth would still be swamp and jungle. The glories of all our wars would be unknown. . . . The Czar and the Kaiser would never have worn their crowns or lost them. Whatever may be their use in civilized societies, mirrors are essential to all violent and heroic action" (*Room* 35-36). If it is true that women's "reflective" power bears its share of responsibility for the existence of devastation and war, it is equally true that this power, when consciously harnessed, carries within it the potential to transform society. If *A Room of One's Own* "trains us to read as women," as Jane Marcus has argued ("Sapphistry" 187), its sequel can be viewed as a continuation of that project of instruction and its photographs of prominent British leaders as tools Woolf uses to teach and model resistant reading and critical thinking practices. It is through the photographs that Woolf directly challenges her reader to resist the instinct to "reflect the figure of man at twice its natural size" (*Room* 35) and, instead, to implement an alternate set of reading practices based in their natural capacity for creative thought; the theoretical basis of these reading strategies would be established in two works that flank *Three Guineas*, *A Room of One's Own* and "Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid."

Woolf voices her concern that the Society of Outsiders “be creative in their activities, not merely critical” (*Three Guineas* 113) and directly associates those creative activities with an active questioning of the world around them: thus, she calls on women to “obtain full knowledge of professional practices,” “investigate the claims of all public societies,” “scrutinize the endowments of the schools and universities,” and “inform themselves of the practice of that religion by attending Church services, by analyzing the spiritual and intellectual value of sermons” (*Three Guineas* 112-13). Arguing that “Hitlers are bred by slaves” (“Thoughts on Peace” 245), she makes clear that women are in possession of something beyond a merely “reflective” power, “a weapon” which they can use to fight tyranny: the power of “private thinking, tea-table thinking” wrested from the constraints and biases that accompany “unreal loyalties” (“Thoughts on Peace” 244). Properly harnessed and engaged, this power is constructed as a kind of “mental fight,” which Woolf defines as “thinking against the current, not with it” (*ibid.*), part of women’s obligation to their brothers “to help the young Englishman to root out from themselves the love of medals and decorations” (“Thoughts on Peace” 247). As the following passage makes clear, “private thinking” occurs in public spaces, in reaction to the masculine spectacles that are witnessed there:

Let us think in offices; in omnibuses; while we are standing in the crowd watching Coronations and Lord Mayor’s Shows; let us think as we pass the Cenotaph; and in Whitehall; in the gallery of the House of Commons; in the Law Courts; let us think at baptisms and marriages and funerals. Let us never cease from thinking—what is this ‘civilization’ in which we find ourselves? What are these ceremonies and why should we take part in them? What are these

professions and why should we make money out of them? Where in short is it leading us, the procession of the sons of educated men? (*Three Guineas* 62-63)

In this passage, Woolf identifies, one by one, each of the urban habitats in which the subjects of the text's photographs generally might be found: thus we are shown Baden-Powell at the Cenotaph, Stanley Baldwin in the House of Commons, Gordon Hewart at the Law Courts and Lord Mayor's Shows, Cosmo Gordon Lang at Coronations and Church services, and the State Trumpeters of the Household Cavalry in Whitehall. She connects theory and practice in a series of carefully constructed lessons that use photographs as their visual centerpieces. In one such lesson, Woolf imaginatively guides the reader through the process of encountering a soldier, modeling a set of critical responses that she might employ in place of her habitual "reflective" response: "we who are forbidden to wear such clothes ourselves, can express the opinion that the wearer is not to us a pleasing or an impressive spectacle. He is on the contrary a ridiculous, a barbarous, a displeasing spectacle" (*Three Guineas* 21). The model she proposes is flexible, recognizing that women's responses will alter according to variables such as class:

We can say that for educated men to emphasize their superiority over other people, either in birth of intellect, by dressing differently, or by adding titles before, or letters after their names are acts that rouse competition and jealousy--emotions which . . . have their share in encouraging a disposition towards war. If we then express the opinion that such distinctions make those who possess them ridiculous and learning contemptible, we should do something, indirectly, to discourage the feelings that lead to war. (ibid.)

Three Guineas, then, can be seen as instructive in that it teaches readers alternative ways of engaging the patriarchy by encouraging them to replace their habitual responses with well-informed criticism and active questioning and models these practices through the inclusion of verbal and visual portraits of public men.

An equally significant aspect of Woolf's instructional method, however, is her reliance on the "lives of the obscure" as an available body of evidence upon which women can draw as a source for their creative and critical thought experiments. In addition to supplying additional instructional reading materials, her extensive recourse to obscure biographies and autobiographies in constructing her own assaults upon public men shows readers just how such materials can be put to effective use in constructing an alternate discourse or version of history. Presenting readers with evidence drawn from both public and private quarters, Woolf trains her readers how to detect fault lines within the dominant discourse and how to construct alternative cultural narratives using only the materials available to the common reader—the evidence from daily newspapers, biographies, and autobiographies.

Woolf emphasizes the value of "that marvelous, perpetually renewed, and as yet largely untapped aid to the understanding of human motives which is provided in our age by biography and autobiography" and "the daily paper, history in the raw" as fragments of evidence—"picture[s] of the lives of others" (*Three Guineas* 7)—that could be cheaply and easily pieced together by the daughters of educated men in their creative pursuit of knowledge. Observing how "all these infinitely obscure lives remain to be recorded" (*Room* 93), she goes on to instruct readers in the research methods by which evidence of those obscure lives can be discovered: because such evidence is available only to "those

who have the time to extract it and the imagination with which to decipher it,” women must learn to read “between the lines of their husbands’ biographies” and to coax “old boxes . . . to give up their old secrets” (*Three Guineas* 77, 75). They must learn to corroborate such evidence as they are able to unearth from common sources and learn to make inferences, deductions, and comparisons. “If you want to know any fact about politics you must read at least three different papers, compare at least three different versions of the same fact, and come in the end to your own conclusion,” she writes (*Three Guineas* 95). Contemplating the primary evidence of Mary Kingsley’s statement, “I don’t know if I ever revealed the fact that being allowed to learn German was *all* the paid-for education I ever had,” Woolf instructs the reader in the proper handling of such evidence: “if we develop the suggestions we find in that statement, and connect it with the other hints and fragments that we have uncovered, we may arrive at some theory or point of view that may help us to answer the very difficult question, which now confronts us” (*Three Guineas* 77-78).

Beyond the instructional properties of its narrative discourse, the text of *Three Guineas* offers itself up to the reader as tangible evidence of the potential results of women’s refusal to reflect “the figure of man at twice its natural size” and their commitment to engage in acts of critical and creative thought. While the reader has been schooled in how to skillfully confront public subjects that demand admiration from women, the text’s parting lesson, how to skillfully confront such subjects who present themselves in the private sphere, is taught exclusively by example. The photographs in *Three Guineas* reveal figures of not only immense public significance, but figures of immense private significance to Woolf: for “the figure of man” in his military,

ecclesiastical, judicial, and intellectual guises was one that had suffused all aspects of her early family life and history. Thus, when Woolf parades before her reader the procession of great educated men of the past—“Great-grandfathers, grandfathers, fathers, uncles—they all went that way, wearing their gowns, wearing their wigs, some with ribbons across their breasts, others without. One was a bishop. Another a judge. One was an admiral. Another a general. One was a professor. Another a doctor” (*Three Guineas* 61)—it is her family history that she parades before the reader as well. The text’s verbal and visual portraits of public men of power recall none other than those great “makers of English civilization” (Marcus, *Languages* 8) from whom she herself had descended.¹¹⁹ Among these were her uncle, James Fitzjames Stephen, “the inventor of modern legal discourse, to whom generations of law students turned for definitions of crime and punishment, the harsh discourse of discipline, the voice of an Old Testament judge” and, like Gordon Hewart, a High Court judge (Marcus, *Languages* 16); her grandfather, James Stephen (dubbed “Mr. Mother Country Stephen” for coining the phrase “mother country”), Permanent Under Secretary for the Colonies, “an architect of imperialism,” and a Cambridge professor who was once described as “the most powerful man in England” (Marcus, “Liberty” 80, 83); and her father, Leslie Stephen, an academic whose *Dictionary of National Biography* was instrumental in establishing “the Victorian definition of English history as the biographies of England’s great men” (ibid.). Woolf’s refusal to glorify the family patriarchs is another way in which she leads by example and is, perhaps, the most practical of the skills taught by the text of *Three Guineas*, for that act of refusal

Suggests a connection and for us a very important connection. It suggests that the public and the private worlds are inseparably connected; that the tyrannies and servilities of the one are the tyrannies and servilities of the other. But the human figure even in a photograph suggests other and more complex emotions. It suggests that we cannot disassociate ourselves from that figure but are ourselves that figure. It suggests that we are not passive spectators doomed to unresisting obedience but by our thoughts and actions can ourselves change that figure. (142)

The section below relates the fruits of my own creative and critical labors to “change that figure”: piecing together recoverable evidence in the form of essays, speeches, toasts, newspapers, and biographies old and new, I offer the following verbal portraits as a starting point for a historical reconstruction of these public figures, and for the creation of an alternative historical discourse.

Public Facts and Figures

Sir Robert Baden-Powell, “The Hero of Mafeking” and “The Chief Scout”

The name and image of Robert Stephenson Smyth Baden-Powell, first Baron Baden-Powell, the much-celebrated “hero of Mafeking” and founder of the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, would have been virtually synonymous with imperialism and militarism to the 1930s reader. Known throughout Britain for protecting the vulnerable border town of Mafeking from Boer attack for 219 days during the Boer War (Warren, “Robert” 114), Baden-Powell was elevated to “demigod” status, and his image given a place in Madame Tussaud’s wax museum, after the British had secured a victory (Rosenthal, 30-31). His

reputation among the public was so well established by 1924, in fact, that his biographer, Eileen Wade, did not consider it an exaggeration to describe him as a man “destined to have perhaps more widely reaching effect than that of any man since the founder of Christianity. . . . There are literally millions of people in the world to-day who are the better for Robert Baden-Powell having been born. There are few—whether prophets, kings or statesmen—about whom as much could be said” (qtd. in Rosenthal 15). By 1918, Baden-Powell’s Scouts and Guides had become “established features of national life in Britain and the empire, and, with variations, throughout the world” (Warren, “Robert” 116), and by 1937, nearly three million Scouts alone existed in 49 countries worldwide. Accordingly, upon his death in 1941, he was “lauded as a figure of global significance, having founded the two largest youth organizations in the world” (Warren, “Robert” 117). His influence would extend well beyond his own time, with Scouting attracting a membership of 350,000,000 males from its inception in 1908 to the present day (Daniels 22), and his Scouting manual, *Scouting for Boys*, selling “more copies worldwide than almost any other text, excluding the Bible” (Warren, “Robert” 115).¹²⁰

Unlike the other men whose photographs appear in *Three Guineas*, Baden-Powell is referenced only obliquely in the text itself. While a holograph fragment makes reference only to an “Admiral” in a list of other figures that includes “Bishops,” “Judges,” and “Prime Ministers” (M28 holograph 65), an early typescript fragment includes “Generals” among *its* list of educated men whose dress is worthy of ridicule, along with “Cabinet Ministers, Archbishops, Judges & Professors” (M28 typescript 8). Subsequent revisions to the text demote the General to an “army captain” (54) and one of the “elderly dilettantes” responsible for the perpetuation of war (97).¹²¹ However, the

book's preoccupation with military uniforms, ceremonies, and pageantry and its constructivist perspective on gender can be read as a direct comment on the imperialist and militarist discourses surrounding Baden-Powell's controversial Scouting movement.

Baden-Powell's involvement in securing a British victory over the Boers would firmly establish him in the British popular imagination as a heroic protector of the empire at precisely the moment when Britain was experiencing anxiety over the strength of the Empire and of British soldiers. This national anxiety was brought on in part by Britain's lackluster performance in the Boer War, in which it had taken "the entire might of the then British Empire to defeat a relative handful of backwoodsmen" (Daniels 23), and was exacerbated by a statement made by General J. F. Maurice in 1902 alleging that the British race had so deteriorated that it could no longer produce men capable of serving as soldiers (Ross 198-200).¹²² Ironically, war commonly was regarded as the antidote to racial deterioration, as suggested by Viscount Knebworth's fear "that if permanent peace were ever achieved, and armies and navies ceased to exist, there would be no outlet for the manly qualities which fighting developed, and that human physique and human character would deteriorate" (qtd. in *Three Guineas* 7). Anxiety over the future of the British Empire was particularly pronounced at this historical moment, with Germany, Japan, and the United States, three emerging imperial superpowers, on the horizon as potential competitors (Daniels 23). Also rampant were concerns over diminishing masculinity among British soldiers, which was viewed as an immediate threat to British control over its colonial subjects since "Victorian standards of manliness [were] thought crucial for colonial order" (Enloe 48). It was no coincidence that the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides should emerge amidst this climate of concern over the preservation of the British

Empire: Baden-Powell would acknowledge the origins of his movement in a full-page article on the aims of the Scouting and Guiding movements that appeared in 1937 in *The Times*. “Our aim is to make a more *healthy* nation. Recruiting statistics show that an appallingly large proportion of our manhood is classed as C 3—medically unfit,” he would write, adding that “all these are points which in the last thirty years we have been attending to in the training of the Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, under the term of physical education” (“Lest We Run”). He would align the approach of Scouting with that of military training:

In training boys, very many of whom are under-nourished or suffering from minor but curable malformations, we cannot employ the same methods as those used in the Army on well-fed, sound, and fully formed men. Our idea rather is to induce each boy . . . to become athletic minded, to be individually responsible for his own health. (ibid.)

Inculcating in British youth the skills and qualities deemed essential to the preservation of the Empire, “Scouting and Guiding emerged as particularly potent imperial movements” (Proctor 606) designed to help remedy the imperial crisis at hand. As Baden-Powell had secured the town of Mafeking during the Boer War, so would his Boy Scouts and Girl Guides secure the safety of England and protect the interests of her Empire.

The Boy Scouts and Girl Guides were founded on the premise that participation in group activities, adherence to a strong moral and spiritual code, and the cultivation of a sense of brotherhood could create happier individuals and better citizens (Warren, “Robert” 117). The movements were

Dedicated to the individual development of character through a training scheme which was based on the small group (the patrol), and each focused on ideas of voluntary social or civic service as a means of individual fulfillment and social improvement. Both sought the development of the whole person, physically, mentally, and spiritually, and were committed to ideals of a common humanity, believing that this informal training in personal development could be best achieved through camping and outdoor activities. (ibid.)

While both Scouting and Guiding had the development of a responsible, contented citizenry as their goals, gender would play a significant role in determining how the terms of citizenship were constructed. Scouting thus emphasized the necessity for chivalry and bravery among boys, and the desirable aim of “breed[ing] manly men” (“Peace Aim of Scouting”), while Guiding emphasized girls’ future roles as wives and mothers, and framed their participation in the preservation of the empire in terms of the production of healthy children. This programmatic gender division suggests Scouting’s usefulness as an instrument to enforce Mussolini’s notion of “two worlds in the life of the nation, the world of men and the world of women” (qtd. in *Three Guineas* 180).

The development of the Girl Guides coincided with that of a powerful pronatalist movement, and became an instrument for the inculcation of these values. “To make a healthy nation we want a good deal more than spectacular physical training,” Baden-Powell would write, “namely, prenatal care, proper feeding, and upbringing of the young” (“Lest We Run”). He would go on to assert that

More important even than the physical education of the boys is the physical education of the girls. These are the future mothers of the race. On their practice

of pre-natal care of themselves and then the proper nutrition and diet for their infants largely depends the health of their offspring. . . . Hence my frequent advocacy of the Girl Guides movement as having greater national importance than the Boy Scouts, since the Guides have as subjects of their training such definite activities as home nursing, homecraft, mothercraft, cooking, & c. . . Thus in the Guide movement the foundations are laid for a healthy race. (ibid.)

The principles of Guiding were laid out in *How Girls Can Help Build Up the Empire: A Handbook for Girl Guides* (1912) by Baden-Powell and his sister Agnes, who would go on to run the Girl Scouts until the post was assumed by the Chief Scout's wife, Olave Baden-Powell (Warren, "Robert" 115-6). The dominance of such rhetoric throughout this period is likely to have impacted Woolf's argument in *Three Guineas* that "one method by which she [the educated man's daughter] can help to prevent war is to refuse to bear children" (147). An article in Woolf's scrapbook describes a meeting of the National Council for Equal Citizenship, where "vigorous arguments for and against a campaign to increase the birth rate were put forward by women delegates." Advocates were in favor of "mak[ing] use of the schools to bring home to girls their responsibilities as future citizens and to educate them to expect a good standard of conditions for their children," while dissenters, who included Helena Normanton, argued that the campaign "was advocating enormous families to provide 'cannon fodder' for the next war." The article relates how Normanton had argued that "this resolution, together with the whole agenda of the conference, was in line with what Hitler and Mussolini wanted," and that "the only thing that women in any country can do to prevent war is to stop the supply of 'cannon fodder'" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 4). Woolf interprets the "falling" birth rate among the

educated classes—a subject of no small concern among certain circles—as an indication that “educated women are taking Mrs. Normanton’s advice” (*Three Guineas* 147).

The association of Scouting with militarism would continue to plague the movement throughout the 1920s and 1930s. Following the Prince of Wales’s comment that “disciplined physical training is a form of ‘militarism’ or conducive to it,” for example, the Archbishop of York argued publicly in *The Times* that “nothing could be more absurd than to suppose that the aim of the training in discipline is to equip one to fight” (“Peace and ‘Pacifism’” 15). A similar concern, and one often articulated by feminist pacifists during the previous half century, was voiced by Lady Shena Simon in a Letter to the Editor that appears in Woolf’s scrapbooks. The letter expresses concern over Lord Stanhope’s appointment as President of the Board of Education given his connections with the military, and her question as to whether ““the new drive for physical fitness in the schools is to be developed in close connection with the fighting Services”” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 8). That “the British Left persisted in identifying the Boy Scouts with militarism and imperialism” can be seen in Ramsay MacDonald’s refusal in 1923 to serve on the Scout Council from concerns that those running the movement had intentions to militarize it (Springhall, “Baden-Powell and the Scout Movement” 940).

The heated debate over the alleged militarism of Scouting reached its pinnacle with the 1909 “Vane Rebellion.” A member of the Peace Society and an advocate of Scouting’s civil rather than military aspects, Sir Francis Vane had been fired by Baden-Powell from his position as London Commissioner for advocating a more democratic movement in which Scoutmasters could exercise their own authority, rather than remain subject to the control of what was becoming an increasingly militant headquarters (Jeal

404-9). A highly publicized meeting in December 1909 exposed the general public to these debates over the future of the movement and its organizational structure to the general public and helped him win the support of both the Press and the public (Jeal 407; MacDonald 180). Along with many other Scoutmasters, Vane had found himself increasingly distressed by with the militarism of the Scouting movement and felt it important to save Scouting, which he called a “great educational movement,” from becoming merely “a recruiting ground for the army” led by “a military cabal” (qtd. in Rosenthal 206). Following his dismissal, he would go on to serve as President of the newly formed British Boy Scouts, a pacifist offshoot of the Battersea Boy Scouts founded by Scoutmasters who objected to the military nature of Baden-Powell’s Scouting movement. Vane’s defection nearly caused a crisis for Baden-Powell’s movement, for with him went most of London troops and the majority of Birmingham’s: by April 1910, the British Boy Scouts boasted 50,000 members and were endorsed by numerous prominent Liberal politicians and organizations (Jeal 407-8).

Contemporary newspaper articles reveal the pressure felt by youth organizations to defend themselves against such allegations of militarism. Baden-Powell himself had repeatedly to defend against such claims, “always insist[ing] that individual character training was at the centre of his scouting method, rejecting accusations of militarism” (Warren, “Robert” 116). It is important to recall that the founding of the Scouts coincided with controversial and unsuccessful efforts by military officials and politicians before WWI to introduce conscription in England, the only European superpower at that time without compulsory military service. Allen Warren’s sympathetic portrait of Baden-Powell maintains that he resisted pressure from his superiors to support the National

Service League's campaign for compulsory military service and protested a proposal for compulsory state youth training service in his final 1940 memorandum ("Robert" 115, 117), although even he is forced to admit that "among the early scouting volunteers his ideas were capable of more than one interpretation, and Baden-Powell steered a slightly uneven course on the militarism question between 1908 and 1910" ("Robert" 116).

The question of intention aside, the organization had all the *appearances* of having been created to serve as a military training ground, which made the two all but synonymous in the popular British imagination. This impression was created by its having emerged during a period of national anxiety over imperial and military strength; having been founded and administered by military personnel; and having originated in an imperial cadet corps and police force. To these should be added its indebtedness to certain military conventions and traditions, including an emphasis on honor, the use of badges to distinguish rank and achievement, the grouping of individuals into small units or troops, the use of uniforms, and an emphasis on skills drawn from the battle ground, including scouting and reconnaissance.¹²³

Indeed, the connections between the Boy Scouts and the military are compelling and difficult to ignore, particularly in light of the organization's military predecessors, the Mafeking Cadet Corps and the South African Constabulary (SAC). The Mafeking Cadet Corps, established during the siege of Mafeking by Baden-Powell's chief of staff, Lord Edward Cecil, served as a prototype for the youth organization. The corps was comprised of boys from ages nine and up who would perform various duties in town—carrying messages, acting as orderlies, delivering mail, and serving as look-outs—thus freeing up the town's men for their military activities (Rosenthal 53). Baden-Powell draws clear

parallels between the Mafeking Cadet Corps and the Boy Scouts in the opening of his seminal *Scouting for Boys* (1908), where he notes having “had an example of how useful Boy Scouts can be on active service, when a corps of boys was formed in defence of Mafeking, 1899-1900” (qtd. in Rosenthal 162). Baden-Powell further elaborates on the analogy between the Scouts and the cadets, and between Britain and Mafeking, when he remarks that “so, too, we ought to be prepared in Britain against being attacked by enemies; for though it may not be probable, it is quite as possible as it was at Mafeking; and every boy in Britain should be just as ready as those boys were in Mafeking to take their share in its defence” (qtd. in Rosenthal 163). Fortunately, the skills to be learned in Scouting are precisely those required for national defense: thus “every boy ought to learn how to shoot and obey orders, else he is no more good when war breaks out than an old woman” (qtd. in Rosenthal 162).

Scouting’s military aspects were further developed through Baden-Powell’s formation in 1900 of “the world’s largest mounted police force,” the South African Constabulary, “in order to restore order in parts of the Transvaal and to protect Boers from armed Africans” (Proctor 608). While the police force was intended “to aid pacification once the war was concluded” (Warren, “Robert” 114), by 1902 the SAC had become “a force of imperial control and precursor of the modern South African Police Force” entrenched in imperialist, racist practices (Proctor 608). As one historian observes, the SAC served as “the testing ground for many ideas later used in the Scouts and Guides” and as inspiration for Scouting’s use of awards and medals, its moral code of honor, its uniform (it was SAC constables who first wore the trademark khaki shorts and

shirts and Stetson hats associated with Boy Scouts), and its motto, “Be Prepared”—the initials of which are Baden-Powell’s own (Proctor 608).¹²⁴

The image of a militaristic organization was only furthered by the military connections of its leaders. In 1910, 140 of the movement’s 250 Presidents and Commissioners could be classified as either active or retired military officers, a number that had increased to 247 out of 352 by 1912 (Springhall, *Youth* 128; qtd. in Rosenthal 206). Chief among them was Sir Robert Baden-Powell, whose military exploits read like a list of imperial conquests. Beginning his army career as a lieutenant in the 13th hussars, Baden-Powell moved quickly through the ranks to become the youngest major general in the British army, prior to finding fame as Chief Scout. In spring of 1880, immediately following the second Anglo-Afghan War, he was stationed in Afghanistan, where he performed mapping and reconnaissance work (Warren, “Robert” 113); after participating in an expedition against the Zulu in November 1887, he was appointed by Commander-in-Chief Lord Wolseley to “raise and command the native levy for Sir Francis Scott’s expedition against King Prempeh of Asante” in 1895 and organized a “thousand-strong pioneer force” that aided the successful invasion of Asante (Warren, “Robert” 114). After being promoted to lieutenant-colonel in the following year, he served Sir Frederick Carrington as chief staff officer, and was responsible for aiding the suppression of the Ndebele (Matabele) uprising in Southern Rhodesia, again in charge of reconnaissance and logistics (ibid.). He would become involved in, and ultimately be exonerated for his involvement in, an incident in which he authorized the killing of a rebel chief, Unwini, who had been captured, although his involvement in the affair would subject him to harsh criticism from the British radical press (Warren, “Robert” 114).¹²⁵ He would go on to

command dragoon guards in India in 1897 before being appointed commander-in-chief of Northwest frontier forces in South Africa during the Boer War, occupying the border town of Mafeking in the famous siege of that name, a military coup for which he was promoted to the rank of major-general in 1900 (ibid.)

Much of what successfully associated Scouting with militarism in the popular imagination, however, was the fact that

The outward and visible signs of Scouting were military: Scouts were organized in troops, and sub-divided into patrols; they wore uniforms, had parades, and did a little drill, they were led by officers, scoutmasters, patrol leaders, corporals. . . .

Scouts' activities were also often military: they practised signaling, carried dispatches, went on trek, posted sentries around camp, and fought mock battles.

(MacDonald 186-87)

Scouts were frequently referred to within the Press as Baden-Powell's "Model Army," while their image often appeared in advertisements, cigarette cards, picture books, paintings, and war posters in a military context, or accompanied by a military caption (MacDonald 188, 188-202). It must have outraged Woolf to learn that the founder of such an organization should be awarded the Wateler Peace Prize in 1937, which was granted to the individual "who had rendered the most valuable services to the cause of peace or had contributed to finding means of combating war" ("Wateler Peace Prize")—particularly in light of her views on how such "outward and visible signs" of militarism could lead directly to war. She would argue in *Three Guineas* that soldiers' uniforms and medals functioned primarily to entice young boys to join the military: such "splendour," she writes, "is invented partly in order to impress the beholder with the majesty of the

military office, partly in order through their vanity to induce young men to become soldiers” (21). Crucial here is her belief that militarism is contingent upon such inducements rather than inevitable consequences of gender: she voices this belief through the inclusion of a quote from Prince Hubertus Lowenstein in which he says, “it is not true to say that every boy at heart longs for war. It is only other people who teach it to us by giving us swords and guns, soldiers and uniforms to play with” (qtd. in *Three Guineas* 187).

The popular association of Scouting with militarism and patriotism was only further cemented through the Boy Scouts’ visible involvement in the Great War. The war provided Scouts an opportunity to demonstrate their commitment to the Scouting rules—which included Honour, Loyalty, Usefulness, Friendliness, Politeness, Kindness to Animals, Obedience, Cheerfulness, Thrift, and Cleanliness—and their willingness to “[make] themselves into fine, reliable men, ready to take the place of those who have gone away to fight and who have fallen at the Front” (Baden-Powell, *Young Knights* 13). Recognizing that “a war requiring mobilization of the nation’s resources created opportunities for trained civilian war-service by boys and girls” (Warren, “Robert” 116), Baden-Powell offered the Scouts’ services to the government prior to the outbreak of war, and their help was enlisted in protecting communications lines and “coast watching” (Jeal 450). In addition to assisting the Coastguard, Scouts were also active in guarding telephone and telegraph lines and railway bridges, carrying messages, and acting as wounded soldiers for VAD nurses in training (MacDonald 199). Trained in “cunning and unobtrusive” methods, it was argued that Boy Scouts could make themselves “essential to the war effort” since they could “act as gatherers of intelligence about enemy movements,

and as message bearers across enemy lines” (Daniels 25). For their service on the home front during wartime, Scouts could even earn a “war service badge” for performing twenty-eight days of voluntary service (Rosenthal 228). The Great War also saw the founding of Baden-Powell’s Scout Defense Corps, whose aim was to provide Scouts aged fifteen to seventeen with advanced training in shooting, signaling, entrenching, and basic infantry techniques, and for which training they would receive a red feather to be worn on their hats (ibid.). Scouts’ contributions to the war effort were widely recognized; they received accolades from Prime Minister David Lloyd George and even had a chapter written about their heroic efforts in *The Times History of the War* (Jeal 456; MacDonald 201-2).

Scouts’ service to the Empire virtually ensured that movement would come to signify patriotism and nationalism and “the national symbols of the flag, the King, and Britannia” (MacDonald 195), an association strengthened by the well-publicized support they received from prominent politicians and members of the royal family. Among their prominent supporters were the King, the Prince of Wales, the Archbishops of Canterbury, York, and Westminster, the Lord Chief Justice, Kitchener, and the Lord Mayor of London, among others (MacDonald 196). A letter from Woolf to Lady Ottoline Morell reveals her own association of Scouting with nationalism and organized religion: “I must break off, chiefly owing to the Boy Scouts who have camped in our field. . . ,” she writes. “They have a Union Jack, and go to Church. I wish one liked these things naturally” (L2 542). The connection between nationalism and religion is made concrete in a passage of *Three Guineas* in which she acidly remarks, “You will have to wear certain uniforms and profess certain loyalties. If you succeed in those professions the words ‘For God and the

Empire' will very likely be written, like the address on a dog-collar, round your neck" (70). In a footnote to this passage, she remarks how "those who thus ticket themselves see some connection between the Deity and the Empire, and hold themselves prepared to defend them" (164). "Is God English?" she had asked herself rhetorically in her typewritten notes for *Three Guineas* (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 39).

From 1920 on, Scouting would become increasingly associated in the public imagination with the spectacle of pageantry. Tim Jeal notes the enormous impact the first International Jamboree had on the citizens of London, noting that "the *Daily Mail* and *The Times* rhapsodized over the Jamboree and the unprecedented publicity lured tens of thousands of would-be spectators, hundreds of whom had to be turned away daily"; as a result, "Baden-Powell loomed far larger in the public imagination than he had previously" and was awarded a baronetcy by David Lloyd George (511, 512).¹²⁶ The first International Jamboree took place in 1920 in west London, and included 5,000 participants of over 12 nationalities (Jeal 511). This extravaganza was followed in 1922 by a gathering of 60,000 Cubs and Scouts at Alexandra Palace held to welcome the Prince of Wales home from a world tour, an event which was well-covered by the Press (Jeal 512). This was followed by the Imperial Jamboree at Wembley of 1924, the World Camp held at Foxlease, and the Second International Jamboree held in Denmark. In 1929, the Imperial Headquarters arranged a Jamboree in celebration of Scouting's twenty-one years and which was celebrated as an affair of state; 30,000 Scouts were in attendance along with the Prime Minister, the Prince of Wales, and the Archbishop of Canterbury, who gave the benediction at the event. It was also at this event that Baden-Powell

received his peerage and was famously presented with a Rolls-Royce bought with pennies collected from Scouts throughout the world (Jeal 513).

International recognition of both Scouting and Baden-Powell increased throughout the thirties. In August 1933, the fourth World Jamboree took place in Hungary, drawing an audience of 60,000 people and 20,000 Scouts, who marched under their national flags; this was followed in 1934 by a World Jamboree in Australia, which drew an audience of 15,000 people and 11,000 Scouts (Keesing's 1931-4 899 A; 1934-7 1491 N). As the prominence of Scouting and Guiding grew worldwide, Baden-Powell and his wife Olave became international ambassadors of sorts, traveling extensively "and being accorded a reception similar to that of a head of state" (Warren, "Robert" 116). And yet the more prominent Baden-Powell became internationally, the more criticism he received among politicians of the Left for his political opinions on affairs both national and international (Warren, "Robert" 117).

With the increasing threat of fascism and war, Scouting and Guiding assumed a more politicized role as an instrument of peace. As an organization founded on the principles of brotherhood and unity, the Scouts were touted by Baden-Powell as a "junior League of Nations" at an International Scouts Conference in 1937 (Keesing's 1937-40 2684 A). It was at this Conference, held at The Hague, that the following resolution was passed as to the organization's official position on the militarization or politicization of Scouting:

The Conference resolves that the International Committee be required to do all it can to ensure that Scouting and Rovering in all countries, while fostering true patriotism, is kept within the limit of international cooperation and friendship

irrespective of creed and race, as has always been outlined by the Chief Scout.

Thus any step to the militarisation of Scouting or the introduction of political aims which might cause misunderstanding and thus handicap our work for peace and good will among nations and individuals should be entirely avoided in our programme. (Keesing's 1937-40 2700 F)

Nevertheless, Scouting was made to serve a political function, its ideology expressive of the spirit of pacifist internationalism emerging in the thirties in response to mounting international tensions. The increased diplomatic role of the Scouts was acknowledged in Baden-Powell's receipt of the Wateler Peace Prize in 1937 "for his valuable services in furthering international good will by means of the Boy Scouts organization" ("Wateler Peace Prize").¹²⁷ Yet Woolf would have noted that even an organization devoted to "peace and good will among nations," such as the Boy Scouts, was in danger of perpetuating war through its dominating patriotic rhetoric and pageantry. A diary entry dated 18 June 1927 reveals Woolf's criticism of the parading scouts she saw during a trip to Hyde Park. "The church boys [the Church Boys' Brigade] were marching; officers on horses in their cloaks like equestrian statues," she observed. "Always this kind of scene gives me the notion of human beings playing a game, greatly, I suppose, to their own satisfaction" (D3 139).¹²⁸

Stanley Baldwin, "The Most Respected Figure in British Public Life"¹²⁹

Stanley Baldwin, leader of the Conservative party from 1923 to 1937 and Prime Minister in 1923-4, 1924-9, and 1935-7, appears frequently throughout the text of *Three Guineas*. That Baldwin is referred to in "This is the House of Commons" as "a country

gentleman poking pigs” (59) invites us to imagine him, along with Maynard Keynes, as a potential source of inspiration for Woolf’s correspondent in *Three Guineas*, who, “instead of turning on your pillow and prodding your pigs,” is “writing letters, attending meetings, presiding over this and that, asking questions, with the sound of the guns in your ears” (3-4). The text of *Three Guineas* is laced with evidence of Baldwin’s activities during the thirties, which included writing letters to *The Times* soliciting funds for Newnham College; hosting meetings at 10 Downing Street for the same cause; and delivering speeches and radio broadcasts on subjects as diverse as Universities, women’s professions, the British Empire, and fascism. Woolf’s correspondent, we are told, “began [his] education at one of the great public schools and finished it at the university” (4)—a detail that further aligns him with Stanley Baldwin, who attended Harrow and Cambridge, and who assumed the Chancellorship of Cambridge University in 1930 (Middlemas and Barnes 574). Including a photograph of Baldwin in his capacity as Chancellor allows Woolf to gesture toward the pageantry and ceremony central to these institutions and to invoke contemporary discourses regarding educational and professional opportunities for women.

Given that most citizens “could only ‘know’ and respond to political leaders through their constructed and projected public characters, especially as revealed by speeches and media presentation,” and since “politicians are what they speak and publish” (Williamson, *Conservative* 15), Baldwin’s public character was largely established through the image he projected in his speeches and addresses, many of which were delivered via radio broadcast and reprinted verbatim in national, local, and organizational newspapers, or printed as pamphlets (Williamson, *Conservative* 154).¹³⁰

The advent of radio broadcasting during this time meant, furthermore, that in contrast to Lloyd George and Bonar Law, “the personalities of Baldwin and MacDonald, as matters of public interest and inquiry, probably occupied the time and readership of the electorate more than any since Gladstone and Disraeli in the infancy of the modern political system” (Middlemas and Barnes 479). Thus, during the General Strike of 1926, “the first occasion in Britain when a national crisis was acted out on the radio,” Woolf would record in writing those features of his speech that she connected with the presence of an increasingly violent “male political authority” within the government (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 534-5):

Baldwin broadcast last night: he rolls his rs; tries to put more than mortal strength into his words. “Have faith in me. You elected me 18 months ago. What have I done to forfeit your confidence? Can you not trust me to see justice done between man & man?” Impressive as it is to hear the voice of the Prime Minister, descendant of Pitt & Chatham, still I can’t heat my reverence up to the right pitch. I picture the stalwart oppressed man, bearing the world on his shoulders. And suddenly his self assertiveness becomes a little ridiculous. He becomes megalomaniac. No I don’t trust him: I don’t trust any human being, however loud they bellow & roll their rs. (D3 81)

In addition to her gifts of mimicry and wit, one recognizes in this criticism her view of men’s public speech as a form of game playing or posturing involving the use of excessive verbal force: here, Baldwin exemplifies that “monstrous male, loud of voice, hard of fist, childishly intent upon scoring the floor of the earth with chalk marks” (*Three Guineas* 105). The connection between such acts of speech and the war-like preparations

being made by Baldwin's government in response to the General Strike would have been readily apparent to Woolf, and further illustration of the inseparability of the private and public realms.¹³¹

As Chancellor of Cambridge, Baldwin had frequent opportunity to reflect publicly on the rich traditions and privileges associated with that institution. He publicly associated Church and University with what he called the "Brotherhood Movement," examples "of the sort of fellowship which enriches our British public life" and through which "men group themselves spontaneously in an endless variety of social forms" ("The Authentic Note" 50). Woolf would have recognized the truth of his claim that those who deliver this message of brotherhood are none other than "the generation that is even now going forth from your colleges into the world" ("Freedom and Discipline" 285). In direct contrast to Woolf's Society of Outsiders—predicated on the belief that individuals can effect social change through independent action—is Baldwin's view that only membership in an institutionalized form of brotherhood leads to social efficacy: "it is the history of mankind," he maintained, "that if our aspirations are to be made effective they must be embodied in an institution, in a Church, in an Order, in a Parliamentary assembly" ("Bound Over" 329).

Woolf's arguments regarding women's educational opportunities often give the appearance of having been constructed in direct conversation with Baldwin himself. Thus, her point of departure in *Three Guineas*—her discussion of the sacrifices made by the daughters of educated men on behalf of their brothers' education—can be read as a feminist revision of Baldwin's view of University history. Absent from his remarks on

University members' debts to their predecessors, for example, is any mention of their indebtedness to their sisters, mothers, and grandmothers:

Great have been your privileges; learning, old and new, has been yours to grasp and you have unconsciously been drinking in the traditions of the ages and breathing the influence of centuries of high endeavour. On you above all of your generation, on you, members of the universities, it rests to repay, as far as you are able, and each in his vocation the debt you owe to those who have gone before you, and who, by their piety and forethought, made it possible for you to obtain these blessings. You go out into all the world—in the Church, in Medicine, and in Law, in the Civil Service of this country, of India, and of the Colonies, in a hundred trades and businesses. And wherever you go you will influence your fellows because of your sojourn here. (“Freedom and Discipline” 285)

Here, of course, are the central themes of the first chapter of *Three Guineas*: how access to such tradition, influence, and privilege is extended to the sons of educated men, but refused the daughters of educated men; how such benefits are obtained at the expense of those same daughters; and how educational opportunity leads directly to professional opportunity, wealth, and influence.

It was thanks to the existence of that “voracious receptacle,” Arthur’s Education Fund, that daughters would be forced to sacrifice their own education, as well as “those luxuries and trimmings which are, after all, an essential part of education—travel, society, solitude, a lodging apart from the family house,” so that her brother could pursue his own education (*Three Guineas* 4). Woolf’s interest in the history of women’s exclusion is at once psychological, historical, and political: she is as concerned with the

impact of exclusion upon the individual woman as in how institutionalized exclusion has affected women as “a whole” in both the past and the present. The fact that “your class has been educated at public schools and universities for five or six hundred years, ours for sixty” (17) leads her to the “indisputable fact” that the “we,”

A whole made up of body, brain and spirit, influenced by memory and tradition—must still differ in some essential respects from “you,” whose body, brain and spirit have been so differently trained and so differently influenced by memory and tradition. Though we see the same world, we see it through different eyes. Any help we can give you must be different from that you can give yourselves, and perhaps the value of that help may lie in the fact of that difference. (18)

Women’s exclusion from the traditions of the “paid-for” education, Woolf goes on to argue, frees them of “college pride” and “school pride” and “those unreal loyalties that spring from them” (80). “As long as . . . the ancient schools and colleges refuse to admit us to a share of their endowments and privileges we shall be immune without any trouble on our part from the particular loyalties and fealties which such endowments and privileges engender,” she argues (82). As a result of this difference, outsiders must absent themselves from “any society which, while professing to respect liberty, restricts it, like the universities of Oxford and Cambridge” (112). Because Woolf identified the universities as a breeding ground for the jealousies and rivalries that perpetuate war, she held that it was “by criticizing education [that] they would help to create a civilized society which protects culture and intellectual liberty” (113).

Woolf makes clear, moreover, that the exclusion of women from universities is no mere relic of the past, but a defining feature of the present—which point she uses to

argue the position that patriarchal oppression is equivalent to a form of domestic fascism. She carefully builds her case against Cambridge by pointing out that in 1937 women were still denied full membership in the university; that their numbers were severely restricted; and that they received a far smaller share of the scholarship funds than their male counterparts.¹³² These facts lead her to reflect on how little progress has been made in expanding women's educational opportunities, or in quelling the objections voiced by her brothers:

The battle of Harley Street in the year 1869 might well be the battle of Cambridge University at the present moment. On both occasions there is the same waste of strength, waste of temper, waste of time, and waste of money. Almost the same daughters ask almost the same brothers for almost the same privileges. Almost the same gentlemen intone almost the same refusals for almost the same reasons. It seems as if there were no progress in the human race, but only repetition. (66)

Of apparent concern to Woolf is the deplorable state of women's colleges, which are, "compared with their brothers' colleges, unbelievably and shamefully poor" (30). This poverty signified to her the sting of grievances both past and present, including the state's continued refusal to pay women for their work as mothers, daughters, and wives, which all but ensured their economic dependence, their intellectual subordination, and their political powerlessness.

The "fabulous proportions" (24) of the incomes of Oxford and Cambridge, detailed in several places throughout the text, serve as a stark reminder of the financial destitution of women's colleges, whose treasurers relied on public fundraising appeals to raise money for the renovation and expansion of their facilities. Woolf's scrapbooks

abound with evidence as to her interest in the contrasting state of financial affairs at men's and women's colleges, often positioned in close proximity to one another: the index to Volume Two, for example, includes the heading "Newnham wants money to rebuild" in close proximity to an entry detailing "Oxfords [*sic*] income" and to another reporting "More money for Universities" from the State (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 14, 19). Volume One reveals a similar preoccupation with the financial and physical state of women's colleges, juxtaposing on a single page a report of a room at Somerville "over run with mice" with a second report that "Somerville received with pathetic gratitude the £7,000 which went to it last year from the Jubilee gift and a private bequest" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 46).

Unlike the men's colleges, women's colleges suffered doubly from the relative poverty of their alumni: "The old students are supporting their college generously," one such solicitation letter from Newnham College ran, "but they are not themselves wealthy" ("Newnham College" 10). In his position as Chancellor of Cambridge, Baldwin was involved actively in soliciting much-needed funds for both Girton and Newnham College ("Women at Cambridge"; "Newnham College"), including the campaign spearheaded by Woolf's friend and Principal of Newnham, J. P. Strachey. Strachey's letter of February 1936, included among Woolf's scrapbooks (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 7), would serve as the real-life basis for the "fictional" letter from an honorary treasurer "asking for money with which to rebuild her college" in *Three Guineas* (30). The poverty of women's colleges, women's exclusion from the public sphere, and the perpetuation of war are conjoined in this letter, which announces a meeting to discuss Newnham's fundraising campaign to be held at the center of British political life: "the Prime Minister,

who is also Chancellor of the University of Cambridge, has most kindly consented to arrange for a Meeting concerned with the needs of Newnham College to be held under his Chairmanship at 10, Downing Street on March 31st” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 7).

A footnote to *Three Guineas* directing the reader to “compare Mr. Baldwin at Downing St. (March 31st, 1936.)” (153) draws attention to Baldwin’s advocacy of women’s education and their employment in the Civil Service.¹³³ The comparison Woolf prompts the reader to make here is with Walter Bagehot, who had refused Emily Davies’ request to assist in the founding of Girton College and who supported women’s employment only “as *labourers* or in other *menial* capacity” (ibid.). Baldwin’s comments supporting women’s employment in the Civil Service also form the rhetorical centerpiece of the mock trial of *Baldwin v. Whitaker* staged by Woolf in the second chapter of the book. She uses his personal testimony as to women’s “industry, capacity, ability and loyalty” (49) in the Civil Service profession to disprove her conjecture that the economic disparity in men’s and women’s earning potentials may be due to some deficiency on women’s part: “it may be, to speak bluntly, that the daughters are in themselves deficient; that they have proved themselves untrustworthy; unsatisfactory; so lacking in the necessary abilities that it is to the public interest to keep them to the lower grades” or that they are intellectually inferior to men (48). Woolf uses the evidence supplied by Baldwin’s personal testimony to contrast the reality of women’s ability with the reality of how they continue to be treated by their brothers, a distinction that demonstrates the persistence of the separate spheres doctrine and the existence of the “infantile fixation.” Since “both boards and divisions transmit human sympathies, and reflect human antipathies,” it is “quite possible that the name ‘Miss’ transmits through the board or

division some vibration which is not registered in the examination room. ‘Miss’ transmits sex; and sex may carry with it an aroma” (50). The existence of this aroma “allows us to decide in the case of *Baldwin v. Whitaker* that both the Prime Minister and the *Almanack* are telling the truth. It is true that women civil servants deserve to be paid as much as men; but it is also true that they are not paid as much as men” (52).

Allowing men freedom to practice their professions without interruption, moreover, leads to a kind of stunted human development that, in turn, leads inevitably to war. Baldwin’s experience is used to typify that of professional men in general: “since 1914 I have never seen the pageant of the blossom from the first damson to the last apple . . . , and if that is not a sacrifice, I do not know what is” (qtd. in *Three Guineas* 70; MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 26). Woolf counters bitinglly, “A sacrifice indeed, and one that explains the perennial indifference of the Government to art—why, these unfortunate gentlemen must be as blind as bats” (*Three Guineas* 70). The negative impact of the professional life on the individual “cause[s] us to doubt and criticize . . . its spiritual, its moral, its intellectual value” (72). For while its “cash value” is said to be “great,” its human cost is far worse:

If people are highly successful in the professions they lose their senses. Sight goes. They have no time to look at pictures. Sound goes. They have no time to listen to music. Speech goes. They have no time for conversation. They lose their sense of proportion—the relations between one thing and another. Humanity goes. . . . What then remains of a human being who has lost sight, sound, and sense of proportion? Only a cripple in a cave. (ibid.)

These arts and abilities are central to Woolf’s vision of how war might be eradicated, expressed in her view that the new college must teach “the arts of human intercourse; the

art of understanding other people's lives and minds" and the ability to judge the proper relation of the part to the whole: "the ways in which mind and body can be made to cooperate" and "what new combinations make good wholes in human life" (*Three Guineas* 34).

The advent of imperial radio broadcasts and frequent imperial "gatherings" in the thirties meant that by 1937, Baldwin "was regarded in the Dominions as well as Britain as the foremost *imperial* statesman of his time" (Williamson, *Conservative* 260; italics in original). That Woolf regarded him in much the same way is suggested by her decision to include in her scrapbooks a newspaper clipping detailing his final speech as Prime Minister on the occasion of the Empire Day and Coronation banquet, in which he "revealed his intense personal faith in the triumph of its [the Empire's] ideals" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 7). Despite clear signs of the decline of the British Empire, particularly given Britain's tenuous hold over India, his speeches would evoke celebratory images of a unified, patriarchal Empire: it was thus that he went on to remark how "the greatest days of the Empire still lay ahead" (qtd. in Williamson, *Conservative* 261) in a 1935 broadcast, despite all evidence to the contrary. The preservation of imperial prowess was regarded in these speeches as essential to the preservation of peace, for "no greater blow could befall the peace of the world than the disablement of the British Commonwealth of Nations" ("Unto Whomsoever" 27).

If the health of the British Empire was represented as essential to world peace, then the health of Britain was regarded as the sole guarantor of freedom against the threat of totalitarianism. In a letter to Tom Jones, Baldwin maintained that "we are the only defenders left of liberty in a world of Fascists" (qtd. in Williamson, *Conservative* 319)

and, in a 1935 speech, he claimed that more than any other nation, “we are today the guardians and the trustees for democracy [and] ordered freedom” (qtd. in Williamson, *Conservative* 332). Williamson notes that Baldwin’s concern with the threat of totalitarianism surpassed that of the ordinary, and became the “keynote in a series of valedictory addresses on leaving office in 1937” (*Conservative* 317). Because Baldwin was always sensitive to the threat that “imported foreign ideas”—key among them fascism and communism—potentially posed to British democracy and freedom, a “sense of international infection” became a “principal feature of Baldwin’s public doctrine, and his most favoured political instrument” (ibid.) during this time. Thus he would refer to fascism and communism—those “alien plants—for they neither have their roots in England” (“Our Freedom” 23)—as external threats against which Britons must protect themselves. *Three Guineas* supplies evidence in direct refutation of such claims, arguing instead that the Dictator “is here among us, raising his ugly head, spitting his poison, small still, curled up like a caterpillar on a leaf, but in the heart of England” (53). The lines that follow take on added significance when we consider that they may, after all, have been addressed to Baldwin himself. “Should we not help her to crush him in our own country before we ask her to help us to crush him abroad?” she asks her male correspondent. “And what right have we, Sir, to trumpet our ideals of freedom and justice to other countries when we can shake out from our most respectable newspapers any day of the week eggs like these?” (ibid.)

“The Voice of England”: William Cosmo Gordon Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury

William Cosmo Gordon Lang, 1st Baron Lang of Lambeth, was the 95th Archbishop of Canterbury. After serving as canon and treasurer of St. Paul’s and, from 1908 to 1928 as Archbishop of York, he assumed the highest religious position in the Church of England in 1928, making him “the foremost representative of Christianity in England” (Ollard, Crosse, and Bond 321). Lang was to hold this position longer than any other Archbishop of Canterbury in the twentieth century, resigning only in 1942. His tenure, however, was distinguished by more than its exceptional length: his talents as a speaker, combined with the technological advances of radio broadcasting and an active involvement in matters of Church and State, made him both a highly visible and highly audible figure in thirties’ England. This was so much the case that Lang is said to have been told by a chaplain in the mid-thirties that “the name of the Archbishop of Canterbury is to-day a household word throughout the inhabited globe” (Wilkinson 459).

That several events of great national and religious significance took place during his tenure no doubt added to his visibility: these included the 1930 Lambeth Conference, the death of King George V, the Abdication of King Edward VIII, the Coronation of King George VI, the rise of fascism, and the beginnings of a Second World War. He had close, well-publicized connections with the monarchy and statesmen alike. Since “an Archbishop of Canterbury is a national figure and, apart from such special or unprecedented occasions as an Abdication, a Coronation, or a war, his presence is expected, almost of right, at many functions which appear to have little connexion with his ecclesiastical responsibilities” (Lockhart 372), his reputation as a public figure perhaps equaled that of his reputation as a religious one. His entry in the *Oxford*

Dictionary of National Biography attributes much of his visibility in the thirties to such public roles, noting how “His bell-like voice at the coronation had become familiar through film and wireless. He had close relationships with public figures, including Baldwin, Chamberlain, and Halifax. But it was above all his involvement in international questions and royal affairs which made him well known to the public” (Wilkinson 459). When King George V died, Lang presided over the funeral ceremony and it was his voice that was “clearly heard throughout the world” (Lockhart 395); when Edward VIII abdicated the throne, it was again Lang whose broadcast Baldwin claimed represented “the voice of England”; and when George VI became King, it was Lang who “produced” and officiated at his Coronation.

Of the many faces that Lang appeared capable of conjuring, however, “it was the proud, pompous prelate that, by the thirties, appeared to the world to have long prevailed” (Hastings 250). This impression was only strengthened when, on 13 December 1936, he made a radio broadcast on the Abdication of King Edward VIII which was perceived by many as highly critical of Edward, “like kicking a man when he was down” (Wilkinson 460). Despite Stanley Baldwin’s assertion that Lang had spoken the “voice of England” in his broadcast, “such emotional moralizing at a moment when everyone felt bruised and in need of silence was far too histrionic to be the voice of England, too judgmental to be authentically Christian” (Hastings 248). This speech, moreover, left the nation with the impression that Lang had played a greater role than is now generally surmised in prompting the Abdication, resulting in enormous animosity toward the Archbishop among the people, who booed him when he arrived at Downing Street to visit Baldwin on 6 December 1936 (Wilkinson 460).

The Archbishop's love of ceremony and elaborate costumes, along with his important social connections, did very little to amend his reputation for having a "prelatical" side and a "weakness for people of rank or importance" (Lockhart 328): he was said to have a personality that combined "unctuousness with snobbery in a way that left a bad taste in many people's mouths" (Hasting 251). That he should have given such an impression is due partly, no doubt, to his intimate relations with the monarchy, for "no Archbishop had ever been closer to the royal family than Lang" (Hastings 248). Like his father, Dr. John Marshall Lang, who had served as Queen Victoria's Chaplain in Scotland, Lang became honorary chaplain to Queen Victoria in 1896 (Ollard, Crosse, and Bond 321) and was "commanded to preach before Queen Victoria at Osborne" in 1898, thus inaugurat[ing] what became a particularly close relationship with the royal household" (Wilkinson 457). As Archbishop of York, he baptized Queen Elizabeth II, and also boasted close connections to King George V, Queen Mary, and King George VI; in fact, upon King George's death in 1936, Lang would explain to the nation that "during nearly forty years King George permitted me to look upon him as a very dear friend" ("Convocation of Canterbury, Loyal Tributes"). The relations were perhaps closer than many imagined: it was Lang, in fact, who drafted the King's last two Christmas broadcasts and his Silver Jubilee broadcast, as well as the messages given by Queen Mary following the death of the King and the abdication of her son, Edward VIII (Wilkinson 459). One religious historian remarks how "Lang was a great royalist. The whole paraphernalia of monarchy at the summit of a hierarchical society ministered to something very fundamental in his nature" (Carpenter 457), and another attributes to

Lang the role of inventing “the modern monarchy with its pageant and commitment to family values” (Starkey).

Lang’s love of ceremony and elaborate costuming was well known to the public: he was the first Archbishop of Canterbury since the time of the Reformation to wear cope and mitre (Lockhart 315; Ollard, Cross, and Bond 321-2) and the first “to make the cope the normal liturgical dress for bishops and archbishops” (Hylson-Smith 273). Lang is known also for having “catholicized” the Church of England by advocating ceremonial changes to “the main outward symbols which, in the view of both Anglican Catholics and Evangelicals, distinguished the mass of the one from the Communion of the other” (ibid.). These changes, known still as the “Six Points,” include the wearing of Eucharistic vestments, the lighting of candles on the altar, the use of wafers rather than bread for Communion, the eastward positioning of celebrant, the ceremonial mixing of water and wine in the chalice, and the use of incense. In light of these facts, it is significant that the Archbishop makes his appearance in *Three Guineas* wearing “full canonicals” and presiding over an elaborate ceremony involving the Lord Mayor, “with turtles and sheriffs in attendance, tapping nine times with his mace upon a stone” (101).¹³⁴ Her scrapbooks contain additional verbal and visual illustration of religious finery, including a photograph of the Pope on his throne (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 44) and a typewritten description of a Church service at St. Paul’s, in which she remarks on the Canon’s sermon, on “tradesmen who deal in the paraphernalia of religion,” that this is “true of the canon” as well, who, she observes, is wearing “different hood, red bands. Some have satin or plush” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 55).

Lang presided over two particular events that revealed his affinity for ceremony, ritual, and pageantry: his “enthronement” as Archbishop of Canterbury and the Coronation ceremony of King George VI (Lockhart 411). Two changes were made to ritual and symbolic aspects of Lang’s enthronement ceremony: first, a return to pre-Reformation custom in regard to how the mandate to enthronement was issued; and second, a change with “something more than a ceremonial significance,” the placing of the marble chair of St. Augustine on a special platform at the top of the stairs at the east end of the nave as a symbolic gesture of his spiritual leadership over the land (Lockhart 315). The ceremony was given the further air of a spectacle by the series of individual processions designed to “bring in the world of the arts” that had been masterminded by George Bell, Dean of Canterbury (Carpenter 446).

“Delight[ing] in the ancient rites of Church and State,” Lang’s orchestration of, and officiation at, George VI’s Coronation ceremony won the attention of the nation (Ollard, Cross, and Bond 321-2). After eight rehearsals in Westminster Abbey, the Coronation took place on 12 May 1937, the first ever to be filmed and radio broadcast (Lockhart 414). Lang noted afterward that some said truthfully that he had “produced” the Coronation, and reflected as to “whether any event in history has ever been so *realised* throughout the whole world” (Lockhart 415, 421). Observing Britons’ declining interest in the Church, Lang regarded the Coronation as an opportunity to wed Church and State: “the beginning of the return of the nation to God” (Lockhart 410). He even masterminded an Evangelistic campaign, “A Recall to Religion,” to coincide with the 1937 Coronation, asking people to “dedicate themselves with their King to the service of God and their country” (Lockhart 398); the campaign was launched during a radio

broadcast of 27 December 1936 in which he attempted to impart the spiritual significance of the Coronation ceremony, explaining it as “the commissioning of the State, through the King, by the Church, through the Archbishop” (Lockhart 409). He urged British citizens to view the Coronation as an opportunity to commit to “a new, deliberate, and sustained endeavour to arrest the drift, to arouse and strengthen the interest, to satisfy the longing [for spiritual fulfillment]” (ibid.). Woolf’s comments in her scrapbook on the Canon’s sermon record, in telegraphic shorthand, the Archbishop’s message:

Primate’s message. Whither are we going? Losing or holding the foundations of our nations life. Our blessings [sic] (money) depend on touch with him. all together must fight for the soul of England. What can we do? Primate says you each one can be a link in the chain that binds England to God. So simple. Pray habitually; open the mind daily, public worship on Sunday through the ennobling and enabling power of Jesus be a link that binds. (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 55-56)

Despite Woolf’s notoriously poor typing, her impressions of the sermon, and the Archbishop’s message, are fairly clear: “Mere fulsome and filthy playacting feeble rhetoric,” she commented.¹³⁵

The Church’s intransigent position on the subject of women’s ordination and the historic role played by the Church in women’s subordination, however, form the two heads of the large bone that Woolf wanted to “pick” with Lang in *Three Guineas*. The Church’s position on women’s ministry was made public in a series of published reports emerging from the Lambeth Conferences of 1920 and 1930 and from the subsequent Committee appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to ““examine any theological or other relevant principles which have governed or ought to govern the

Church in the development of the Ministry of Women” (qtd. in *Three Guineas* 121).

While the 1930 Lambeth Conference can be said to have taken a remarkably progressive (and well publicized) position on contraception, it simultaneously reasserted marriage laws and restricted women’s capacity to serve within the Church of England (Lockhart 349-50, 398). The report produced by the 1930 Conference included a long paragraph detailing the theological grounds for objections to women’s admission to the priesthood; while recommending that women’s role in the Church should be enlarged, it restricted their role to that of deaconesses rather than increasing their rights and privileges (Lockhart 347, 352). Church historians identify the 1930 Lambeth Conference as having dealt “a severe blow” to women (Petre 25), moreover, for reasons that stem back to the decade’s previous Conference. In 1920, the preparatory committee had determined the order of deaconess to be a holy order, with the result that many women ordained in the twenties believed themselves to be receiving holy orders (ibid.). Further confusion resulted from the Committee’s ambiguity as to the actual role of deaconesses within the Church: while they were allowed to “lead in prayer” and “instruct and exhort the congregation” with the permission of the Bishop, they were not permitted to read from the gospel or to assist with chalice, as these tasks were reserved explicitly for male deacons. Seeking to clarify this confusion, the 1930 Lambeth Conference declared deaconesses to be “outside the historic order of the ministry,” a move that would effectively disenfranchise women in the Church. It would not be until the 1968 Lambeth Conference that the role of deaconess would be officially recognized as a holy order and not until 11 November 1992 that women obtained the right to be ordained as priests in the Church of England (Petre 25).

Woolf's discussion of this historic debate over women's exclusion from the ministry is rooted in her arguments about the professionalization of the priesthood. She is careful to point out that in the early Church, the priesthood "was originally open to anyone who had received the gift of prophecy. No training was needed; the professional requirements were simple in the extreme—a voice and a market-place, a pen and paper" (*Three Guineas* 123). She goes on to show how the resulting professionalization of the priesthood would ensure the "extinction" of prophetesses, the erasure of their existence from religious history books, and the eradication of any further role for women as paid ministers of the Church. Several clippings in Woolf's scrapbooks pertain directly to her argument: one about a meeting of the Anglican Group for the Ordination of Women, at which "custom" was identified as the sole "barrier to the admission of women to the ministry" and another in which clergymen's wives are referred to as "the unpaid curates of the Church" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 49, 48).

The recently published findings of the third Commission would form the foundation of Woolf's arguments as to the existence of both a "money motive" for the exclusion of women from the priesthood and the existence of an "infantile fixation" within the its male leaders. Her intensive analysis of the *Report of the Archbishops' Commission on the Ministry of Women* yields extensive evidence of the lengths to which Church leaders and Committee members would go—in blatant disregard for the teachings of the New Testament and the traditions of the early Church—in order to attempt to justify their exclusion of women and thereby secure their own status and livelihood. Woolf viewed women's exclusion from "that profession which, since it is the highest of all, may be taken as the type of all, the profession of religion" (121) as emblematic of

women's broader exclusion from the professions, including "the priesthood of medicine or the priesthood of science" (127). Women's exclusion from the priesthood exemplified the machinations of the "infantile fixation" at work in the world: "'Miss' may carry with it . . . the savour of scent or other odour perceptible to the nose on the further side of the partition and obnoxious to it. What charms and consoles in the private house may distract and exacerbate in the public office. The Archbishops' Commission assures us that this is so in the pulpit" (50). As proof, she supplies the conclusion of the Archbishops' Commission that "it would be impossible for the male members of the average Anglican congregation to be present at a service at which a woman ministered without becoming unduly conscious of her sex" (161) and their conclusion that "the general mind of the Church is still in accord with the continuous tradition of a male priesthood" (124).¹³⁶

Women's exclusion from the profession of the priesthood calls to Woolf's mind, and to the reader's attention, a further wrong committed by that body in the past: for "the influence of religion upon women's education, one way or another, can scarcely be overestimated," she writes (152). Citing the biographies of Mary Astell and Mary Butts, Woolf recounts the Church's active efforts in centuries past to intervene in the education of women, both by obstructing the founding of women's colleges and by espousing the view that "desire for learning in woman was against the will of God" (*ibid.*). She goes on to show that the Scriptural basis for the Church's exclusion of women in the past—St. Paul's view of chastity as expressed in his Letter to the Corinthians—remains the basis upon which women continue to be excluded from education opportunity. She reflects on the historic impact of Paul's notion of chastity:

Such a conception when supported by the Angels, nature, law, custom and the Church, and enforced by a sex with a strong personal interest to enforce it, and the economic means, was of undoubted power. The grip of its white if skeleton fingers can be found upon whatever page of history we open from St. Paul to Gertrude Bell. Chastity was invoked to prevent her from studying medicine; from painting in the nude; from reading Shakespeare; from playing in orchestras; from walking down Bond Street alone. (167-68)

In what is surely one of the text's most dramatic moments, she connects the figure of Paul—and with him the whole of the Church's authority—with the figure of fascism, remarking how “he was of the virile or dominant type, so familiar at present in Germany, for whose gratification a subject race or sex is essential” (167).

Woolf invokes further skepticism over the Church's ambiguous position on war and its function as an apparatus of the State. That she should choose to foreground such criticisms in the text of *Three Guineas* suggests its overall importance to her indictment of patriarchal institutions for their role in perpetuating war. Asking whether war is “right” or “wrong,” she observes, “the Church of England, which might be supposed able to abstract the question from its worldly confusions, is of two minds also” (10). Her strategy throughout this passage is both rhetorical and political, a challenge to the Church's superior claim to morality and spirituality as well as an expose of its central role in perpetuating war. Woolf's critique is implicit in Wilfred Owen's distinction between the “pure Christianity” and “pure patriotism” that appears just two pages earlier:

I have comprehended a light which never will filter into the dogma of any national church: namely, that one of Christ's essential commands was: Passivity

at any price! Suffer dishonour and disgrace, but never resort to arms. Be bullied, be outraged, be killed; but do not kill. . . . Thus you see how pure Christianity will not fit in with pure patriotism. (qtd. in *Three Guineas* 8)

By inserting this binary into her text, Woolf gestures towards the “two minds” of the Church that could be witnessed in the daily newspapers. Woolf’s evidence of this phenomenon is drawn from newspaper clippings that appear in her scrapbooks, including two articles on a 1937 Church Assembly meeting (over which Lang presided), at which the Bishop of London, Dr. Winnington-Ingram, alleged that “the real dangers to peace of the world to-day are the pacifists” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 50) and at which the Archbishop of York, Dr. Temple, maintained that “it was probably true that the pacifist agitation was increasing the danger of war” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 49). The Archbishop of York maintained:

Christians were not committed to the position that in no circumstances whatsoever were they to take the life of their brother. But the conditions which justified that must be watched with the utmost vigilance. It could be a Christian duty to kill. That ought to be said with perfect clearness. . . . They had to consider how they could bring the world most nearly into conformity with the absolute principles of Christ. (ibid.)

These articles also relate the comments of Bishop of London on the “dangers” of extreme pacifism, which he held was “absolutely hastening war. If that had been our policy in 1914, either the German Emperor or Hitler would be in Whitehall to-day” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 49, 50). The Archbishop of York would go even further in aligning pacifism with anti-Christian behavior, arguing that those “who say that it is, as a universal principle,

unchristian to use in support of law whatever degree of force is requisite, even to the taking of life, in restraint of lawless force or violence” subscribe to a view that is “heretical in tendency” (“Pacifism and ‘Heresy,’ An Explanation”). Dr. Temple’s assertion on this occasion that “the law of love is not applicable to nations consisting in large measure of unconverted or . . . very imperfectly converted citizens” would elicit a condemnation from Charles E. Raven in *The Times*, who rightly remarked that “for Christian nations or Christian Archbishops to proclaim that ‘the law of love is not applicable’ is not only heretical in tendency but definitely an act of apostasy” (“Pacifism and ‘Heresy,’ The Law of Love”). It is interesting to note that Woolf includes photographs of both the Bishop of London and the Archbishop of York in her scrapbook (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 50).

That Woolf was aware that the view of the Church on war was consistent with that of the government can be determined from another clipping relating Minister of War Duff Cooper’s plea to “the leaders of the Church of England to denounce the ‘insidious doctrine of pacifism’ as heresy” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 24). Arguing that there is no “authority” in the Scriptures to support the belief that it is “contrary to the Christian religion to fight for anything,” and that such a belief is, moreover, “directly contrary to the whole history of the Church,” he urges that “leaders of the Church should say boldly that it is the duty of a man to defend his country and the ideals in which he has been brought up, and that in the whole history of Christianity there are no finer Christian heroes than soldiers” (ibid.). Lang himself would connect Church and State in the interest of war in his declaration that “the use of force, of the sword, by the State was the ministry of God for the protection of the people” (“The Right Use of Force”).

The Church's primary ideological alignment with the State rather than Christian doctrine led representatives of the Christian pacifist position like Dick Sheppard to accuse Church leaders of a "shattering and abysmal ignorance of what was going forward in the minds and conscience of ordinary people" and to deride "the lack of moral courage in the so-called leading men in Church and State" ("The Churches and Peace"). Sheppard would regard the Church's efforts as misplaced energy: "Rather than assure the Government of the support of Christians for its present policy, we would press it instead to abandon the rearmament proposals, and concentrate on positive peace-making based on Christian principles ("Christian Pacifism"). Such criticism was aimed directly at Lang and Temple, whose support for the Government was frequently publicized in the press.¹³⁷ Sheppard's position was consonant with that of Wilfred Owen and Virginia Woolf, who similarly held that war is "at all times and in all circumstances contrary to the mind of God" ("The Churches and Peace") and to the teachings of Christ.

Woolf calls on the Society of Outsiders to engage directly with the peaceful teachings of Christ as articulated in the New Testament, and to eschew the interpretive interventions of Church leaders and false prophets. After all, she writes, "what the Christian religion is has been laid down once and for all by the founder of that religion in words that can be ready by all. . . . It can thus safely be said that whereas few people know what medicine is, or what law is, everyone who owns a copy of the New Testament knows what religion meant in the mind of its founder" (*Three Guineas* 121). Rather than laws themselves, the words of archbishops are but "interpretations" that we are free to accept or not: "Antigone's five words," she writes—translated as "'Tis not my nature to join in hating, but in loving" (170)—are worth all the sermons of all the archbishops,"

she writes (82). Calling on the daughters of educated men to be “creative in their activities, not merely critical,” she advocates a grassroots approach to “free[ing]” the religious spirit from its present servitude” and “creat[ing] a new religion”:

By reading the New Testament in the first place and next those divines and historians whose works are all easily accessible to the daughters of educated men, they would make it their business to have some knowledge of the Christian religion and its history. Further they would inform themselves of the practice of that religion by attending Church services, by analyzing the spiritual and intellectual value of sermons; by criticizing the opinions of men whose profession is religious as freely as they would criticize the opinions of any other body of men. . . . By criticizing religion they would attempt to free the religious spirit from its present servitude and would help, if need be, to create a new religion based, it might well be, upon the new Testament, but, it might well be, very different from the religion now erected upon that basis. (113)

“His name . . . a household word throughout the land”¹³⁸: Sir Gordon Hewart

Of all the photographic subjects to appear in *Three Guineas*, the identity of Gordon Hewart has received the most extensive historical restoration for a contemporary audience, thanks to a 2003 essay appearing in *Virginia Woolf Miscellany*. In “The Lord Chief Justice and the Woolfs,” Stuart N. Clarke concludes:

As far as Virginia Woolf herself is concerned, the Lord Chief Justice was not just a pillar of the establishment, not just a name, not just a representative of the male order of things—but a real person, one whom she had read about in the

newspapers, one whom she had heard about from relations and friends, and one whom she had watched in action, dressed in red robes, and meting out what perhaps only *he* thought was justice. . . . Her attack on Gordon Hewart in *Three Guineas* was not just an advisedly subtle attack but an informed attack. (24)

Clarke's essay goes on to trace the criss-crossing paths of both Woolfs and the Lord Chief Justice, painstakingly documenting references in her letters and diaries and his autobiography to several prominent cases over which Hewart had presided during the twenties and thirties: the much-publicized murder trial of Edith Thompson and Freddy Bywaters (1922) and the libel trials of Marie Stopes (1923), Count Potocki de Montalk (1932), and Rose Macaulay (1936).¹³⁹ As I argue in Chapter 3, Woolf's awareness of, and participation in, public debates over libel and obscenity during the period in which she was writing *Three Guineas* suggests an additional motivation behind her decision to use photographs in this work: they allowed her to comment on specific male establishment figures while circumventing the very real threats of libel and sedition. Limiting his attention to those trials for which we possess "direct evidence" (15) of Woolf's interest (in the form of diary entries and letters), however, Clarke necessarily is forced to omit many aspects of Hewart's career likely to have had cultural and historical significance for Woolf and her readers.¹⁴⁰ Most important among these aspects, and to the present discussion, is Hewart's direct involvement in cases leading to the significant expansion of State powers, the erosion of individual civil liberties, and the suppression of political dissent.

Serving as Attorney General in Lloyd George's Coalition government, a position he held from 1919-22 immediately preceding his promotion to the position of Lord Chief

Justice in 1922, Gordon Hewart had been intimately involved with reversing and amending war time legislation (Jackson 87). In 1920, Hewart moved for a second reading of the Official Secrets Act of 1911. While the 1911 Act had referred quite clearly to espionage, the vaguely worded changes proposed in the 1920 Act were widely denounced as potentially threatening to civil liberties and freedom of the press (Anderson 15-16), a subject of immediate concern to Woolf, who observes in *Three Guineas* that “the power of the Press to burke discussion of any undesirable subject was, and still is, very formidable,” a reference to its recent silence over the controversy surrounding the Contributory Pensions Bill (*Three Guineas* 162). The proposed clause of particular concern to members of the Press was one that would “provide machinery by which the recipient of official information could be compelled to reveal to the police the source from which he obtained it” (Kidd 88). Hewart rejected accusations that the amended act “seemed to give the government the power to declare any document ‘prejudicial to the safety or interests of the State’ and thereby keep the press from publishing or even possessing it” and that it was “a veiled attack on the individual’s rights of public information” (Anderson 16, 17). A contemporary of Hewart, M.P. Sir Donald Maclean, opposed the proposed revisions on the grounds that they were tantamount to direct censorship:

The bill would give the government a power of press censorship of unwarranted degree and would militate against the public service that the press could otherwise provide. The right to decide what was prejudicial to the state was to be left to the courts, and justice might be long delayed. The government could then control

news even for purely political reasons, knowing that the delay involved in a court decision would be as effective as strict censorship. (qtd. in Anderson 16)

As General Secretary of the Council for Civil Liberties Ronald Kidd pointed out, in spite of such theoretical assurances by Hewart and others of the bill's supporters, in practice the Act was used as "a convenient instrument for the assertion of bureaucratic authority, . . . for political purposes, to check the freedom of the Press and even to limit free discussion in the House of Commons (91). In 1937, the National Campaign for Civil Liberties undertook a campaign against "misuse" of the law, which led lawmakers in 1939 to amend its language, thereby restricting its applicability to "acts of espionage" (Anderson 22, 19).¹⁴¹ Still Hewart would preside over just such a case in 1938, in which a journalist, Ernest Lewis, was prosecuted under the Official Secrets Act of 1920 for declining to reveal his sources—a decision that led to an outcry among Members of Parliament, and making it so that "much frenzied Government activity was needed to redeem the promise of Hewart the politician in 1920 and by-pass the judgment of Hewart the judge in 1938" (Jackson 324).

During the mid-1930s, Hewart presided over two appeals cases brought before the Divisional Court that would directly involve him in controversy over the suppression of individual civil liberties.¹⁴² These two cases, *Thomas v. Sawkins* and *Duncan v. Jones*, form part of the "great quartet of public order cases in English law," which also includes *Wise v. Dunning* and *Beatty v. Gillbanks* (Williams 118). The facts of *Thomas v. Sawkins* have been summarized as follows.¹⁴³ Alun Thomas, a member of the Communist Party, had organized a meeting in South Wales for 17 August 1934 to protest the Incitement to Disaffection Bill that was then under parliamentary review. Despite the fact that the

Home Secretary, Sir John Gilmour, had just two months earlier affirmed before the House of Commons that “unless the promoters of a meeting ask the police to be present in the actual meeting, they cannot go in unless they have reason to believe that an actual breach of the peace is being committed in the meeting” (Williams 118-19), police present at Thomas’s peaceful meeting refused to leave in spite of being asked to do so, claiming that their knowledge of the group and its members had given them sufficient cause to suspect that a breach of peace *would* occur. Hewart quickly dismissed the case, maintaining that police entry to private property was justified in circumstances in which an officer has “reasonable ground for believing that an offence is imminent or is likely to be committed” (Williams 122).¹⁴⁴

Ronald Kidd would refer to this case, and that of *Duncan v. Jones*, as examples of “judge-made law”: “High Court decisions which may have the result of reducing or abolishing certain civil rights,” though not explicitly codified as laws themselves (20). The result of this ruling was “a constitutional innovation” (Goodheart 22), for the Court’s decision was not “a clarification or explanation of the law as it had existed from time immemorial, but . . . it enunciated a new and unheard of principle in British law in regard to the right of police entry to private premises on the mere apprehension in a policeman’s mind of some hypothetical offence that might or might not be committed at some future time” (Kidd 28). Commenting on the practical import of the ruling, another legal commentator writes: “the discretion of the police remains unimpaired by the decision, but the potential scope for its exercise is enlarged: though all sorts of issues were left unclear, including the meaning of breach of the peace, whether the rule applied to *public* meetings only, and the basis of intervention” (Williams 123).

What made this ruling particularly offensive to civil rights advocates was the quite evident double standard in how it was being applied in practice, as police were more likely to intervene in meetings of the Communist Party, unemployed workers' groups, and anti-war groups than those of fascist organizations like the B.U.F.¹⁴⁵ Kidd and Goodheart have noted that Sir John Gilmour's articulation of police policy before the House of Commons in June 1934, following upon the heels of the violent B.U.F. rally at Olympia that took place earlier that month, appears to have been a defense of what many regarded as a failure on the part of police to intervene in a situation in which a breach of peace clearly *had been* taking place (Kidd 124-25; Goodheart 22). That police would refuse to leave Alun Thomas's meeting, despite his request that they do so and in spite of its having been a peaceful meeting, just two months after Gilmour's statement was issued, suggests something of the arbitrary nature of police decision making on this matter during this period. This discrepancy in the application of the law is made further apparent in the events surrounding the much-publicized B.U.F. rally held at the Royal Albert Hall in 1936. While approximately 2,000 officers were positioned at the anti-Fascist demonstration outside where the rally was taking place, only thirty officers were positioned inside the Hall itself; eyewitness accounts maintain, moreover, that those thirty officers repeatedly refused to intervene amidst escalating Blackshirt violence, despite being asked for assistance by several members of the crowd (Kidd 126-27; Ewing and Gearty 295-302).

The second of these important trials, *Duncan v. Jones*, extended to police the authority to ban public meetings that were seen as being likely to cause a breach of the peace. The facts of the case have been described consistently as follows. On 30 July

1934, Mrs. Katherine Sinclair Duncan, a member of the National Unemployed Workers' Movement, had organized a public meeting outside a training center for unemployed workers on the topic of "defend[ing] the right of free speech and public meeting" (E.C.S. Wade 179). Because a prior meeting held fourteen months earlier at the same location had resulted in a "disturbance" inside the training center, a training center administrator called on police to put a stop to the meeting. When instructed by police to move her platform to a nearby location, Mrs. Duncan refused and subsequently was arrested and charged with "obstructing the police in the execution of their duty" (Kidd 23). As a 22 September 1934 article in the *New Statesman* explained, "her arrest was justified on the ground that she might have said something, had she been allowed to speak, which would have led to a breach of the peace" (qtd. in Kidd 23). The legal issue in *Duncan v. Jones* hinged on the question of whether, and in what circumstances, police possessed the authority to prevent a political meeting from taking place, since "before this decision, the police could intervene to prevent a meeting being held only when a breach of the peace actual or contemplated at the meeting then assembled was in issue" or when a gathering obstructed traffic (E.C.S. Wade 179). Two relevant facts obtain in this case: first, the meeting was being held on a *cul-de-sac*, making moot any argument as to traffic obstruction; and second, "no breach of the peace, actual or contemplated as occurring by reason of the present meeting, was in question" (Kidd 22; E.C.S. Wade 178). Hewart again was to dismiss the appeal after only a hasty hearing, affirming police authority in the matter, which resulted in "a decision which is as noteworthy today for the vacuity of its reasoning as for its long term deleterious effect on civil liberties. The case is well

known for the latter, and frequently applied by the police, though its historical context has long been forgotten” (Ewing and Gearty 265).¹⁴⁶

The theoretical and practical consequences of this decision, which provided “a source of open-ended police power to restrict civil liberties” (Ewing and Gearty 274), were as devastating for the private individual as for groups holding marginalized views. As Ronald Kidd writes, this decision “establishes the precedent that the police have power to ban any political meeting in streets or public places at will. . . . The police are set up by this judgment as the arbiters of what political parties or religious sects shall and shall not be accorded the rights of freedom of speech and freedom of assembly” (24). An effect of this decision was to further disenfranchise those with limited economic resources, as another legal commentator has noted: “Since *Duncan V. Jones* the net has closed entirely upon those who from lack of resources, or for other reasons, desire to hold meetings in public places. The result is that there is now no assurance, unless police permission is secured in advance, that a meeting can be held anywhere in a public place” (E.C.S. Wade 179). The decisions of the Divisional Court on both matters was to confer an unprecedented authority upon the State to intervene in civil affairs, leading one commentator to reflect that “had the police sought a general power of this nature from the Legislature, no House of Commons in the twentieth century would have been willing to grant it. . . . Both *Thomas v. Sawkins* and *Duncan v. Jones* are certainly powerful weapons in the hands of the Administration” (ibid.).

Woolf’s emphasis on those “cheap and so far unforbidden instruments” that the Outsider might use to “put her opinion into practice” (*Three Guineas* 98) can be read as an acknowledgment of the above recent legislation, and an attempt to circumvent it. “The

private printing press is an actual fact, and not beyond the reach of a moderate income. Typewriters and duplicators are actual facts and even cheaper,” she remarks (ibid.). Private meetings, furthermore, may take the place of public ones, now that “you have a room, not necessarily ‘cosy’ or ‘handsome’ but still silent, private; a room where safe from publicity and its poison you could, even asking a reasonable fee for the service, speak the truth” (98). It is from here this place, and through these means, that women of even the most limited means can learn to “speak freely as free people should” (125).

Historical and legal commentaries make frequent reference to Hewart’s reputation for arbitrary and capricious decision-making. When Lord Caldecote succeeded Hewart as Lord Chief Justice in 1941, it was said that

He succeeded to a great office which had become somewhat tarnished during the occupancy of his predecessor. Hewart was perhaps the worst Lord Chief Justice of England since the seventeenth century. Although no imputation of corruption or dishonesty could be brought against him, as against Scroggs and Jeffreys, on the bench he rivaled them in arbitrary and unjudicial behavior. The author of the famous dictum that “justice must not only be done, but manifestly and obviously be seen to be done” was incapable of securing its observance in his own court.

(Heuston 603-4)

Leonard Woolf’s condemnation of Hewart in *Downhill All the Way* makes it equally clear that his reputation as “one of the least satisfactory holders of the office” (Blom-Cooper and Morris, 123 note 38) was one well established during his legendary tenure.

Reflecting on Hewart’s behavior at the obscenity trial of Count Potocki de Montalk, Woolf writes:

I dare say that in private life Gordon Hewart, 1st Baron Hewart, Lord Chief Justice of England, was a nice man, a good husband and father, a good club man, a pleasant man to play a round of golf with. I watched him ‘doing justice’ in the Appeal Court for the better part of a day and he seemed to me—and still seems to me—a typical example of a High Court judge suffering from the occupational disease of sadistic, vindictive self-righteousness. His treatment of the unfortunate Mr Y [Count Potocki de Montalk] was disgraceful. (*Downhill* 136-37)

In spite of the fact that Jack Hutchinson “made a good speech and showed to any unbiased person that the sentence [three months’ imprisonment for a first offense] was monstrously excessive in relation to the offence,” Hewart “rejected the appeal with . . . self-righteous self-satisfaction” (*Downhill* 138), a decision that Leonard regarded as a “judicial injustice” and “a grossly inequitable judgment” resulting from Hewart’s bias against Potocki (*Downhill* 212). Leonard’s statements are consistent with the portrait painted by Hewart’s biographer of a man who, having “been all his life a partisan, in politics as well as in the courts,” “exhibited a tendency to take sides in cases that came before him” (Jackson 157).

Robert Jackson observes that Hewart’s “autocratic and irascible bearing in court” had become “more and more noticeable by 1928,” which resulted in his public censure by the Bar Council in that same year (197-99). Later that year, Jackson writes, Hewart’s behavior at the much-publicized trial of William Cooper Hobbs “confirmed in the Temple a feeling that on occasions the Chief was far too hasty in his judgments. From the start of the trial the Chief took a violent dislike to the plaintiff, and all through seemed determined to frustrate his attempt to obtain justice. His conduct of the trial was testy,

vindictive, and far from impartial” (199). “Those who saw him on the Bench and did not know him though him a formidable pocket despot whose benevolence was a veneer; kindly when he was so disposed, but easily ruffled” (Jackson 295).

Leonard maintained that his similar experience with Hewart only confirmed his earlier view, expressed in *Sowing*, as to the cruel tendencies of members of the judiciary:

I have always felt that the occupational disease of judges is cruelty, sadistic self-righteousness, and the higher the judge the more criminal he tends to become. It is one more example of the absolute corruption of absolute power. One rarely sees in the faces of less exalted persons the sullen savagery of so many High Court judges’ faces. Their judgments, *obiter dicta*, and sentences too often show that the cruel arrogance of the face only reflects the pitiless malevolence of the soul. (qtd. in Woolf, *Downhill* 136)

And yet, the public face presented by Hewart was far more complex than a review of these legal cases suggests. For apart from his reputation for arbitrary legal decisions, Hewart was known widely as a skilled, learned orator, who had by the 1920s earned a reputation as “the best after-dinner speaker in London” (Jackson 291): “a well-known establishment figure for his public pronouncements” (Clarke, “Lord Chief Justice” 15) as much as for his judicial ones. Given that Woolf’s knowledge of Hewart was largely constructed through the glimpses of him provided by the news media (Clarke, “Lord Chief Justice” 24), any reconstruction of his historical and cultural significance requires that we examine both the nature of his “public pronouncements” and their representation in the Press.

Regularly recorded and reprinted in the newspapers that Woolf read, and from which she drew inspiration and evidence for the text of *Three Guineas*, Hewart's witty toasts, addresses, and speeches would serve as a point of departure for many of Woolf's attacks in *Three Guineas*. Hewart's direct function in the text is to define "what patriotism means to an educated man and what duties it imposes upon him" (*Three Guineas* 9), a task Woolf achieves through extensive quotation of his toast before the Royal Society of St. George. While the toast famously celebrates England as the "home" of liberty and democracy, it also explicitly connects patriotism with men's educational and professional opportunity, as seen in the lines: "Englishmen are proud of England. For those who have been trained in English schools and English universities, and who have done the work of their lives in England, there are few loves stronger than the love we have for our country" (ibid.). That the source material for this speech, in the form of newspaper clippings, should appear twice in the scrapbooks (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 3, 12) further suggests the importance of these remarks to Woolf's argument. Her narrative supplies a model for the kinds of questions that patriotic speech such as Hewart's ought to produce:

The educated man's sister—what does 'patriotism' mean to her? Has she the same reasons for being proud of England, for loving England, for defending England? Has she been 'greatly blessed' in England? History and biography when questioned would seem to show that her position in the home of freedom has been different from her brother's. . . . Therefore her interpretation of the word 'patriotism' may well differ from his. And that difference may make it extremely difficult for her to understand his definition of patriotism and the duties it

imposes. It seems plain that we think differently according as we are born differently; there is a Grenfell point of view; a Knebworth point of view; a Wilfred Owen point of view; a Lord Chief Justice's point of view and the point of view of an educated man's daughter. (*Three Guineas* 9)

The direct product of this line of inquiry emerges only later in the book, at which point Woolf predicts the way that the daughters of educated men will interpret the findings of their inquiries: "All these facts will convince her reason (to put it in a nutshell) that her sex and class has very little to thank England for in the past" and "not much to thank England for in the present," and "she will find that she has no good reason to ask her brother to fight on her behalf to protect 'our' country. . . . 'For,' 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" (108, 109).

To those whose knowledge of Hewart extends no further than his role as Lord Chief Justice or a Liberal M.P.—one of the two parties "to which the educated woman's brother belonged" (*Three Guineas* 44)—it will come as some surprise to discover his longstanding record as a supporter of women's suffrage and rights, and as a vocal advocate of divorce and marriage law reforms benefiting women.¹⁴⁷ He was, it appears, a figure not without some contradiction. When Viscountess Rhondda, following her inheritance of a peerage from her father in 1922, requested a formal writ allowing her admission to the House of Lords, then Attorney General Gordon Hewart argued before a committee of his peers that the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act of 1919 extended to women the right of admission to the House of Lords. When the committee voted in favor of her admission, Lord Birkenhead forced a re-vote that reversed the decision and barred

women from entering until the passage of the Life Peerages Act in 1958 and barred hereditary peeresses from entering until the passage of the Peerage Act of 1963 (Sharpe and McMahon 69-70). It was to this defeat that Hewart refers in his address before the women students of Roedean School in 1923: “it is not all of us who are to blame if for a little longer they are prevented from sitting and voting in the House of Lords” (“School Speech Days”). It appears, moreover, that Hewart’s support of women’s rights and causes extended beyond any occupational obligation to interpret the law. While the cause of women’s suffrage gained support among men in many quarters only as a result of women’s service during the Great War, an assertion made by Hewart in 1918 that he was no “wartime convert to women’s suffrage” indicates that his support predated the war (qtd. in Pugh 119).

It is to the Hewart’s credit that interspersed throughout his patriotic speeches are frequent allusions to women’s repression. Amidst his toast to the Royal Society of St. George on the themes of liberty and justice, for instance, is his remark that the Englishman “would not deny that the long progress towards justice and liberty has sometimes seemed to hesitate and has even been deliberately thwarted. He is not blind to the fact that the yielding of what is due has sometimes appeared to be reluctant and belated” (“England” 40). His view of justice, moreover, expressed in the following lines—“It is so hard to remember that the ideal of liberty is not merely that men shall be free,” he writes, “but also that they shall be willing and eager for others to be free” (“The Meaning of Democracy”)—resonates with those lines of Josephine Butler quoted by Woolf in *Three Guineas*: “Our claim was no claim of women’s rights only,” but “a claim for the rights of all—all men and women—to the respect in their persons of the great

principles of Justice and Equality and Liberty” (102). And in a speech made just four years after the passage of the Sex Disqualification (Removal) Act of 1919, he remarks how “side by side with somewhat recent developments in the education of women, and quite manifestly in no small measure in consequence of them, there has been taking place a gradual and remarkable, although hitherto incomplete, removal of barriers in the path of women’s careers” (“School Speech Days”).

Hewart was no pacifist, however, and Woolf is likely to have been familiar with his indictment of Ramsay MacDonald on that count during the 1918 Coupon Election, which helped Hewart secure victory as the Coalition candidate for Leicester. As Hewart’s biographer relates,

MacDonald’s well-publicized pacifist activities during the War had been anathema to Hewart, and he flayed MacDonald in language of the utmost severity. MacDonald, he has, had put an odious stain and stigma upon the fair name of Leicester. . . . I don’t ask you, “Do you any longer desire that he should be called your representative in the House of Commons?” I ask you rather, “Who shall repay him for what he has done?” Greater disservice no man ever did his country in the hour of her greatest need. (Jackson 85-86)

Following his promotion after this election to the position of Attorney General, Hewart “became Lloyd George’s close confidant and his advisor, not only on legal matters, but in the domestic and international fields” (Jackson 87). Hewart was located at the center of diplomatic efforts to dictate the terms of a highly controversial Peace. “All through the complicated and amorphous negotiations between the victors of the War and the vanquished, Hewart stood at, or was summoned to, Lloyd George’s elbow,” his

biographer writes, noting his attendance at preliminary deliberations of the Peace Conference in Paris and his role as a signer of the Peace Treaty on behalf of Britain (116). At the outset of the Second World War, Hewart reflected with regret on the course of events that would give birth to National Socialism in Germany. “The world seems to have been half mad in 1919. . . . Those who seemed to have complete power in their hands could not, at the moment, bring themselves to think of change” (qtd. in Jackson 116).

Like Baldwin’s writings on the same subject, and as was undoubtedly a common theme of mid-thirties writing, Hewart represents fascism as a foreign product that threatened to invade England:

To-day democratic institutions are under fire all over Europe and the elementary liberties of speech and movement are being flouted. The persecution of minorities—that easy pastime—is being widely pursued. The free expression of opinion is being crushed by censorship and control. Free action is stifled in a party uniform. These insidious influences have hitherto hardly penetrated into England. (“The Bud of Liberty” 46)

Hewart’s vision of fascism, however, differs from that of Baldwin in that it admits of the existence a corrupting influence within the perimeters of the nation. “It is true that in our midst there are many enemies of liberty—some of them in rather unexpected quarters,” he writes (*ibid.*). In a similar vein, he had enjoined his listeners at a 1926 commemoration of Magna Carta to recognize the many forms that tyranny could take: “Do not let us forget that tyranny is not always or of necessity the tyranny of Kings or rulers. Do not let us forget that tyranny may be exercised by various classes of bodies and individuals, that

it may take many different forms, and that it may appear from rather unexpected quarters” (“Lord Hewart on Magna Carta”). Hewart’s best-known work, *The New Despotism* (1929), decried an abuse of Executive authority in just such terms, alleging that its goal was to “subordinate Parliament, to evade the Courts, and to the render to will, or the caprice, of the Executive unfettered and supreme” (17).

As the head of the British legal system, Gordon Hewart was figure closest to the physical embodiment of Law, and it is ultimately for this offense that he is tried in *Three Guineas*. In his role as creator and enforcer of the Law, Hewart is cast as a modern-day Creon, who, we are told by Woolf, “held that ‘disobedience is the worst of evils,’ and that ‘whomsoever the city may appoint, that man must be obeyed, in little things and great, in just things and unjust’” (*Three Guineas* 170). She goes on to align these attitudes with fascism, noting that “it is easy to squeeze these characters into up-to-date dress” (ibid.). The phrase is compelling in light of the photograph of Hewart included in the text and the verbal portrait provided in the scrapbooks, which describes Hewart as “wearing scarlet and ermine robes and full-bottomed wigs surmounted by black caps” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 61). Citing the actions of disobedient women from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries as examples of “endeavours of an experimental kind to discover what are the unwritten laws,” Woolf gestures toward a future in which an active questioning of patriarchal Law will replace strict adherence to it: “That such laws exist, and are observed by civilized people, is fairly generally allowed,” she observes:

But it is beginning to be agreed that they were not laid down by “God,” who is now very generally held to be a conception, of patriarchal origin, valid only for certain races, at certain stages and times; nor by nature, who is now known to

vary greatly in her commands and to be largely under control; but have to be discovered afresh by successive generations, largely by their own efforts of reason and imagination. (*Three Guineas* 184-85)

The infinite mutability of Law in the interests of power: a law of Woolf's own, and *Three Guineas* her attempt "to share the results" of her feminist "discoveries" (185) in the law.

Coda: “Belong[ing] to the World”: Pacifism and the Transnational Imaginary in Late Modernism

The dominant narrative of the late modernist period is invariably androcentric in its emphasis on the political tendencies of right-leaning male modernists including Ezra Pound, T. S. Eliot, D. H. Lawrence, and W. B. Yeats. Yet at the back of this oft-repeated tale of rightward male migration, of “fascist modernism,” lie other, equally true stories: the story of widespread resistance to fascism by both male and female members of the European intellectual community; the story of the ideological battle between anti-fascism and pacifism that confronted left-leaning modernists; and the story of the pacifist minority whose resolve miraculously remained intact, and in some cases was strengthened, during the interwar period. While the division between “fascist” modernism and what might be called a “pacifist” modernism is not clearly cut along gender lines, anti-militarist content is particularly pervasive in late modernist literature written by women: a fact that helps account for the critical erasure of this tradition from later accounts of modernism, given that “influential critics and scholars have constructed a twentieth-century literary history that depends on categories that erase most women’s writing of the 1930s” and that “thirties women’s writing has had little claim to the reserved public spaces that structure scholarly discussion” (Bluemel 65).

Though much of it is out of print, a vast body of literature indeed exists that testifies to women’s preoccupation during the period with the problems posed by both fascism and the threat of another world war. Among those little-known prose works devoted to anti-fascism are two dystopian novels, Storm Jameson’s *In the Second Year* (1936) and Katharine Burdekin’s *Swastika Night* (1937); Sylvia Townsend Warner’s

Spanish Civil War novel, *After the Death of San Juan* (1938); Mary Borden's *Passport for a Girl* (1939); Jean Rhys's *Good Morning Midnight* (1939); Sally Carson's *If She is Wise* (1935); and Sarah Champion's *Duet for Female Voices* (1936). It should be noted that the boundaries between anti-fascist and anti-militarist works in this period are frequently blurred: a testament to the very interconnectedness of the subjects of patriarchy, fascism, and militarism. In addition to Virginia Woolf's *The Years* (1937), *Three Guineas* (1938), and "Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid" (1940) notable pacifist works of the late modernist period written by women also include Vera Brittain's *Testament of Youth* (1933) and her "Letters to Peace-Lovers" series (1939-45); Katharine Burdekin's *Quiet Ways* (1930) and *Proud Man* (1934); and H.D.'s *The Hedgehog* (1936), *Madrigal* (1939), *Tribute to Freud* (1942), *Trilogy* (1944-46), and *The Sword Went out to Sea* (Synthesis of a Dream) (1946-48). Rather than representing a homogenous approach to the problem of how to prevent war, these works form part of a largely submerged cultural discourse that seeks to define peace as well as part of a largely submerged literary tradition that uses writing to reflect upon, and model, ethical and imaginative forms of social engagement that lead to peace. By way of both illustration and conclusion, I examine evidence of these pacifist discourses and practices in several works by Virginia Woolf and H.D., works that gesture also towards the presence of a nascent transnational imaginary within late modernism.

In response to her male correspondent's request that she sign a manifesto in favor of culture and intellectual liberty, the narrator of *Three Guineas* retorts, "some more energetic, some more active method of expressing our belief that war is barbarous, that war is inhuman, that war, as Wilfred Owen put it, is insupportable, horrible and beastly

seems to be required” (12). The horror of the atrocity photographs “demands something more positive than a name written on a sheet of paper; an hour spent listening to speeches; a cheque written for whatever sum we can afford” (ibid.). Women’s contribution to the cause of peace, she maintains, must be something more “positive,” more “active,” more “energetic” than these tired, old forms of political involvement: a contribution rooted in women’s private knowledge of human nature and tied intimately to what Gertrude Stein calls “the business of daily living” (“The Winner Loses” 637). What was needed, Woolf wrote in a letter to Ethel Smyth, was for individuals to “enlarge the imaginative” (*L6* 234-35). By focusing one’s attention on the reality of distant events and the suffering of others, acts of sympathetic imagining can help dissolve the indifference that separates “us” from “them” and that allows us to overlook the human costs of war. “I suppose the bombs are falling on rooms like this in Warsaw,” she noted in 1939, early on in the war (*D5* 233). “I try to imagine how one’s killed by a bomb,” she would write later. “I’ve got it fairly vividly—the sensation” (*D5* 326-27).

Woolf’s “enlarg[ing] of the imaginative” can be viewed as part of the Outsider’s obligation to “experiment not with public means in public but with private means in private” through experiments that she describes as not “merely critical but creative” (*Three Guineas* 113). This “private” approach to the prevention of war is one advocated in the writings of H.D. as well, who can be viewed as espousing “a politics that begins with the personal, with human relationships” founded on her “identification with those left out of the cultural mainstream,” both central to her construction of a “modernism of the margins” (“Scattered Remnant” 115, 104). H.D.’s most extensive meditation on the proper relation of the private and public spheres appears in her own pacifist manifesto,

The Sword Went out to Sea (Synthesis of a Dream) (1946-48), which recounts her experience living in London during the Battle of Britain. She writes:

If you have consolation, do not try to share it, but eventually, if you are consoled or integrated, you help console and integrate the scattered remnant. I don't think society can be reconstructed from the outside. I have said if there is comfort, it is solitary. When the ego or centre of our amorphous, scattered personality crystallizes out, then and only then, are we of use to ourselves and to other people. I have said it is *sauve qui peut*, even for the best of us. In saving oneself, one creates a shell, not the isolated highly individual spiral-shell I spoke of, but a minute coral-shell, one of a million, or a single wax-cell of the honeycomb. (67)

The connection for H.D. between the intrapersonal and the interpersonal is nowhere made clearer than in *Tribute to Freud* (1942), in which she attributes her desire “to fight in the open, war, its cause and effect” (142) with her decision to undergo psychotherapy with Freud in 1932 and again in 1934, and which allowed her to witness firsthand the escalating signs of fascism in Vienna during that time. “I had begun my preliminary research in order to fortify and equip myself to face war when it came,” she writes, “and to help in some subsidiary way, if my training were sufficient and my aptitudes suitable, with war-shocked and war-shattered people (*Tribute to Freud* 142).¹⁴⁸

Both H.D. and Woolf demonstrate in practice what acts of independent thinking and writing might accomplish. Equivalent to Woolf's conviction that her thinking was her particular form of “fighting” is H.D.'s remark that writing *The Sword* was “a fight to the finish,” that made her feel as if “I have a gattling gun in my hands” (qtd. in Hogue and Vandivere xxi). In H.D.'s war poem, “The Walls Do Not Fall” (1942), H.D.

mythologizes the eternal battle between the pen and the sword and triumphantly declares Word the winner. To those “whom seem to imply / that we will soon be swept aside, / crumpled rags, no good for banner-stuff, / no fit length for a bandage,” she counters that “other values were revealed to us,” we “companions of the flame” (520-21), for “we are the keepers of the secret, the carriers, the spinners / of the rare intangible thread that binds all humanity to ancient wisdom, to antiquity” (522-23): a role that H.D. assumes consistently throughout her war sequence, *Trilogy*, and her prose works, particularly in *The Sword* (1946-48), which connects World War II London with ancient Greek, Roman, and Aztec civilizations, and *Palimpsest* (1926), which links contemporary London and Egypt with ancient Rome. Just as Septimus Warren Smith’s compulsion to “write it down” bespeaks an implicit faith in the act of recording and transmitting his revelation, H.D. offers poetry up as vehicle for the transmission of both divine and more mundane truths. Writing’s potential as a “culture-creating activity” (Boulding 1) is all but assured us by the fact that even “small verses,” written about “things that in no way matter,” are said to “dye all existence with their colour” (“The Walls” 226). For as Woolf reminds us, “Words are dangerous things, let us remember. A republic might be brought into being by a poem” (“Royalty” 240).

The composition of *The Sword Went out to Sea (Synthesis of a Dream)* (1946-8), H.D.’s autobiographical novel documenting her real-life forays into spiritualism during the Second World War, are motivated by a similar desire to record and transmit anti-war messages she allegedly received throughout the summer of 1945 from a group of Royal Air Force pilots killed during the 1940 Battle of Britain.¹⁴⁹ This desire is informed by a sense of duty and honor, as she explains: “if we have contacted or believe we have

contacted, any being of the higher spheres, even if the messages have now ceased, we have a duty, the duty of recording our experience. I have tried to do that” (*Sword* 128). Distinctly pacifist in nature, the pilots are motivated by a desire to “stop the bombs altogether” (*Sword* 47). Like the simple wording of Septimus Warren Smith’s thoughts, their message is “presented in such a way, that a child could understand the message” (“HD by Delia Alton” 187), and “though sent to one,” the message “is yet pertinent to the thousands, the millions who directly or indirectly were participants in the war” (“HD by Delia Alton” 186). She would explain, in a letter to Richard Aldington, “that the world was, perhaps is and possibly will be ‘crashing to extinction,’ if those in authority, no matter where or who, don’t stop smashing up things with fly-bombs, V2 and the ubiquitous (possibly) so called ‘atom’. . . . What I HAD to say at that point, with whatever paraphernalia I had right at hand, was that WAR had got to stop” (Zilboorg 92).

In works by Woolf and H.D., pacifist sentiments are invariably articulated by a character who wears a badge of his or her status as an Outsider, whether on the basis of his or her sexuality, as in *Paint it Today* and *Mrs. Dalloway*; her nationality, as in “Murex” and *The Hedgehog*; his or her war-time experiences, as in *Asphodel* or *Mrs. Dalloway*; her exclusion from institutionalized power structures, as in *Three Guineas*; or on the basis of her pacifism, as in *Paint It Today* and *The Sword Went Out to Sea*. That transcendent visions of human existence are available to the disinterested Outsider alone forms an essential part of the argument of *Three Guineas*, in which women’s exclusion from traditional realms of political power forms the foundation of what Susan Stanford Friedman calls Woolf’s “early feminist formulation of a locational politics” in which she “implicitly advocates a transnational oppositional identity that replaces patriotism”

(*Mappings* 118). Both H.D. and Woolf participate in this kind of transnationalist vision, in which the words “country” and “patriotism,” like the word “feminism” in *Three Guineas*, are destroyed as part of a larger process of reclaiming a women’s language and world view. In *Paint it Today* (1921), Midget describes her epiphanic moment of love for the world as a kind of transnationalist “patriotism”: “She was feeling patriotic. The world is a country, she thought, and I do not wish to see the world perish. I do not wish to see the world knocked out by another world. Yes, I am patriotic. This is the way my landlady in Bloomsbury used to feel about England and Germany” (74-75). Hermione’s own epiphany in *Asphodel* is one in which geographic boundaries are erased, in which “the whole world had melted,” and she “perceived a world outside or inside the world, part of the world, as the moon-nebula is part of the moon, part of the world and yet not part of the world” (182-83). It is only once claims upon their “unreal loyalties” have been erased through death that the RAF pilots, who had once “belonged exclusively to England,” now are said to “belong to the world” (*Sword* 99).

Discovering unity entails dismantling notions of self and other and re-thinking the arbitrary and artificial “innumerable divisions and distinctions,” the “chalk marks,” that result from the inflated male ego and that lead to the perpetuation of war (Woolf, M29 later typescript 54). “As for your Apostles,” Woolf wrote to Julian Bell, “much though I respect them singly, I begin to think that these societies do more harm than good, merely by rousing jealousies and vanities. What d’you think? it seems to me the wrong way to live, drawing chalk marks round ones feet” (*L6* 20). Woolf maintained that it would be easier for women than men to “rub out all the chalk marks,” given British women’s tenuous hold on their citizenship, “since by a merciful dispensation of our brothers we are

still only imperfectly nationalised—since if we marry a foreigner our Englishness fades like a mist” (Woolf, M29 later typescript 50), thus freeing them from the constraints of “patriotic prejudices” (ibid.) Women’s position as outsiders thus leads directly to their dismantling the very notion of “otherness” so essential to the justification of war and exploitation. The implications are profound: “if he says he is fighting to protect England from foreign rule, she will reflect that for her there are no ‘foreigners,’ since by law she becomes a foreigner if she marries a foreigner. And she will do her best to make this a fact, not by forced fraternity, but by human sympathy” (*Three Guineas* 108). The “positive love of all countries” (Woolf, M28 holograph 14), the feminine antithesis to “the educated man’s habit of creating little groups” (M28 typescript 52), is the logical correlative of women’s position as social outsiders and their unpaid-for education in “the power of sympathy” (qtd. in Radin, *Evolution* 73). The narrator condenses this logical proof in the final version to her penultimate feminist pacifist formula: “As a woman, I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman my country is the whole world” (109).

In the excised 1917 section of *The Years*, Woolf elaborates on the “power of sympathy” that is part of women’s unpaid-for education. Nicholas argues for the superiority of this education, which develops the “whole soul” or “whole being” rather than simply a part:

“The soul---the whole being. . . . It wishes to expand; to adventure; to form—new combinations. . . . Whereas now,”—he drew himself together; put his feet together; he looked like an old lady who is afraid of mice—“this is how we live,

screwed up into one hard little, tight little—knot? . . . Each is his own little cubicle; each with his own cross or holy book; each with his fire, his wife.” (293)

Woolf would argue that the soul’s ability to expand and grow is crucial to personal accomplishment, interpersonal relations, and even national relations. In her own life, she would view as necessary the freedom “go on adventuring, changing, opening my mind & my eyes, refusing to be stamped & stereotyped. The thing is to free ones self; to let it find its dimensions, not be impeded” (*D4* 186-87). Expanding the “tight little—knot” of the self is central to envisioning the self as part of a larger community of other selves, part of the remedy for what Stein calls “the concentration of isolation which is war” (*Paris France* 109). Accordingly, Woolf was to emphasize the development of the “whole soul” in creating the curriculum for her “experimental college” in *Three Guineas*; instead of “the arts of dominating other people. . . the arts of ruling, of killing, of acquiring land and capital,” it should teach

The arts of human intercourse; the art of understanding other people’s lives and minds, and the little arts of talk, of dress, of cookery that are allied with them. The aim of the new college, the cheap college, should be not to segregate and specialize, but to combine. It should explore the ways in which mind and body can be made to co-operate; discover what new combinations make good wholes in human life. (34)

Part of Freud’s perennial appeal for H.D. was his belief in a universal element that, residing in the unconscious, was capable of erasing the national, religious, and ethnic “chalk marks” dividing humankind (Hogue and Vandivere; Augustine). As H.D. makes clear in the following passage from *Tribute to Freud*, Freud’s transcendence of these

artificial boundaries is seen as essential to the cause of peace, and Freud himself as a “peacemaker” who had discovered a language “potentially free from the old religious connotations that divide people” (Robinson 304). She writes that Freud

Had dared to say that the dream came from an unexplored depth in man’s consciousness and that this unexplored depth ran like a great stream or ocean underground, and the vast depth of the ocean was the same vast depth that to-day, as in Joseph’s day, overflowing in man’s small consciousness, produced inspiration, madness, creative ideas or the dregs of the dreariest symptoms of mental unrest and disease. He had dared to say that it was the same ocean of universal consciousness, and even if not stated in so many words, he had dared to imply that this consciousness proclaimed all men one; all nations and races met in the universal world of the dream; and he had dared to say that the dream-symbol could be interpreted; its language, its imagery were common to the whole race . . . was the common property of the whole race; in the dream, man, as at the beginning of time, spoke a universal language, and man, meeting in the universal understanding of the unconscious or the subconscious, would forgo barriers of time and space, and man, understanding man, would save mankind. (*Tribute to Freud* 107-8)

An awareness of this “universal understanding” would make it immensely difficult for the mind “to separate itself from the people in the street, for example, and think of itself as apart from them,” and might encourage the individual to “think with other people spontaneously. . . . Clearly the mind is always altering its focus, and bringing the world into different perspectives” (Woolf, *Room* 101). While for H.D., this vision of “universal

understanding” is contingent upon an understanding of the language of dream-work, for Woolf, it is presented as an ethical choice, an act of free will rooted in the mind’s inherent ability to “alter its focus.” She would reflect, in a diary entry dated 27 August 1918, on the “difficulty” of realizing the mind’s potential:

The existence of life in another human being is as difficult to realise as a play of Shakespeare when the book is shut. This occurred to me when I saw Adrian talking to the tall German prisoner. By rights they should have been killing each other. The reason why it is easy to kill another person must be that one’s imagination is too sluggish to conceive of a succession of days which are furlled in him and have already been spent. (*D1* 186)¹⁵⁰

Three Guineas and *The Years* can be understood as meditations on the enormous human costs of imaginative “sluggishness,” while Woolf’s recognition, in a letter dated 13 August 1940, that “if it [a bomb] doesn’t kill me it’s killing someone else” (*L6* 414), and Renny’s response that “they’re only killing other people” (Woolf, *Years* 290), can be read as attempts to stir the sluggish imagination into recognizing the common humanity that lies beneath surface differences. Woolf makes clear also that “enlarg[ing] the imaginative” entails imagining the common humanity of “enemies” and contemplating their likeness to our selves, given that “it is not certain that enemies are what they seem” (Stein, *Wars* 34). Woolf forces the reader’s mind to “alter its focus” and recognize its likeness to the Other when she places a photograph of a dictator before her correspondent in the final pages of *Three Guineas*:

But the human figure even in a photograph suggests other and more complex emotions. It suggests that we cannot dissociate ourselves from that figure but are

ourselves that figure. It suggests that we are not passive spectators doomed to unresisting obedience but by our thoughts and actions can ourselves changes that figure. A common interest units [sic] us; it is one world, one life. How essential it is that we should realise that unity the dead bodies, the ruined houses prove. (142)

She models this ethical imaginative practice, demonstrating the positive results that can result from such acts of imaginative identification: for only by recognizing our likeness can we embrace our potential to effect social transformation.

Woolf emphasizes such acts of discovery in *The Years* by locating the roots of peace in self-knowledge; this can be seen in her repetition of Nicholas's question, "If we do not know ourselves, how can we know other people?" (306, 312) and North's question, "If they want to reform the world, . . . why not begin there, at the centre, with themselves?" (400). The latter imagines "another life; a different life," a wholeness that begins from the center and radiates outward: "Not halls and reverberating megaphones; not marching in step after leaders, in herds, groups, societies, caparisoned. No; to begin inwardly. . . . Why not down barriers and simplify? . . . [to] spread out, make a new ripple in human consciousness, be the bubble and the stream, the stream and the bubble—myself and the world together" (405). North's Zen-like conception of the self as both "the stream and the bubble" articulates an alternative to the rigid self/other binary in favor of a vision of the self as flexible and interdependent; in his image of the stream, North discovers an image of "unity" that is capable of transcending "multiplicity" without destroying the self's individuality, for as Woolf recognized, "its the persons own edge that counts" (*D4* 282). Just as Jinny Carslake meditates on her "ordinary pebbles picked off the road" and discovers that "if you look at them steadily . . . multiplicity becomes

unity, which is somehow the secret of life” (*Jacob’s Room* 131), gazing on the photos of dead children can help us to sink our private differences—our multiplicity—in favor of a recognition of our unity.

The theme of “unity in multiplicity” forms the thematic pulse behind a series of epiphanies that unfold in H.D.’s work. *The Sword’s* RAF pilots are described as a “star-nebula” embodying this “unity in multiplicity”: “They were not one person but they were at-one, as a snow-cloud is one cloud and at the same time, a collection of infinite snowflakes. But they were not vaguely ‘infinite,’ they had names and they were numbered. It was, as I had said, a star-nebula, they were separate stars yet converging to a centre” (*Sword* 151). In *Madrigal*, the H.D. figure, Delia Alton, meditates: “One individual leaf, she might have philosophized, holds the soul of a forest, as one salt drop, the ocean’s. So here, this walled-in space, was a world; the whole world was given her in conscious, she was see-er” (147). Similar to Delia’s vision of reconciled opposites, which gives her “the whole world,” is Raymonde Ransome vision of “the eternal truth, the eternal law. . . beyond the shallow boundary of nationality,” that “one formula written in a cryptic language that everyone would understand” (“Murex” 223). The “formula” revealed to her is one defined by delight in ambiguity, difference, and simultaneity, and which often is expressed in terms that transcend geographic boundaries: “*east fronts the west* was a concise and absolute formula for her outlook. East and west. The seen and the only just not-seen. The absolute form enclosing the absolute vacuum behind it. The vacuum held and prisoned in a grain of mustard seed (“Murex” 233).

Although such epiphanies and visions may be granted only to those who remain somehow outside their culture, such visions simultaneously pronounce their own

universal applicability. Woolf identifies the “larger capacities of the human spirit” (M28 holograph 24) and the “human power to change and create new wholes” (*Three Guineas* 114) as fundamentally human, rather than gender specific, powers. The desire for unity is a “feeling that is common to all people . . . of some unity that binds them; of something that lies beneath the medals & the stripes; that rubs out all the chalk marks that have been so elaborately scored in the floor of the earth” (M28 holograph 26). Woolf and H.D. reveal the very existence of unity within multiplicity, supplying routes to this realization that are rooted, respectively, in the imaginative, the mythic, and the spiritual, and showing how such paths can be pursued, even amidst the blare of guns.

Endnotes

¹ An insistence on the inextricability of these terms as the crux of *Three Guineas* may be, for some, an insistence on the obvious. Yet, Naomi Black's recent attempt to parse the essay's pacifism from its feminism in *Virginia Woolf as Feminist* seems to suggest that the point is far from moot, at least for Black, and so bears repeating.

² For a detailed discussion of Woolf's involvement in these organizations, see Naomi Black's "Virginia Woolf and the Women's Movement," David Bradshaw's "British Writers and Anti-Fascism in the 1930s, I and II," and Hermione Lee's *Virginia Woolf* 686-87.

³ The most obvious examples are to be found in Wyndham Lewis's *Men Without Art* and Q. D. Leavis's review of *Three Guineas*, "Caterpillars of the Commonwealth Unite!" Appearing in the December 1934 issue of the *New Statesman & Nation*, C. E. M. Joad's article, "The End of an Epoch," heralded the demise of Bloomsbury at the hands of Woolf, as she recounted in her diary: "We—By [Bloomsbury]—are dead; so says Joad. I snap my fingers at him. Lytton & I the two destructors" (*D4* 265). Published as she was beginning to work seriously on *Three Guineas*, Joad's assault may have inspired her to lampoon him in that work.

⁴ It has become a commonplace of feminist criticism that allegations as to Woolf's apoliticism are themselves ideologically motivated. On this point, see Hermione Lee's *Virginia Woolf*, Jane Marcus's "No More Horses" and *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy*, Naomi Black's "Virginia Woolf and the Women's Movement," Brenda Silver's "The Authority of Anger," and Anna Snaith's *Virginia Woolf: Public and Private Negotiations*.

⁵ My thanks to Jane Marcus for her insight on this point.

⁶ Alex Zwerdling, for example, advances the view that Woolf begrudgingly renounced her pacifism but fails to supply any evidence of this claim. Extrapolating from Zwerdling's account of Woolf's "reluctant renunciation" (*Women Against the Iron Fist* 121, note 63), Sybil Oldfield concurs: "Slowly and painfully, like Maude Royden and Simone Weil, Virginia Woolf had to renounce her pacifism. Finally she could no longer say with her character Kitty in *The Years*: 'Force is always wrong--don't you agree with me?--always wrong?'" (*ibid.*). Oldfield reproduces this faulty conclusion elsewhere, writing how "at enormous inner cost, she renounced her total pacifism when confronted by the Nazis' drive to conquer the world" (*Women Humanitarians* 282), a conclusion drawn from a misreading of Woolf's observation "One merely feels that the killing machine *has* to be set in action" (Oldfield's emphasis) as an endorsement of war. I would argue that Woolf's observation of 6 September 1939, "So far, the Athena has been sunk," suggests Woolf's state of intense anticipation and anxiety over the imminent violence:

Our first air raid warning at 8:30 this morning. . . . This war has begun in cold blood. One merely feels that the killing machine has to be set in action. So far, the Athena has been sunk. It seems entirely meaningless—a perfunctory slaughter, like taking a jar in one hand, a hammer in the other. Why must this be smashed? Nobody knows. (D5 234-35)

A diary entry written three days earlier, moreover, further reveals her commitment to pacifism rather than any renunciation of her beliefs: “I argued its ‘they’ as usual who do this. We as usual remain outside. If we win,—then what?” (D5 233). Contrary to Oldfield and Zwerdling’s claims, additional statements made by Woolf up until her death in 1941 suggest that she did *not* formally renounce her pacifism—as had many of her contemporaries, including Bertrand Russell, A. A. Milne, Storm Jameson, Maude Royden, and Simone Weil—but continued to object to the “dreary false cheery hero-making strain” and “emotional falsity” of war (D5 292-93). “My only comfort,” she would write in October 1939, “lies in the obvious horror we all feel for war” (L6 366).

⁷ For a general discussion of Woolf’s habits of revision, see Julia Briggs’s “Between the Texts”; on Woolf’s revisions to *The Voyage Out*, see Jackie DiSalvo’s introduction to *Melymbrosia* and Brenda Silver’s “Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice”; on revisions to the “Time Passes” section of *To the Lighthouse*, see James M. Haule’s “*To the Lighthouse* and the Great War”; on the excision of overt lesbian content in *A Room of One’s Own*, see Jane Marcus’s “Sapphistry”; on the excision of overt anti-militarist content in *The Years*, see Grace Radin’s *Virginia Woolf’s The Years: The Evolution of a Novel* and “Two Enormous Chunks.”

⁸ Brenda Silver offers a cultural analysis of widespread resistance to the anger of *Three Guineas* since the time of its publication in “The Authority of Anger: *Three Guineas* as Case Study.”

⁹ For further discussion of the distinction between *pacifism* and *pacificism*, see Martin Ceadel’s *Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945*.

¹⁰ Sandi Cooper’s “Women’s Participation in European Peace Movements” offers a look at early-nineteenth century women leaders of peace movements in France, Italy, and Germany.

¹¹ Brown suggests that pacifist ideas were “fundamentally useful for feminism” (1) and points to the mutually productive intersection between feminist and pacifist thinking. Despite the delayed flowering of the terms “feminist pacifism” and “pacifist feminism,” “political perspectives developed during the late nineteenth century that combined substantial characteristics of both of these ideologies,” thus producing “a politics where the two modes of analysis are applied together to an understanding of the social and political order” (4).

¹² Mark Hussey's *Virginia Woolf and War*, for example, includes essays on the politics of Woolf's early and experimental fiction, including Helen Wussow's "War and Conflict in *The Voyage Out*," William Handley's "War and the Politics of Narration in *Jacob's Room*," James M. Haule's "*To the Lighthouse* and the Great War," and Judith Lee's "'This Hideous Shaping and Moulding': War and *The Waves*." For an account of how the social politics surrounding pacifism informed Woolf's composition of *Night and Day*, see Jane Marcus's "Enchanted Organ, Magic Bells."

¹³ The 82 letters from correspondents in reference to *Three Guineas* are reprinted by Anna Snaith in "Wide Circles: The *Three Guineas* Letters." For a summary and analysis of the letters, see Brenda Silver, "*Three Guineas* Before and After: Further Answers to Correspondents" and Anna Snaith, "The Reading Public: Respondents to *Three Guineas*" in *Virginia Woolf: Public and Private Negotiations*.

¹⁴ In "War Between the Woolfs," Laura Moss Gottlieb suggests that Leonard's disapproval of his wife's political writings may have been territorial in that he "may have felt threatened by his wife's invasion of the territory he had staked out for himself" (250).

¹⁵ The three scrapbooks kept by Woolf during the thirties, beginning in 1931, are essential to our understanding of the developing conception of the work. Each contains an assortment of newspaper clippings, photographs, handwritten and typewritten reading notes, letters, manifestos, and pamphlets documenting the status of women in Britain, Germany, and Spain; women's exclusion from the professions and universities; men's vanity, pride, and love of costumes; the rise of fascism in Europe; the relentless bombing of civilian populations in Almeria and Madrid, Spain; and the highly publicized assault on pacifism launched by the British government and the Church of England in the mid-thirties. See Merry Pawlowski and Vara Neverow's "*Reading Notes for Three Guineas: An Edition and Archive*," online at http://www.csub.edu/woolf/tgs_home.html. For more on the scrapbooks, see Pawlowski's "Exposing Masculine Spectacle" and "'Seule la culture désintéressée': Virginia Woolf, Gender, and Culture in Time of War."

¹⁶ Two accounts of note are Brenda Silver's "*Three Guineas* Before and After: Further Answers to Correspondents" and Naomi Black's introduction to the Shakespeare Head edition of *Three Guineas* (2000).

¹⁷ *Three Guineas* "releases such a torrent of fact as I did not know I had in me," she recalled. "I must have been observing & collecting these 20 years—since *Jacob's Room* anyhow. Such a wealth of things seen present themselves that I cant choose even" (D4 133).

¹⁸ While I have cited here only those items that can be dated definitively in an attempt to trace the chronological progression of the conception of *Three Guineas*, it should be noted that Volume One contains many more undated than dated items, and that these are especially useful for gauging the depth and range of Woolf's interest in a particular topic. This volume contains, among others, further entries pertaining to "the sexual life of

women,” including items on sterility, chastity, marriage, childbirth, and breastfeeding; items pertaining to the physical and educational restrictiveness of Victorian society; clippings and notes demonstrating misogynist attitudes toward women’s participation in the public sphere; items relating to women’s inferior position at University, and to the inferior finances and conditions of women’s colleges; and items supplying evidence of men’s vanity and pride. The earliest dated item in Volume One is Woolf’s essay on Emily Davies, “Two Women,” which can be dated to 23 April 1927 (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 27) while the latest is a clipping entitled “Young Women and the Church: A Suspicion They Are Not Wanted,” which can be dated to 10 January 1933 (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 63).

¹⁹ See, for example, Katharine Burdekin’s *Proud Man* (1934), and essays by Storm Jameson, Rebecca West, Sylvia Townsend Warner, E. M. Delafield, and Mary Borden in Rebecca West’s *Man, Proud Man* (1932), edited by Mabel Ulrich.

²⁰ Woolf’s dialogic encounter with C. E. M. Joad is discussed further in Chapter Three.

²¹ These items include news clippings on a woman’s appointment to a “coveted post” of the Civil Service (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 19), on the easing of restrictions on social behavior at Newnham and Girton (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 55), on whether a University education prepares women for life (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 58), on the legal system’s “favoritism” toward women (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 30), and on women’s sense of exclusion from the Church (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 63).

²² She refers to “the sequel then, for which I have collected enough powder to blow up St Pauls. [*sic*] It is to have 4 pictures” (D4 77).

²³ For a fuller account of the development of that work, see Mitchell Leaska’s introduction to *The Pargiters: The Novel-Essay Portion of The Years*.

²⁴ Woolf’s readers will recognize Lord Hewart, the Lord Chief Justice of England, as the subject of one of the five photographs included by Woolf in *Three Guineas*. See Chapter Four for a discussion of Hewart’s cultural and historical significance.

²⁵ Leonard describes the effect of this Conference on him:

At the Conference Ernest Bevin, who took the view—with which I agreed—that, if you were going to fight against Hitler or any other aggressor, you must have arms with which to fight—rose in the pretty Regency Pavilion and made the most devastating attack upon the unfortunate Lansbury that I have ever listened to in a public meeting. As I said in *Beginning Again*, he battered the poor man to political death—Lansbury afterwards resigned the leadership—and, although I was politically entirely on the side of Bevin in this controversy, I could not help shrinking from the almost indecent cruelty with which he destroyed the slightly lachrymose, self-righteous Lansbury” (244-45).

²⁶ These fears recall those surrounding the publication of *A Room of One's Own* in 1929: namely, “that the press will be kind & talk of its charm, & sprightiness; also I shall be attacked for a feminist & hinted at for a sapphist. . . . I am afraid it will not be taken seriously” (D3 262).

²⁷ The earliest item in this volume—aside from a random handful of interspersed items dating from 1933, 1935, and 1936—can be dated to 27 February 1937.

²⁸ See Pawlowski, *The Virginia Woolf and Vera Douie Letters* 11-13. The Women's Service Library, which was organized by the London and National Society for Women's Service, was founded with the intention of preserving the history of the women's suffrage movement and of providing “a working library for women entering public life in increasing numbers as a result of the Sex Disqualification Act of 1919” (5). A subscriber to the library, Woolf borrowed books and frequently solicited information or factual clarification from Vera Douie on a host of subjects including present endowments for men's and women's colleges at Cambridge (16-18); the position of women in present-day France (19); the effects of women's suffrage (20); information on disarmament and peace societies (20-21); and the position of schoolmistresses (32-35). From May 1938 until the end of her life, Woolf solicited donations from her friends on behalf of the library, while helping to build the library's collection through book donations.

²⁹ She had, rather curiously, planned that she would “send them all off, to be typed: show to L.: then provide notes” (D5 118). It is unclear whether this ordering of events was motivated by time constraints, or by some desire to conceal from her husband the most acerbic portion of the book.

³⁰ Identified by B. J. Kirkpatrick and Stuart N. Clarke as “an abridgement of *Three Guineas*, 1938 with some additional passages”; see *Bibliography of Virginia Woolf*, 4th edition, 294, subheading C357. Woolf's only reference to this article appears in a diary entry dated 12 March 1938: “Three USA papers have rejected it; but the Atlantic will pay £120 for 12,000 words” (D5 130-31). Jane Marcus suggests that Woolf's initial publication of her anti-war polemic in this venue was a deliberate strategy motivated by a belief that Americans' isolationism might make them more sympathetic to the work's pacifist arguments. For details on individual reprints and editions of *Three Guineas*, see Kirkpatrick and Clarke 106-09, 212-15, 294.

³¹ The cost of the book was regarded by some as unnecessarily prohibitive, as several letters from her readers suggest (Snaith, *Virginia Woolf* 125-26).

³² This information is courtesy of Dianne Shepherd of The Women's Library and Karen Watson of the University of Sussex.

³³ See Chapters Three and Four for an extended discussion of the *Three Guineas* photographs.

³⁴ Jane Marcus's annotations and introduction serve to re-politicize *Three Guineas*, contextualizing the work against the backdrop of Woolf's radical feminism, socialism, anti-fascism, and pacifism. Her views on *Three Guineas* have been essential to my work on Woolf's pacifism.

³⁵ In November 1938, she writes, "My own friends have sent me to Coventry over it. So my position is ambiguous" (D5 188-89). The expression is repeated in a letter to A. G. Sayers discussing *Three Guineas*, dated 11 October 1939: "But at least I haven't been sent to prison—rather, on the contrary, to Coventry" (L6 363).

³⁶ Ultimately, Ethel Smyth appears to have approved of the work, though having offered several criticisms of it; see Woolf's responses to these in L6 234-35. Vita claimed to have been "exasperated" by the work's "misleading arguments," which led Woolf to respond: "It may be a silly book, and I don't agree that it's a well-written book; but its certainly an honest book: and I took more pains to get up the facts and state them plainly than I ever took with any thing in my life" (L6 243).

³⁷ Lady Rhondda writes rapturously in a letter dated 23 May 1938, "I don't know how to tell you how exciting I found it or how profoundly it moved me. Such a book coming from you (you are the one right person in all the world to have written it) at such a time may have I think (if only Europe doesn't too quickly break into flames) a profound effect" (Snaith, "Wide Circles" 17). This letter is among the 82 that Woolf kept "as a valuable contribution to psychology" (L6 247) in reference to *Three Guineas*.

³⁸ See Jane Marcus's "No More Horses" for a reprint of the 25 June 1938 *Time and Tide* review (286-87, note 12). This note also contains summaries of several reviews that were highly critical of the book, including Graham Greene's review in *The Spectator*, K. John's in the *New Statesman and Nation*, and Louise Bogan's in the *New Republic*.

³⁹ In *Virginia Woolf: Public and Private Negotiations*, Snaith uses the *Three Guineas* correspondence to refute allegations, propounded most famously by Q. D. Leavis and the "Scutineers," of Woolf's elitism in that work. The 58 letters from unknown readers in response to *Three Guineas* "establish the heterogeneity of Woolf's reading public, the diversity of class, background and location. She was not just writing for a privileged elite, a coterie of friends, but was inspiring a wide cross-section of women, such that they felt compelled to contact her, to elicit discussion," she argues (124).

⁴⁰ For a more general overview of the content of the letters, and information about the letter writers themselves, I refer the reader to Brenda Silver's "*Three Guineas* Before and After," Anna Snaith's *Virginia Woolf: Public and Private Negotiations*, 113-29, and to the letters themselves, reprinted and annotated by Anna Snaith in "Wide Circles."

⁴¹ Silver and Snaith also have suggested that the *Three Guineas* letters extend the boundaries of that text, especially as they frequently generated continued correspondence and discussion between Woolf and her correspondents, and because she continued to

develop her ideas through these contacts. The implications of such a reading for a new edition of *Three Guineas* is discussed in Chapter Two.

⁴² This subject is discussed further in Chapter Four.

⁴³ In the same letter, Naomi Mitchison raises a question central to the debate between Marxism and pacifism: whether the use of force is permissible in the pursuit of revolutionary ends. She expresses skepticism at the prospect of remaining “indifferent” in such a situation, and concludes that it would be impossible to “stand out, even if I knew for certain, as all sensible people must, that any revolution brings after it, not what its makers hope for and dream of, but only, with luck, something in that direction” (42).

⁴⁴ Ernest Huxley’s letter also supplies a working class perspective on war, in its description of the “anger, resentment and disdain, which we of the working class generally feel towards a country which keeps us to a low standard of living, a continuous army of unemployed, and spends hundreds of millions on modern armaments” (149).

⁴⁵ Woolf’s social constructivist view of gender was lost on several other correspondents, however, who misread Woolf’s position as an essentialist one. These included Shena Simon, who wrote, “I do hope it may be true that there is really an inherent difference between men & women on that matter of combativeness” (21) and Ellen Crockren, who wrote that “men are cursed with pugilistic tendencies” and that woman, as the second creation, was the more perfect of the two sexes (69). Another correspondent urged Woolf to recognize that “the wars now going on are about something real & vital” (109) and to disabuse herself of the notion that “men are just fighting, like children, for the sake of fighting” (108). She continues, “As long as men and women just ask for peace, as an unwise mother stops quarreling children, without troubling to know what are the rights & wrongs of the quarrel and what injustices have led to the aggression, we shall live to see our generation looking vainly for peace in a world of anarchy and decay” (109).

⁴⁶ See Sandi E. Cooper, *Patriotic Pacifism*.

⁴⁷ Silver mentions briefly the importance of *Three Guineas* to debates within the women’s peace movement of the sixties and seventies, noting the adoption of its gendered arguments by the women of Greenham Common and the refutation of those arguments by others (“The Authority of Anger” 341, note 1). Silver’s analysis of the causes that precipitated the third historical period in the work’s reception, however, largely overlooks the impact of “changes in the political climate” (354) on the resurrection of the work, of which the most important would have been the growing antiwar movement.

⁴⁸ See Marcus, “Introduction” xxxvii-xxxviii.

⁴⁹ On maternalist politics in mid-century peace organizations, see Lisa Yaszek, “Stories ‘That Only a Mother’ Could Write” 72-75.

⁵⁰ For more on inclusive security, and the assistive role of internet technology, see Hunt and Posa, “Women Waging Peace.”

⁵¹ For more on the organization’s gendered identification, see Featherstone’s “Mighty in Pink” and “Pink Thongs and Patriarchy.”

⁵² Adrienne Rich adopts an opposing stance, arguing in “A Politics of Locations” that national identity plays a crucial role in political identity and thus should not be erased altogether:

As a woman I have a country; as a woman I cannot divest myself of that country merely by condemning its government or by saying three times "As a woman my country is the whole world." Tribal loyalties aside, and even if nation-states are now just pretexts used by multinational conglomerates serve their interests, I need to understand how a place on the map is also a place in history within which as a woman, a Jew, a lesbian, a feminist I am created and trying to create.

⁵³ Having been asked to contribute to an anti-war organization, the narrator pledges to give money “to fund women’s studies at universities. . . . to fund campaigns to get more women into politics, banks, industry and the army. . . . [and] to fund feminist activists and writers” (“Four Fivers”).

⁵⁴ For more detailed histories of the development of Anglo-American textual editing practices in the last half-century, see D. C. Greetham, *Theories of the Text* and “Editorial and Critical Theory: From Modernism to Postmodernism”; George Bornstein, introduction to *Representing Modernist Texts*; Jerome McGann, *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*; and Philip Cohen and David H. Jackson, “Notes on Emerging Paradigms in Editorial Theory.” In *Romantic Texts and Contexts*, Donald Reiman recounts the well-established practice of versioning within edited works of the early modern, Romantic, and nineteenth-century American periods, and which can be traced back to Biblical studies (167-80).

⁵⁵ In “Observations on the History of Middle English Editing,” A. S. G. Edwards cites Henry Wharton’s attempt in 1688 to create a parallel-text edition of Pecock’s *Treatise Proving Scripture to be the Rule of Faith* (Roland 2).

⁵⁶ The vertical approach to textuality advanced by the notion of the work-as-palimpsest shares an affinity, of course, with the “vertical, archeological look at the evolution of any given passage” afforded by textual geneticism (Bornstein, *Material Modernism* 126).

⁵⁷ Where a structuralist view of textuality has its physical manifestation (if only a partial one) in the form of the genetic edition, the palimpsestic view remains largely procedural, and thus conceptual, a way of *reading* rather than a way of *editing*. Precisely how a palimpsestic view of textuality might be translated to a specifically feminist form of

textual editing has not, to my knowledge, been considered and may be worthy of further consideration. For a recent overview of feminist approaches to textual editing, see D. C. Greetham, *Theories of the Text*, 433-86.

⁵⁸ For further discussion of parallel-text displays and facsimile reproductions of pages from numerous parallel-text editions, see Meg Roland, “More Odd Texts.”

⁵⁹ The existence of a considerable divide between textual and literary studies may also be a culprit. On this point, see D. C. Greetham’s “Textual and Literary Theory” and “The Manifestation and Accommodation of Theory in Textual Editing”; see also Philip Cohen’s introduction to the above, ix-xviii. We are indebted to Brenda Silver for recovering the joined history of Woolf studies and textual studies in her essay.

⁶⁰ Gabler has recently outlined a rationale for a genetic edition of *To the Lighthouse* in “A Tale of Two Texts.” That the call for a postmodernist edition of this work should have been voiced by a textual editor rather than a Woolf scholar may itself suggest how few contemporary Woolf scholars are actually trained in the theory and practice of textual editing, a conclusion seemingly borne out by James Haule’s and J. H. Stape’s *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text* (2002). On this point, see reviews of their book by Julia Briggs and Hans Walter Gabler in *Woolf Studies Annual* and *Text*, respectively.

⁶¹ See her “Editing Woolf for the Nineties”; “Between the Texts”; and her review of Haule and Stape’s collection in *Woolf Studies Annual*.

⁶² Woolf’s works briefly came out of copyright on 1 January 1992, and went back into copyright on 1 January 1996 when the UK adopted the European Union Directive on Copyright, which stipulates that works remain copyright protected for seventy, rather than fifty, years from the author’s death. Accordingly, Woolf’s works will come out of copyright once again on 31 December 2011 (WATCH).

⁶³ In formulating the following analysis, I have relied on Briggs’s description of individual editions, and the four series as a whole, when individual reprints were unavailable for consultation. My frequent references to her essay throughout this section refer to her description of these items, while the analysis is entirely my own. Because she limits her analysis to the subject of post-publication revisions, I argue, she overlooks what I consider to be the more troubling evidence of eclecticism within these editions, and within the very account of them that she narrates. While indebted to her acts of description, I am in a sense overwriting her descriptive analysis with my own.

⁶⁴ In their editions for Blackwell’s Shakespeare Head imprint. Susan Dick, *To the Lighthouse* (1992); Morris Beja, *Mrs. Dalloway* (1996); and J. H. Stape, *Orlando* (1998).

⁶⁵ See, specifically, the World’s Classics edition of *Jacob’s Room* (1992), edited by Kate Flint, which provides transcriptions of selected holograph excerpts; the Penguin edition

of the same (1992), edited by Sue Roe, which reprints the book's original Chapter 10, published separately as the short story, "A Woman's College from Outside"; both Penguin and World's Classics editions of *The Years*, which append transcriptions of the "two enormous chunks" excised from the work by Woolf; and the Penguin edition of *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas* (1993), edited by Michele Barrett, which appends excerpts from Woolf's scrapbooks and a list of textual variants (Briggs 161, 151 note 18). The use of appendices in subsequent editions of *Three Guineas* is discussed below.

⁶⁶ Partial exceptions would include editions that reproduce multiple manuscript and/or typescript versions within a single volume, such as S. P. Rosenbaum's *Women and Fiction: The Manuscript Versions of 'A Room of One's Own'*, J. W. Graham's *'The Waves': The Two Holograph Drafts*, Mitchell Leaska's *The Pargiters: The Novel-Essay Portion of 'The Years'* (which includes transcriptions of both Woolf's manuscript notes and the typescript of her 1931 speech before the London/National Society for Women's Service) and his *Pointz Hall: The Earlier and Later Typescripts of 'Between the Acts.'* It should be noted, however, that even these versioned editions fail to fully reproduce the diachronous dimension of each work, given that, in each instance, pre-publication versions are not displayed alongside published versions of the work. On synchrony and diachrony, see Hans Zeller, "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts" and Hans Walter Gabler, "The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts."

⁶⁷ "An Electronic Edition and Commentary on Virginia Woolf's 'Time Passes'" is a project of the Centre for Textual Scholarship, De Montfort University. While the edition has not yet been made publicly available, a description of the project's editorial objectives and methodology is available online.

⁶⁸ Black identifies a "second lineage" that is distinct from the primary lineage expressed in the "sequence of texts" that I have listed above. In classifying "A Society" (1921), *A Room of One's Own* (1929), and Woolf's introductory letter to *Life As We Have Known It* (1931) as "other feminist texts" that are part of "a longer pattern of development in Woolf's published writings," she indicates that these compositionally distinct works do not constitute versions of *Three Guineas*, no matter how closely they may resemble that work in some parts (Black, "Introduction" xix, xxxv).

⁶⁹ In "Wide Circles," Snaith similarly argues that "the discussion and correspondence which *Three Guineas* instigated" should be considered part of the "extended text," in addition to the 12 reading notebooks and *The Years* (5). Brenda Silver laid the groundwork for this argument as early as 1983 when she argued that the letters constituted a continuation of Woolf's ongoing dialogue with her culture on the subjects of war, patriarchy, and fascism—a dialogue that she sees continuing through to Woolf's 1940 essay, "Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid" (*Three Guineas Before and After* 255, 266, 270).

⁷⁰ In addition to content, a new version may be determined by time, function, or material changes to the work, which Shillingsburg calls the four "unities" of textual versions. Of

time, he writes, “if an effort of creation is separated from an effort of revision it is likely or at least possible that the revision effort will reflect changes in the person and thus follow its own line of inspiration rather than that which informed the first” (71); of function, that “each new function constitutes the potential for a new version” (72); and of the material view, that “it equates, in effect, the concept of Version of the Work with the Material Text” (72-73). See “Text as Matter, Concept, and Action.”

⁷¹ On the latter point, see J. A. Lavin, “The First Editions of Virginia Woolf’s *To the Lighthouse*” and E. F. Shields, “The American Edition of *Mrs. Dalloway*.”

⁷² See Chapter One for a fuller account of the publication history of *Three Guineas*, including the possible existence of a fourth version published during Woolf’s lifetime.

⁷³ Briggs addresses the fallibility of computer collation in a discussion of James Haule’s and Philip Smith’s *Concordances* to Woolf’s novels: the lists of textual variants “were assumed to be reliable since they had been produced electronically, but in reality they were often incomplete and seldom corresponded precisely with independent listings” (“Between the Texts” 153). While the list found in the appendix to the Shakespeare Head edition of *Three Guineas* does not rely on the *Concordances*, it was produced through electronic collation and, thus, its completeness and accuracy should be viewed with some skepticism. Ideally, this collation would be undertaken manually by the editor undertaking any future edition of *Three Guineas*.

⁷⁴ This is particularly the case in her analysis of the significance of the photographs in *Three Guineas*, a subject I take up in Chapter Three.

⁷⁵ Her explanation of the decision to select the British first edition as copy-text reveals further inconsistencies and irrelevancies:

Four short passages in endnotes and a small number of absent errors and inconsistencies of form do not seem enough reason to select an American copy-text for a very English book that shows no signs of significant rewriting between editions. This edition accordingly uses the first English edition as its copy-text. The text of the 1938 Hogarth edition is the most common text of *Three Guineas*. It has been used for all of Hogarth’s hard-back publications of the book . . . as well as many of the paperback editions. (lxvi)

⁷⁶ Discussing the four passages that appear exclusively in the American edition, she concludes, rather tentatively, “It is easy to assume they at least can serve to demonstrate the order of the texts, by implying that the proofs for the later American edition were reviewed later and these passages added. Then any changes would be authoritative—or perhaps only those?” (lxv).

⁷⁷ She obliquely considers the possibility, if only by way of foreclosing it: citing a letter in which Woolf remarked that “half had to be struck out of the notes [of the British

edition] in proof, to keep some slimness, and not repeat inordinately,” Black maintains, “it seems unlikely that she added passages that would lengthen the first American edition” (lxvi). Under this assumption (ie. that the passages were cut, rather than added, at the proof stage), one might simply reverse the question: that is, rather than ask why Woolf would have added these passages for an American audience, one might ask why she would have deleted the passages from the British version, but *not* the American one. Though approaching the subject from different angles, both questions lead directly to Woolf’s perception of her audiences, and how national, racial, and cultural differences might shape the reception of the work, as well as the direction of her speech.

⁷⁸ For this reading, see Naomi Black, “‘Women Must Weep’: The Serialization of *Three Guineas*.”

⁷⁹ On “radial reading,” see Jerome McGann’s *The Textual Condition*, 108-124.

⁸⁰ In “‘More Odd Texts,’” she writes, “a major implication of parallel-text editions, whether grounded in constructs of the author or constructs of the social aspects of texts, is the premise of indeterminacy: all parallel-text editions express a kind of multi-vocality” in the fragmented, contrastive, “radial” readings that they produce (22, 25).

⁸¹ As in the proposed parallel-text edition, my choice of the longer first American edition over the British one as copy-text is informed by theoretical, as well as practical, concerns: first, by the desire to produce an edition that records variations between these editions; and second, by the assumption that the additional passages of the first American edition would be more easily displayed in the reading text rather than the notes.

⁸² One might further disrupt the hierarchical relation of text and apparatus by laying those parts end to end, rather than end to front, and by flipping the direction of the book itself between the two parts. In this way, a reader might physically approach the edition from either direction.

⁸³ The bibliographic classifications in reference to Berg materials are adopted verbatim from the descriptive criteria provided in the index to the microfilm edition and in the web-based index to collection itself. Bibliographic classifications in reference to the Monks House Papers are adopted verbatim from the descriptive criteria provided in the index to the microfilm edition and by my own analysis of the manuscript materials (underlined).

⁸⁴ A careful examination of M42 reveals that its contents vary on an almost page by page basis between reading notes, holographs fragments from a more advanced stage of composition, and more preliminary fragments containing what one might call “place markers,” moments where Woolf leaves instructions to herself indicating the future work to be done on a passage, as in: “Ponder the following paragraph from Macaulay,” “analyze the motives of the dons who refuse to teach women,” “add your own opinion as to the effect of money,” etc. (2).

⁸⁵ Volkmar Zuhlsdorff writes, “The Academy in Exile and its aid organizations—the American Guild and its British ‘offshoot,’ the Arden Society for Artists and Writers Exiled in England—together created a network spanning every continent. The strings of that network came together at the headquarters shared by the Academy and the Guild at 20 Vesey Street in New York. It was there that the extensive programme of assistance and aid, involving scholarships and prize competitions, advice and mediation, approaches to authorities and all sorts of other support, was coordinated, with the aim of relieving the creative and material troubles of numerous exiled intellectuals. It was there too that funds were made available for further rescue operations and for recent arrivals embarking on a new life in America” (58).

⁸⁶ I am grateful to Dr. Brita Eckert of the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek (Frankfurt am Main, Germany) for her assistance in researching the *Deutsches Exilarchiv, 1933-1945*. While Woolf’s name appears on a “List of people to whom the prince or princess have written or spoken of the book auction,” there appears to be no further reference to Woolf in the catalogue supplements, nor further information on the buyer or the price paid for the item. Email from Dr. Brita Eckert to Rebecca Wisor, 2 October 2007.

⁸⁷ Whibley was best known for his column, “Musings without Method,” which appeared in *Blackwood’s* nearly continuously for thirty years (Donovan).

⁸⁸ In a note to the Bowen letter, Nigel Nicolson claims that this manuscript has been reincorporated into the manuscript fragments held in the Berg Collection, but offers no account of how this came to be, nor indicates any specific knowledge of the auction, the purchaser, or the item itself.

⁸⁹ In a footnote to this passage, Gabler attributes this finding to his “undoing—virtually, if not physically—their rearrangement undertaken by a former curator of the Berg Collection”—a task that may be necessary in the case of *Three Guineas* as well. See “A Tale of Two Texts” 15, note 8.

⁹⁰ For a detailed account of Caroline Emelia Stephen’s influence on Woolf’s pacifist thought, see Marcus, “The Niece of a Nun: Virginia Woolf, Caroline Stephen, and the Cloistered Imagination” and “Liberty, Sorority, Misogyny,” in *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy*.

⁹¹ For a detailed account of the circumstances surrounding the Conference, see Lela B. Costin, “Feminism, Pacifism, Internationalism and the 1915 International Congress of Women”; Gertrude Bussey and Margaret Tims, *Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom*; and Anne Wiltsher, *Most Dangerous Women: Feminist Peace Campaigners of the Great War*.

⁹² See also Vellacott, “Women, Peace, and Internationalism” 112-13 for a brief discussion. For fuller accounts of their involvement, see Andro Linklater, *An*

Unhusbanded Life: Charlotte Despard, Suffragette, Socialist and Sinn Feiner and Emmeline Pethick-Lawrence, *My Part in a Changing World*.

⁹³ For a detailed account of the divide within the NUWSS over the question of war and Emmeline and Christabel Pankhurst's renunciation of the cause, see Vellacott, "Women, Peace, and Internationalism," 111-16 and Liddington and Norris, *One Hand Tied Behind Us*, Chapter 14.

⁹⁴ For details of the debate, see Ceadel, *Pacifism in Britain* 127.

⁹⁵ The first issue of the first British edition, published by Hogarth Press on 2 June 1938, and the second issue of the first British edition (the Uniform edition), published November 1943, included five plates opposite pages 37, 39, 43, 113, and 220. The first American edition, published by Harcourt Brace on 25 August 1938, included five plates opposite pages 30, 32, 34, 94, and 184. B.J. Kirkpatrick and Stuart N. Clarke, *A Bibliography of Virginia Woolf*, 4th ed. These photographs are notably absent from the truncated, Americanized version of *Three Guineas* published as "Women Must Weep" in the May-June 1938 issues of the *Atlantic Monthly*.

⁹⁶ Michele Barrett's 1993 Penguin composite edition was the first of these reprints to restore all five plates in their original positions as Woolf intended them to be viewed. The second English edition, a 1986 Hogarth photo-offset reprint introduced by Hermione Lee, included four rather than five plates, as did Lee's 1984 composite edition of *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas*; in the latter edition, the photographs were reduced in size and re-arranged to appear on two two-page spreads. Morag Shiach's 1992 World's Classics composite edition of *A Room of One's Own* and *Three Guineas* likewise includes only four photographs in a two-page spread. See B.J. Kirkpatrick and Stuart N. Clarke, *A Bibliography of Virginia Woolf*, 4th ed.

⁹⁷ The "custody battle" over Woolf's image is discussed more fully in Chapter One. See also Jane Marcus's "No More Horses" and "Quentin's Bogey."

⁹⁸ Leonard's decision to publish the first rather than the second version of his wife's introduction to *Life as We Have Known It* is a case in point. See Jane Marcus's "No More Horses" for a discussion of his editorial discretion as a "political act" (280-81).

⁹⁹ Staveley identifies as the source of this information a letter from the engravers Garrett & Atkinson, located in the Hogarth Press Archives, Reading University ("Name That Face" 5, note 2).

¹⁰⁰ See, for example, Helen Wussow's "Virginia Woolf and the Problematic Nature of the Photographic Image" for a discussion of Woolf's use of the photo in these other works and Maggie Humm's "Virginia Woolf's Photographs and the Monk's House Albums" and *Modernist Women and Visual Cultures*.

¹⁰¹ These scholars have performed various rhetorical, textual, and semiotic readings of the photographs, all contingent on their generic nature. In the seminal “Her kodak pointed at his head’: Virginia Woolf and Photography,” Diane Gillespie emphasizes the generic and symbolic nature of the photographs when she refers to the subjects as “self-satisfied professional men, unnamed representatives of the patriarchal power structure” (37). In “Virginia Woolf and the Problematic Nature of the Photographic Image,” Helen Wussow argues that Woolf’s use of the photos indicates her awareness of how visual evidence can be manipulated for rhetorical purposes. In a paper originally given at the Thirty-First Annual Conference on Editorial Problems on 3-4 November 1995 and published as “‘Not a novel, they said’: Editing Virginia Woolf’s *Three Guineas*,” Naomi Black argues that the “generic” nature of the photographs “impl[ies] a structural analysis of the situation of men—and by implication, women—in contemporary society” (41) and that the photos “are used to mock the regalia of male dominance” (47) in order to make the point that “men are vain, and arrogant, and besotted with status” (43). In “Demythologizing Facts and Photographs in *Three Guineas*,” Julia Duffy and Lloyd Davis examine the semiotic and ideological function of the photos as part of an “interactive, verbal-pictorial discourse” that “disrupts conventions of syntax, signification, and genre” (130, 131).

¹⁰² Stuart Clarke’s article on Gordon Hewart, “The Lord Chief Justice and the Woolfs,” is a recent, welcome exception to this rule. While Julia Briggs’s recent biography suggests that the photographs may have a function beyond simply illustrating masculine vanity, she limits herself to summarizing the men’s appearances in the text and offers only a brief account of their identities (324-25).

¹⁰³ See Jane Marcus’s “*The Years* as Gotterdammerung, Greek Play, and Domestic Novel” for the entomology of “pargiter” as one who plasters or “patches up” (39).

¹⁰⁴ See Marcus’s “Sapphistry: Narration as Lesbian Seduction in *A Room of One’s Own*” for a discussion of Echo.

¹⁰⁵ Despite identifying her position as one directly opposed to Woolf’s in *Three Guineas*, Sontag’s contrast is a faulty one predicated on a fundamental misreading of that text, and of Woolf’s pacifism as a whole. See especially *Regarding the Pain of Others*, Chapter One.

¹⁰⁶ See Jane Marcus’s “Taking the Bull by the Udders” and “Sapphistry” on the collaborative nature of *A Room of One’s Own*.

¹⁰⁷ By late 1937, Mass-Observation had recruited over five hundred people through the Press by to keep “Day Surveys,” a detailed record of “everything they did from sleeping to waking on the twelfth day of each month throughout the year.” These were regarded as “an experimental method of collecting information about people’s lives and a way of training observers in the art of continuous observation” (Calder and Sheridan 5). Beginning in January 1938, the emphasis shifted to recording activities on specific days (such as Coronation Day, for example) and specific topics. During the war, Mass-

Observation solicited authors to keep war diaries, the most famous example being Naomi Mitchison's *Among You Taking Notes*. For more on Mass-Observation, see *Speak for Yourself: A Mass-Observation Anthology, 1937-49*, ed. Angus Calder and Dorothy Sheridan.

¹⁰⁸ Other strategies identified by critics include Woolf's disruption of the conventional author-reader dyad and use of multiple narrative personas (Winterhalter), her dismantling of textual authority through her use of the footnote (Whittier-Ferguson; Black, "Introduction"), her adoption of a recursive rather than a linear narrative style (Lilly), and her creation of a collaborative, documentary text (Marcus, "Introduction").

¹⁰⁹ Woolf's preoccupation with recuperating the "lives of the obscure" can be noted in nearly all her works, but can be seen particularly in "The Journal of Mistress Joan Martyn," "A Society," "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown," *Mrs. Dalloway*, *Flush*, *The Pargiters*, *The Years*, *A Room of One's Own*, and *Three Guineas*. Throughout her life, she frequently encouraged her women friends to write their memoirs; see, for example, her correspondence with Violet Dickinson, Molly MacCarthy, Ethel Smyth, and Agnes Smith, a working-class woman with whom Woolf struck up a friendship after receiving a letter from her regarding *Three Guineas*.

¹¹⁰ For Woolf's anxiety over preachiness, see Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 664-65; on *Three Guineas* as a response to pressure to propagandize, see Zwerdling 48; for the conflict between art and propaganda in Woolf's thinking, see Marcus, "No More Horses."

¹¹¹ Her references to Antigone and to the arrest of Frau Pommer can be found in *Three Guineas*. Woolf uses much of the text of "'The Thorn of Hatred' (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 20) in the text itself, including Frau Pommer's comment that "the thorn of hatred has been driven deep enough into the people by the religious conflicts and it is high time that the men of to-day disappeared." See also the letter Woolf received from the Six Point Group detailing the imprisonment of several German women by the state on various charges, including sedition. The letter describes the imprisonment and trial of one Else Steinfurth: "The judge was forced to admit in his summing up, that there was no proof of any seditious activities on her part. Instead of releasing her, however, immediately after the hearing was over, she was taken into 'preventive custody' for an indefinite term 'at the discretion of the Secret Police'" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 29-30).

¹¹² For a more detailed account of the circumstances surrounding the trial, see Stuart N. Clarke, "The Lord Chief Justice and the Woolfs."

¹¹³ The letter calls for "drastic reforms in the law relating to literary libel" as a result of "the increasing numbers of actions brought against authors and publishers." This reform would protect "the freedom of literature in general and in particular the right to express unpopular views." The letter goes on to argue, "it is mainly authors of repute, who are endeavouring to give credible pictures of contemporary life, whose work is in jeopardy. A serious threat to the quality of English literature obviously exists when the freedom of

expression of reputable authors is limited by a fear of flimsy or malicious charges against which they are virtually unprotected.” The signators included Richard Aldington, Michael Arlen, Edmund Blunden, Vera Brittain, T.S. Eliot, David Garnett, Aldous Huxley, Storm Jameson, Rose Macaulay, Naomi Mitchison, Vita Sackville-West, H.G. Wells, Rebecca West, and Virginia Woolf, many of whose works frequently took up issues relating to war (“Authors and the Law of Libel”).

¹¹⁴ This Bill was roundly denounced by the Council for Civil Liberties, the Labour Party, the Society of Friends, and by several Christian peace organizations, as well as by radical publishers and educators, including Woolf’s cousin, H. A. L. Fisher, who maintained that “the powers conferred on magistrates are excessive” (“Sedition Bill”).

¹¹⁵ A great deal of controversy was also raised by two other changes to the Bill: one that would expand prosecutable offenses to include “preparations” to seduce, as opposed to “attempts” to seduce, and another that would greatly expand the Government’s power to search premises for evidence. For more on these points, see MacColl and Wells 356-64, “Sedition Bill,” and “The Disaffection Bill, Lord Allen’s Plea.”

¹¹⁶ The projection of English institutions had its greatest expression at the 1939 World’s Fair. The British national pavilion, organized by the British Council, featured just such an exhibit (or “projection”) of Englishness, and included a technicolor film of the Coronation and a display of the Crown Jewels and an original copy of the Magna Carta (Cull 53).

¹¹⁷ See, for example, “Banned ‘Peace Film’ Seen by M.P.s,” which discusses a “peace film” that “has been refused an exhibition certificate on the ground that it is controversial” because it “includes several war scenes and is to be submitted to the War Office for verification.”

¹¹⁸ See also John Johnston, *The Lord Chamberlain’s Blue Pencil*, Chapter 7 and Anthony Aldgate and James C. Robertson, *Censorship in Theatre and Cinema*.

¹¹⁹ The most thorough and engaging discussion of the Stephen family patriarchs remains Jane Marcus’s *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy*. See especially “Liberty, Sorority, Misogyny,” in that volume, upon which the present discussion is founded.

¹²⁰ Baden-Powell authored numerous books in addition to his most widely read Scouting manual, *Scouting for Boys: A Handbook for Instruction in Good Citizenship* (1910), which sold millions of copies and went into ten editions in his lifetime (Daniels 24). Other publications include *The Handbook for Girl Guides, Or, How Girls Can Help Build the Empire* (1912), *Quick Training for War: A Few Practical Suggestions* (1914), *Young Knights of the Empire: Their Code, and Further Scout Yarns* (1917), *Girl Guiding: A Handbook for Guidelets, Guides, Senior Guides, and Guiders* (1918), *The Wolf Cub’s Handbook* (1918), *Rovering to Success: A Book of Life-Sport for Young Men*

(1930), *Scouting and Youth Movements* (1929), *Scouting Round the World* (1935), and *The Handbook for Brownies and Blue Birds* (1936).

¹²¹ “Is it not possible that if we knew the truth about war, the glory of war would be scotched and crushed where it lies curled up in the rotten cabbage leaves of our prostituted fact-purveyors; and if we knew the truth about art . . . the enjoyment and practice of art would become so desirable that by comparison the pursuit of war would be a tedious game for elderly dilettantes in search of a mildly sanitary amusement—the tossing of bombs instead of balls over frontiers instead of nets?” (97)

¹²² Such fears, it seems, were not wholly without warrant, as “recruitment into the ranks of the army during the Boer War had revealed the pitiful condition of young British manhood. Stunted stature meant that the army was obliged to reduce its physical requirements for entry” and “dentition was often so poor that soldiers could not eat the hard biscuit that was the staple ration for soldiers in the South African veldt” (Daniels 23). Among the causes generally blamed for racial deterioration were venereal disease, racial intermarriage, and declining birthrates (Enloe 50). Declining birthrates, particularly in the first and second decades of the twentieth century, paired with anxiety over racial deterioration, would prompt the government to introduce programs aimed at improving infant mortality rates and infant welfare, ultimately resulting in the emergence of a powerful pronatalism movement at the outset of the Great War (Ross 198-201). It is this pronatalist rhetoric that can be heard in Baden-Powell’s urging of Girl Guides to view the raising of babies as “a work of immense value to the nation.” See Baden-Powell, *Girl Guiding: The Official Handbook*.

¹²³ For the argument that the Scouts were founded to create a new generation of soldiers, see the following: John Springhall, “Baden-Powell and the Scout Movement,” “The Boy Scouts, Class and Militarism,” and *Youth, Empire and Society*; Samuel Hynes, *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*; John Gillis, *Youth and History*; Anne Summers, “Militarism in Britain”; Michael Rosenthal, *The Character Factory*; and Robert H. MacDonald, *Sons of the Empire*. For the dissenting opinion, see Tim Jeal, *The Boy-Man* and Allen Warren, “Sir Robert Baden-Powell.” Warren’s apparent bias should be born in mind by anyone referring to his entry on Baden-Powell in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

¹²⁴ See Kathy Phillips’s *Virginia Woolf against Empire* for a discussion of Baden-Powell’s imperialist rhetoric as it relates to the character of Captain Brace, in Woolf’s short story “Scenes from the Life of a British Naval Officer” (235, 237-38).

¹²⁵ The *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* offers the following account of the incident. While commanding a column of 7th hussars in 1896 under orders to suppress the Ndebele uprising, Baden-Powell ordered the court martial of Unwini, the rebel chief whom he maintained was responsible for the continuation of the uprising. He thereafter confirmed the rebel chief’s death sentence, which resulted in his death. It has been said that while his action “may have shortened the uprising,” it “was of doubtful legality since martial law had not been proclaimed” (Warren, “Robert” 114).

¹²⁶ Baden-Powell received numerous accolades in his lifetime. He was knighted in 1909, became a baronet in 1922, in 1923 was made a knight of the Grand Cross of the Royal Victorian Order, in 1929 was made first Baron Baden-Powell of Gilwell, received the Order of Merit in 1937, and was awarded the Carnegie Wateler Peace Prize in 1937. He received two honorary degrees, including a DCL (Doctor of Civil Law) from Oxford in 1923 and an LLD (Doctor of Laws) from Cambridge in 1931. A memorial plaque in Westminster Abbey commemorates both him and his wife for their advancement of Scouting and Guiding. See Warren's entry on Baden-Powell in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*.

¹²⁷ At an unveiling of a life-sized statue of a Boy Scout commemorating the 1929 World Jamboree at Birkenhead, at which 50,000 Scouts from 42 nations camped together, the Chief Commissioner of Boy Scouts, Lord Hampton, identified the movement as performing a diplomatic function: "in spite of talk of disarmament, protocols, and efforts at peace, there was unrest and trouble all over the world. They were trying in their own small way, among boys and young men, to bring about a better understanding through mutual trust" ("Boy Scouts and World Peace"). Baden-Powell would adopt the cause of peace as a goal of Scouting at the 1937 International Scout Conference, asking "How could boys be prepared to save the future in a world so full of uncertainty and change? He suggested two methods, first, the training of the individual in character and patriotism; secondly the promotion of international good will and understanding." His rhetoric was anti-pacifist, warning against the dangers of those "politicians and extremists [who] might, through mass suggestion, lead adherents along divergent paths, thereby directing a nation against itself" ("Peace Aim of Scouting"). The Guides, too, adopted the role of international peacemakers. See "Guides' Flag of Peace."

¹²⁸ According to the editorial note, Woolf here is referring to a procession of 6,000 members of the Church Lads' Brigade, who marched from Wellington and Chelsea Barracks to the parade ground near the Marble Arch, where they were to be inspected by the Prince of Wales. It is interesting to note that even Church organizations such as the Boys' Brigade and the YMCA used as their foundation Baden-Powell's early military manual *Aids to Scouting* (1899), the product of his many years of scouting and reconnaissance work with the army; incidentally, Baden-Powell had served as VP of the Boys' Brigade in 1903 while planning his own organization (Warren, "Robert" 115).

¹²⁹ Williamson, "Reputation" 131.

¹³⁰ Selections from his speeches were published in four volumes that appeared just prior to and during the period under discussion: these included *On England and Other Addresses* (1926), *Our Inheritance, Speeches and Addresses* (1928), *This Torch of Freedom* (1935), and *Service of Our Lives, Last Speeches as Prime Minister* (1937). These volumes sold well, and were reprinted in cheap editions between 1935 and 1938. *On England* was reissued in paperback by Penguin in 1937, while extracts from the last

three volumes, edited by R. Bennett, appeared in 1937 under the title *This Torch I Would Hand to You* (Williamson, *Conservative* 154, 366).

¹³¹ “Baldwin’s government organised as for war, energised by a ferociously anti-working-class Churchill (Virginia Woolf saw his armoured tanks on the streets, and heard the rumours about his plans for using tear gas) and a reactionary Home Secretary, Joynson-Hicks” (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 532). Much of the impact of the Strike on onlookers would have been the result of the fact that “the war was so recent” and that “so many of the strikers, and the workers who helped to break the strike, had fought for their country” (Lee, *Virginia Woolf* 533).

¹³² Woolf’s genius for piecing together diverse sources is evident here. For her argument as to women’s position in the university, she draws upon Pippa Strachey’s report in *Memorandum on the Position of English Women in Relation to that of English Men* that “Cambridge University still refuses to admit women to the full rights of membership; it grants them only titular degrees and they have therefore no share in the government of the University” (153). For her statistics on restricted admission for women, she relies on *The Student’s Handbook to Cambridge, 1934-5*, which states: “The total number of students at recognized institutions for the higher education of women who are receiving instruction in the University or working in the University laboratories or museums shall not any time exceed five hundred” (154), a fact she juxtaposes with evidence from Whitaker’s *Almanac* stating that “the number of male students who were in residence at Cambridge in October 1935 was 5,328” (ibid.). Finally, she substantiates her claim as to unequal scholarship funding for women by comparing the measurement for the men’s scholarship list in the newspaper—thirty-one inches—with that of the women’s list—five inches (154). See MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 64-65 for the newspaper article that prompted these measurements.

¹³³ Although Woolf was not in attendance at the 31 March 1936 meeting at which his remarks were made—she notes in her diary, “I wished I had gone to Downing St. to hear Baldwin on Newnham” (D5 21)—it appears that she later requested information on this speech from the Women’s Service Library. In a letter dated 3 July 1937, the librarian, Vera Douie, writes, “I am sending you a copy of the report on Mr. Baldwin’s speech about women in the Civil Service which appeared in the ‘Daily Telegraph’ on April 1st, 1936” (Pawlowski, “The Virginia Woolf and Vera Douie Letters” 11). Woolf quotes extensively from this report throughout the second section of *Three Guineas*.

¹³⁴ Woolf’s scrapbooks contain a description and photograph of the pageantry surrounding the Lord Mayor’s Show (MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 61).

¹³⁵ This is my best reading of her notes. The original reads: “Mere fultosme and flitthy p ayactoring feeble rhetoric” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 2: 56).

¹³⁶ Woolf attributes the dwindling number of female churchgoers with their exclusion from the Church, quoting Canon Barry’s observation that “what the keen observer would

notice in almost any church in England was the paucity of young women. . . . Among the student population the young women were, on the whole, farther away from the Church of England and the Christian faith than the young men” (*Three Guineas* 117-18). She draws further support from similar newspaper reports, such as one reflecting on the “‘very grave dissatisfaction’ among older schoolgirls at the way in which organized religion was carried on” (*Three Guineas* 179). Her scrapbooks contain additional sources on the subject, including one that relates how “Young women were becoming alienated from the Church because they had a growing suspicion that they were not really wanted by the Church” (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 63). See also MHP B16.f, Vol. 3: 49 and Vol. 1: 54. Woolf goes on to argue that these actions are “an attempt to discover what happens if the daughters of educated men absent themselves from church” (*Three Guineas* 118).

¹³⁷ See, for example, Lang’s letter to the Prime Minister in which he expresses that the views of various representatives of the Christian community “are in harmony with the declared policy of his Majesty’s Government” and “are in general accord with the present policy of the Government.” These representatives, he continues, “desire to assure you that in the pursuit of such a policy you may rely upon their support” (“Need to Rebuild Peace System”).

¹³⁸ In a tribute to his predecessor, Lord Caldecote wrote, “It is not too much to say his name became a household word throughout the land” (“Lord Hewart: Tributes at the Law Courts”).

¹³⁹ Clarke identifies Woolf as a signatory to two letters sent to the newspaper on the subject of obscenity, and a third on the subject of libel, “Authors and the Law of Libel: A Plea for Reform” published in *The Times* (“Lord Chief Justice” 24, 20).

¹⁴⁰ These aspects include, among others, his role in helping draft the Home Rule Bill for Ireland and a Constitution based thereon; his advocacy of constitutional reform in India; and his support of Viscountess Rhondda’s appeal for admission to the House of Lords in 1922, following her inheritance of her father’s peerage. For more on his involvement with Ireland, see Jackson 116-18, Ellis 251-53, and F. Carroll 120; on his support for Indian constitutional reform, see Sidebotham 166-67; and on his involvement in Lady Rhondda’s case, see Sharpe and McMahon 69-70.

¹⁴¹ According to Anderson, “most of the prosecutions under this act [which totaled 28 cases between 1933 and 1938] were in accord with the avowed intentions of the legislation,” with only a few exceptions (18). See Kidd 90-107 for a consideration of these exceptions.

¹⁴² An earlier case likely to have been of interest to the Woolfs was Hewart’s successful (and unpopular) prosecution of Trade Union leader Tom Mann in 1912 under the Incitement to Mutiny Act for his efforts to persuade soldiers to disobey orders to break strikes (Jackson 54).

¹⁴³ See Ewing and Gearty; Williams; E.C.S. Wade; Goodheart; and Kidd for summaries of both cases.

¹⁴⁴ This decision reiterated an earlier one regarding a similar series of events at Glamorgan, which many constitutional authorities maintained was based on a flawed interpretation of the law (Jackson 290).

¹⁴⁵ This has remained true for much of the twentieth century, according to Williams, who cites numerous instances in which this ruling has been used as a basis for police intervention at anti-war meetings, sit-ins, and demonstrations on college campuses and industrial sites, including nuclear facilities (123). In connection to this fact, it is interesting to note that Gordon Hewart had presided over Sir Oswald Mosley's libel case against *The Star*—"a political *cause célèbre* of first magnitude" (Jackson 244)—and came out strongly for the Fascist leader, securing from the jury damages in the nearly unprecedented amount of £5,000 (Jackson 242-48). One of Mosley's attorneys in the case was the Woolfs' friend, St John Hutchinson.

¹⁴⁶ In a 1926 toast at the annual dinner of the C.I.D., the Criminal Investigation Department, Hewart asserted: "the real danger is not so much that the zealous officer may go too far, but that, owing to ignorant and very often malicious criticism he should be deterred in his duty from going far enough" ("Work of the C.I.D.").

¹⁴⁷ In "Mr. A.P. Herbert's Bill" (1937), Hewart argued that "the grounds for divorce ought not to be restricted within the narrow and unreasonable compass which is stereotyped by the existing law" but rather "be so revised and enlarged as to exhibit some real relation to the facts of life" (123). See also "The Law of Divorce" (1935) in the same volume of essays. Woolf's interest in marriage law is evident from her scrapbooks, which contain a clipping bearing the title "Equality of the Sexes Only a Myth, Wives the Law's Favourites" (MHP B16.f, Vol. 1: 30).

¹⁴⁸ On this point, see Cynthia Hogue and Julie Vandivere's introduction to *The Sword Went out to Sea*, xviii. On the importance of dream-work to H.D., see Augustine.

¹⁴⁹ As with all autobiographical fiction, the boundaries between fantasy and reality are particularly difficult to differentiate in *The Sword*, a fact reinforced by H.D.'s equivocal claims about the work. On the one hand is her commentary on the book, expressed in a 1947 letter to Richard Aldington: "The DREAM [*The Sword*] is, as I said before, fantasy-cum-reality. But the five year 'reality' of bombs, fly-bombs and V2 was by far the less stable or 'real' than the world of the imagination that I tried to hold on to, those years. . . of course, I might have made him up, or imagined the whole sequence" (Zilboorg 92). On the other hand, are any number of comments in "H.D. by Delia Alton [Notes on Recent Writing]" that would appear to indicate the authenticity of the events described in the book, including her insistence that "the 'Writing' of the Wm Morris table is not symbolic and it need not be translated. It is, I repeat, as simple as a child's Alphabet chart. It is a

Child's Alphabet chart. So it seemed to me that I and the senders of the messages had returned to childhood" (H.D., "HD by Delia Alton" 194).

¹⁵⁰ Sybil Oldfield regards Woolf's experimental prose as an "antidote to the crudely unimaginative group-hatreds of war," calling it Woolf's "attempt to force our imaginations to become less 'sluggish' and 'to conceive what other people's lives mean to [them]—the infinite possibilities of a succession of days which are furled in [them]'" (*Women Against the Iron Fist* 109).

Works Cited

Woolf Studies

- Bell, Quentin. "A Room of One's Own and Three Guineas." Pawlowski, *Virginia Woolf and Fascism* 13-20.
- . *Virginia Woolf: A Biography*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1972.
- Black, Naomi. Introduction. *Three Guineas*. By Virginia Woolf. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. xiii-lxxv.
- . "'Not a Novel, They Said': Editing Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas*." *Editing Women*. Ed. Ann M. Hutchison. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1998. 27-54.
- . "Virginia Woolf and the Women's Movement." *Virginia Woolf: A Feminist Slant*. Ed. Jane Marcus. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1983. 180-97.
- . *Virginia Woolf as Feminist*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell UP, 2004.
- . "'Women Must Weep': The Serialization of *Three Guineas*." *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text*. Ed. James M. Haule and J. H. Stape. New York: Palgrave, 2002. 74-90.
- Bradshaw, David. "British Writers and Anti-Fascism in the 1930s, I: The Bray and Drone of Tortured Voices." *Woolf Studies Annual* 3 (1997): 3-27.
- . "British Writers and Anti-Fascism in the 1930s, II: Under the Hawk's Wings." *Woolf Studies Annual* 4 (1998): 41-66.
- Briggs, Julia. "Between the Texts: Virginia Woolf's Acts of Revision." *Text* 12 (1999): 143-65.
- . "Editing Woolf for the Nineties." *South Carolina Review* 29.1 (1996): 67-77.
- . Rev. of *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text*, ed. James M. Haule

-
- and J. H. Stape. *Woolf Studies Annual* 10 (2004): 325-29.
- . *Virginia Woolf: An Inner Life*. New York: Harcourt, 2005.
- Carroll, Berenice A. "‘To Crush Him in Our Own Country’: The Political Thought of Virginia Woolf." *Feminist Studies* 4.1 (1978): 99-131.
- Chapman, Wayne K. and Janet M. Manson. "Carte and Tierce: Leonard, Virginia Woolf, and War for Peace." Hussey, *Virginia Woolf and War* 58-78.
- Duffy, Julia and Lloyd Davis. "Demythologizing Facts and Photographs in *Three Guineas*." *Photo-Textualities: Reading Photographs and Literature*. Ed. Marsha Bryant. Newark, DE: U of Delaware P, 1996. 128-40.
- "An Electronic Edition and Commentary on Virginia Woolf's 'Time Passes.'" 2006. Centre for Textual Scholarship, De Montfort University. 28 April 2008. <<http://www.woolfonline.com/>>.
- Gabler, Hans Walter. "A Tale of Two Texts: Or, How One Might Edit Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*." *Woolf Studies Annual* 10 (2004): 1-29.
- . "Editing Virginia Woolf." Rev. of *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text*, ed. James M. Haule and J. H. Stape. *Text* 16 (2006): 333-43.
- Gillespie, Diane. "'Her Kodak Pointed at His Head': Virginia Woolf and Photography." *Virginia Woolf: Themes and Variations*. Ed. Vara Neverow-Turk and Mark Hussey. New York: Pace UP, 1993. 33-40.
- Gualtieri, Elena. "*Three Guineas* and the Photograph: The Art of Propaganda." Joannou, *Women Writers of the 1930s* 165-78.
- Hartley, Jenny. "Clothes and Uniform in the Theatre of Fascism: Clemence Dane and

-
- Virginia Woolf." *Gender and Warfare in the Twentieth Century: Textual Representations*. Ed. Angela K. Smith. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2004. 96-110.
- Haule, James M. "To the Lighthouse and the Great War: The Evidence of Virginia Woolf's Revisions of 'Time Passes.'" Hussey, *Virginia Woolf and War* 164-79.
- Haule, James M. and J. H. Stape. *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Humm, Maggie. *Modernist Women and Visual Cultures: Virginia Woolf, Vanessa Bell, Photography and Cinema*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2002.
- Hussey, Mark. "Living in a War Zone: An Introduction to Virginia Woolf as a War Novelist." Hussey, *Virginia Woolf and War* 1-13.
- . "Mrs. Thatcher and Mrs. Woolf." *MFS: Modern Fiction Studies* 50.1 (2004): 8-30.
- , ed. *Virginia Woolf and War: Fiction, Reality, and Myth*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1991.
- Kirkpatrick, B. J. and Stuart N. Clarke. *A Bibliography of Virginia Woolf*, 4th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1997.
- Lavin, J. A. "The First Editions of Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse*." *Proof: The Yearbook of American Bibliographical and Textual Studies* 2. Ed. Joseph Katz. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 1972: 185-211.
- Lee, Hermione. Introduction. *Three Guineas*. By Virginia Woolf. London: Hogarth Press, 1986.
- . *Virginia Woolf*. London: Vintage, 1997.
- Lilly, Amy M. "Three Guineas, Two Exhibits: Woolf's Politics of Display." *Woolf*

Studies Annual 9 (2003): 29-54.

Marcus, Jane. "Enchanted Organ, Magic Bells: *Night and Day* as a Comic Opera."

Marcus, *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy* 18-35.

---. Introduction. *Three Guineas*. By Virginia Woolf. New York: Harcourt Brace, 2006.

---. "Liberty, Sorority, Misogyny." Marcus, *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy* 75-95.

---. "The Niece of a Nun: Virginia Woolf, Caroline Stephen, and the Cloistered Imagination." Marcus, *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy* 115-35.

---. "'No More Horses': Virginia Woolf on Art and Propaganda." *Women's Studies* 4 (1977): 265-290.

---. "Sapphistry: Narration as Lesbian Seduction in *A Room of One's Own*." Marcus, *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy* 163-87.

---. "Storming the Toolshed." *Feminisms: An Anthology of Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Robyn R. Warhol and Diane Price Herndl. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1997. 263-78.

---. "'Taking the Bull by the Udders': Sexual Difference in Virginia Woolf—A Conspiracy Theory." Marcus, *Virginia Woolf and Bloomsbury* 146-69.

---, ed. *Virginia Woolf: A Feminist Slant*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1984.

---, ed. *Virginia Woolf and Bloomsbury: A Centenary Celebration*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1987.

---. *Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy*. Bloomington : Indiana UP, 1987.

---. "Wrapped in the Stars and Stripes: Virginia Woolf in the U.S.A." *South Carolina Review* 29.1 (1996): 17-23.

-
- Moss Gottlieb, Laura. "War Between the Woolfs." Marcus, *Virginia Woolf and Bloomsbury* 242-252.
- Neverow, Vara. "Freudian Seduction and the Fallacies of Dictatorship." Pawlowski, *Virginia Woolf and Fascism* 56-72.
- Pawlowski, Merry M. "Exposing Masculine Spectacle: Virginia Woolf's Newspaper Clippings for *Three Guineas* as Contemporary Cultural History." *Woolf Studies Annual* 9 (2003): 117-41.
- . "'Seule la culture désintéressée': Virginia Woolf, Gender, and Culture in Time of War." *War and Words: Horror and Heroism in the Literature of Warfare*. Ed. Sara Munson Deats, Lagretta Tallent Lenker, and Merry G. Perry. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2004. 215-33.
- . *Virginia Woolf and Fascism: Resisting the Dictators' Seduction*. New York: Palgrave, 2001.
- . "The Virginia Woolf and Vera Douie Letters: Woolf's Connections to the Women's Service Library." *Woolf Studies Annual* 8 (2002): 3-62.
- Phillips, Kathy J. *Virginia Woolf against Empire*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1994.
- Poole, Roger. "'We All Put Up with You Virginia': Irreceivable Wisdom about War." Hussey, *Virginia Woolf and War* 79-100.
- Radin, Grace. "'Two Enormous Chunks': Episodes Excluded during the Final Revisions of The Years." *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 80 (Winter 1977): 221-51.
- . *Virginia Woolf's The Years: The Evolution of a Novel*. Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1981.

-
- Shields, E. F. "The American Edition of *Mrs. Dalloway*." *Studies in Bibliography* 27 (1974): 157-75.
- Silver, Brenda R. "The Authority of Anger: *Three Guineas* as Case Study." *Signs* 16.2 (1991): 340-70.
- . "*Three Guineas* Before and After: Further Answers to Correspondents." Marcus, *Virginia Woolf: A Feminist Slant* 254-76.
- Snaith, Anna. *Virginia Woolf: Public and Private Negotiations*. London: Macmillan, 2000.
- . "Wide Circles: The *Three Guineas* Letters." *Woolf Studies Annual* 6 (2000): 1-169.
- Staveley, Alice. "Name That Face." *Virginia Woolf Miscellany* 51 (Spring 1998): 4-5.
- Topping Bazin, Nancy and Jane Hamovit Lauter. "Woolf's Keen Sensitivity to War: Its Roots and Its Impacts on Her Novels." Hussey, *Virginia Woolf and War* 14-39.
- Winterhalter, Teresa. "What Else Can I Do But Write?: Discursive Disruption and the Ethics of Style in Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas*." *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* 18.4 (2003): 236-57.
- Woolf, Virginia. *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*. 5 vols. Ed. Anne Olivier Bell. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1977-84.
- . *Jacob's Room*. 1922. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1960.
- . *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. 6 vols. Ed. Nigel Nicholson and Joanne Trautmann. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1975-80.
- . *Melymbrosia: An Early Version of The Voyage Out*. Ed. Louise DeSalvo. New York: New York Public Library, 1982.
- . *Mrs. Dalloway*. 1925. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1953.

-
- . *Orlando: A Biography*. 1928. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1956.
- . *The Pargiters: The Novel-Essay Portion of The Years*. Ed. Mitchell Leaska. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1977.
- . *A Room of One's Own*. 1929. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1957.
- . "Royalty." *The Moment and Other Essays*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1948. 235-40.
- . "A Sketch of the Past." *Moments of Being*. Ed. Jeanne Schulkind. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1985. 61-160.
- . "This is the House of Commons." *The London Scene: Six Essays on London Life*. New York: Ecco, 2006. 53-66.
- . "Thoughts on Peace in an Air Raid." *The Death of the Moth and Other Essays*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1942. 243-48.
- . *Three Guineas*. 1938. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1966.
- . *Three Guineas*. 1938. Ed. Naomi Black. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- . *Three Guineas*. 1938. Annotated and Introduced by Jane Marcus. New York: Harcourt, 2006.
- . *To the Lighthouse*. 1927. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1955.
- . *The Virginia Woolf Manuscripts from the Henry W. and Albert A. Berg Collection at the New York Public Library [Microform]*. Woodbridge, CT: Research Publications International, 1993.
- . *The Virginia Woolf Manuscripts from the Monks House Papers at the University of Sussex [Microform]*. Sussex, England: Harvester Microform, 1985.
- . "Virginia Woolf's Reading Notes for *Three Guineas*: An Online Archive and

Edition.” Ed. Merry Pawlowski and Vara Neverow.

<http://www.csub.edu/woolf/tgs_home.html>.

---. “Women Must Weep—Or Unite Against War.” *Atlantic Monthly* 161.5 (May 1938): 585-94; 161.6 (June 1938): 750-59.

---. *The Years*. 1937. London: Grafton, 1977.

Wussow, Helen. “Virginia Woolf and the Problematic Nature of the Photographic Image.” *Twentieth Century Literature* 40.1 (1994): 1-14.

Zwerdling, Alex. *Virginia Woolf and the Real World*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1986.

Peace Studies

3gf.org. The Three Guineas Fund. 27 April 2008. <<http://www.3gf.org/>>.

Bennett, Yvonne Aleksandra. “Vera Brittain and the Peace Pledge Union.” Pierson, *Women and Peace* 192-213.

---. “The Mothers’ International: The Women’s Co-Operative Guild and Feminist Pacifism.” *Women’s Studies International Forum* 7.6 (1984): 467-76.

Boulding, Elise. *Cultures of Peace: The Hidden Side of History*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 2000.

Brock, Peter and Nigel Young. *Pacifism in the Twentieth Century*. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1999.

Brown, Heloise. “*The Truest Form of Patriotism*”: *Pacifist Feminism in Britain, 1870-1902*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003.

Bussey, Gertrude and Margaret Tims, *Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1965.

Carroll, Berenice A. "Feminism and Pacifism: Historical and Theoretical Connections."

Pierson, *Women and Peace* 2-28.

Ceadel, Martin. *Pacifism in Britain 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith*. Oxford:

Clarendon, 1980.

---. "Ten Distinctions for Peace Historians." *The Pacifist Impulse in Historical*

Perspective. Ed. Harvey L. Dyck. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1996. 17-35.

Chatfield, Charles and Peter van den Dungen. *Peace Movements and Political Cultures*.

Knoxville: U of Tennessee P, 1988.

Coalitionofwomen.org. 2008. Coalition of Women for Peace. 27 April 2008.

<<http://coalitionofwomen.org/>>.

"CODEPINK Call to Action." 2007. CODEPINK, Women for Peace. 27 April 2008.

<<http://codepinkalert.org/>>.

Coile, Zachary. "Those Pesky Peaceniks." 12 July 2007.

28 April 2008 <<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi>>.

Cooper, Sandi E. *Patriotic Pacifism: Waging War on War in Europe, 1815-1914*. Oxford:

Oxford UP, 1991.

---. "Women's Participation in European Peace Movements: The Struggle to Prevent

WWI." Pierson, *Women and Peace* 51-75.

Costin, Lela B. "Feminism, Pacifism, Internationalism and the 1915 International

Congress of Women." *Women's Studies International Forum* 5.3-4 (1983): 301-

15.

Cross, Pamela. "International Women's Day 2003: Women Stand Together for Peace."

March 2003. 27 April 2008. <<http://www.owjn.org/action/IWD03.htm/>>.

-
- Devidayal, Namita. "A Room of One's Own and Not Just Three Guineas." *Times of India* (2001) <<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/articleshow/1192310281.cms>>.
- Douglas, Carol Anne. "Dear Ms. Woolf, We Are Returning Your Guineas." *off our backs* 21.5 (1991): 5.
- Enloe, Cynthia. *Bananas, Beaches & Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.
- "Fantastic Gospel According to Virginia." Plavo Pozoriste Theatre Laboratory. 27 April 2008. <<http://www.plavopozoriste.com/eng/produkcija/virdzinija.htm/>>.
- Featherstone, Liza. "Mighty in Pink." *The Nation* 14 February 2003. 28 April 2008 <<http://www.alternet.org/waroniraq/15189/>>.
- . "Pink Thongs and Patriarchy." *The Women's Review of Books* Sept. 2004 28 April 2008 <<http://www.wellesley.edu/womensreview/archive/2004/09/highlt.html>>.
- Foster, Catherine. *Women for All Seasons: The Story of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.
- "Four Fivers." 25 July 2006. 28 April 2008 <<http://www.feminish.net/>>.
- Goodman, Ellen. "Are Women Now Insiders on the War?" *Boston Globe* 27 Mar. 2003: A15.
- "HLS Establishes Alumnae-in-Residence Program for Women." *The Harvard University Gazette* 28 April 2008 <<http://www.hno.harvard.edu/gazette/1997/09.25/HLSEstablishesA.html/>>.
- Hume, Leslie Parker. *The National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies 1897-1914*. New York: Garland, 1982.
- Hunt, Swanee and Cristina Posa. "Women Waging Peace." *Foreign Policy* 124 (May-

June 2001): 38-47.

“International Network of Women’s Solidarity Against War 1992-2003.” 2006. Women in Black, Belgrade. 27 April 2008 <<http://www.zeneucnom.org/index.php>>.

“An Introduction to Obstetric Fistula.” 2007. *Three Guineas*. 27 April 2008 <<http://threeguineas.wordpress.com/>>.

Koehler, Robert. “Outraged Nurturers: Grieving Moms Have Long Made Strutting Warriors Tremble.” 25 August 2005. 28 April 2008. <<http://www.commonwonders.com/archives/col308.htm/>>.

“A Letter to Virginia Woolf.” 28 April 2008. <<http://matrifocus.com/BEL03/feminism.htm/>>.

Liddington, Jill. *The Road to Greenham: Feminism and Anti-Militarism in Britain since 1820*. London: Virago, 1989.

Liddington, Jill and Jill Norris. *One Hand Tied Behind Us: The Rise of the Women’s Suffrage Movement*. London: Rivers Oram Press, 2000.

Moghissi, Haideh “Women, War and Fundamentalism in the Middle East.” 28 April 2008 <<http://www.ssrc.org/sept11/essays/moghissi.htm/>>.

Muther, Cate. “Her Philanthropic Story Footnotes Virginia Woolf.” *Women’s eNews*. 28 May 2007. 28 April 2008 <<http://www.womensenews.org/article.cfm/>>.

“No Time for Despair: Women Take Action Worldwide, Message from Robin Morgan, Ellie Smeal, and Gloria Steinem,” *Ms*. Spring 2003. 28 April 2008 <<http://www.msmagazine.com/mar03/notime.asp/>>.

Oldfield, Sybil. *Women Against the Iron Fist: Alternatives to Militarism 1900-1989*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

---. *Women Humanitarians: A Biographical Dictionary of British Women*

Active Between 1900 and 1950. London: Continuum, 2001.

Perreault, Gerri. "Rethinking Leadership: Leadership as Friendship." *Advancing Women in Leadership Online Journal* 18 (Spring 2005)

<http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/social_justice1/Perreault.html>.

Pierson, Ruth Roach, ed. *Women and Peace: Theoretical, Historical and Practical Perspectives*. London: Croom Helm, 1987.

Rich, Adrienne "A Politics of Locations." 28 April 2008.

<<http://www.medmedia.org/review/numero2/en/art3.htm>>.

Ruddick, Sara. *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace*. Boston: Beacon, 1989.

---. "Peace in Our Time: Learning to Learn from Virginia Woolf." *Re: Reading, Re:*

Writing, Re: Teaching Virginia Woolf: Selected Papers from the Fourth Annual

Conference on Virginia Woolf. Ed. Eileen Barrett and Patricia Cramer. New York:

Pace UP, 1995.

Summers, Anne. "Militarism in Britain Before the Great War." *History Workshop*

Journal 2 (1976): 104-23.

Thompson, Dorothy. "Women, Peace and History: Notes for an Historical Overview."

Pierson, *Women and Peace* 29-43.

"The Three Guineas Trust." 2007. GuideStar International. 27 April 2008.

<<http://www.guidestar.org.uk/>>.

Vellacott, Jo. "Feminist Consciousness and the First World War." Pierson, *Women and*

Peace 114-36.

---. "Women, Peace and Internationalism, 1914-1920: 'Finding New Words and

Creating New Methods.” Chatfield and van den Dungen 106-24.

“The Vital Role of Women in Peace Building.” 2008. Hunt Alternatives Fund. 27 April

2008. <<http://www.huntalternatives.org/>>.

Wand.org. 2008. Women’s Action for New Directions. 27 April 2008

<<http://www.wand.org/>>.

Wilpf.org. The United States Section of WILPF, Women’s International League for Peace

and Freedom. 27 April 2008. <http://www.wilpf.org/US_WILPF/>.

Wiltsher, Anne. *Most Dangerous Women: Feminist Peace Campaigners of the Great*

War. London: Pandora, 1985.

Womenagainstar.org. 2008. Women Against War. 27 April 2008.

<<http://www.womenagainstar.org/>>.

“Women in Black.” 2002. 27 April 2008. <<http://balkansnet.org/wib/mission.html>>.

Yaszek, Lisa. “Stories ‘That Only a Mother’ Could Write: Midcentury Peace Activism,

Maternalist Politics, and Judith Merrill’s Early Fiction.” *NWSA* 16.2 (2004): 70-

97.

Textual Theory and Editing

Bornstein, George. “Introduction: Why Editing Matters.” Bornstein, *Representing*

Modernist Texts 1-16.

---. *Material Modernism: The Politics of the Page*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

---, ed. *Representing Modernist Texts: Editing as Interpretation*. Ann Arbor: U of

Michigan P, 1991.

Bornstein, George and Ralph G. Williams, eds. *Palimpsest: Editorial Theory in the*

Humanities. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1993.

Bryant, John. *The Fluid Text: A Theory of Revision and Editing for Book and Screen*.

Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2002.

Cohen, Philip, ed. *Devils and Angels: Textual Editing and Literary Theory*.

Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1991.

Cohen, Philip and David H. Jackson, "Notes on Emerging Paradigms in Editorial Theory." Cohen, *Devils and Angels* 103-23.

Eggert, Paul. "Textual Product or Textual Process: Procedures and Assumptions of Critical Editing." Cohen, *Devils and Angels* 57-77.

Gabler, Hans Walter. "The Synchrony and Diachrony of Texts: Practice and Theory of the Critical Edition of James Joyce's *Ulysses*." *Text* 1 (1981): 305-26.

Greetham, D. C. "Editorial and Critical Theory: From Modernism to Postmodernism." Bornstein and Williams, *Palimpsest* 9-28.

---. "The Manifestation and Accommodation of Theory in Textual Editing." Cohen, *Devils and Angels* 78-102.

---. "Textual and Literary Theory: Redrawing the Matrix." *Studies in Bibliography* 42 (1989): 1-25.

---. *Theories of the Text*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Grigely, Joseph. *Textuality: Art, Theory, and Textual Criticism*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1995.

Haule, James and J. H. Stape, eds. *Editing Virginia Woolf: Interpreting the Modernist Text*. London: Palgrave, 2002.

Hay, Louis. "Does 'Text' Exist?" *Studies in Bibliography* 41 (1988): 65-77.

McGann, Jerome. *A Critique of Modern Textual Criticism*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1983.

---. *The Textual Condition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.

Parrish, Stephen. "The Whig Interpretation of Literature." *Text* 4 (1988): 343-50.

Reiman, Donald H. *Romantic Texts and Contexts*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1987.

Roland, Meg. "'More Odd Texts': A Theory of Parallel Texts." *Text* 17 (2005): 1-33.

Shillingsburg, Peter. "Text as Matter, Concept, and Action." *Studies in Bibliography* 44 (1991): 32-83.

Silver, Brenda R. "Textual Criticism as Feminist Practice: Or, Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf Part II." Bornstein, *Representing Modernist Texts* 193-222.

WATCH (Writers, Artists, and Their Copyright Holders) File. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center. 28 April 2008 <<http://tyler.hrc.utexas.edu/uk.cfm/>>.

Zeller, Hans. "A New Approach to the Critical Constitution of Literary Texts." *Studies in Bibliography* 28 (1975): 232-65.

British Cultural and Literary History

Aldgate, Anthony and James C. Robertson. *Censorship in Theatre and Cinema*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 2005.

Anderson, Gerald D. *Fascists, Communists, and the National Government: Civil Liberties in Great Britain, 1931-1937*. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1983.

"Archbishop of York on Use of Force, Disapproval of Extreme Pacifism." *The Times* 24 Oct. 1934: 19.

"Archbishop on Vestments, Dean of Canterbury's Proposal." *The Times* 24 Dec. 1936:

15.

“Australia Day—144th Anniversary of Its Founding as Part of the British Empire.” *The Times* 27 Jan. 1932: 12.

“Authors and the Law of Libel, Plea for Reform.” *The Times* 13 Mar. 1936: 10.

“Award of Peace Prize to Herr von Ossietzky, From Prison to Hospital.” *The Times* 25 Nov. 1936: 13.

Baldwin, Stanley. “The Authentic Note of Democracy.” Baldwin, *This Torch of Freedom* 30-51.

---. “Bound Over to Make the Peace.” Baldwin, *This Torch of Freedom* 319-39.

---. “Freedom and Discipline.” Baldwin, *This Torch of Freedom* 271-88.

---. “Our Freedom Is Our Own.” Baldwin, *This Torch of Freedom* 15-24.

---. *This Torch of Freedom: Speeches and Addresses*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.

---. “Unto Whomsoever Much Is Given.” Baldwin, *This Torch of Freedom* 25-29.

“Banned ‘Peace Film’ Seen by M.P.s.” *The Times* 9 Apr. 1936: 12.

“Bishop of Gloucester on Pacifism, ‘Directly Anti-Christian.’” *The Times* 5 May 1936: 13.

Blom-Cooper, Louis and Terence Morris. *With Malice Aforethought: A Study of the Crime and Punishment for Homicide*. Portland, OR: Hart, 2004.

“Boy Scouts and World Peace.” *The Times* 21 Sep. 1931: 7.

Bridenthal, Renate, Claudia Koonz, Susan Stuard, eds. *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987.

Calder, Angus and Dorothy Sheridan, eds. *Speak for Yourself: A Mass-Observation*

Anthology, 1937-49. London: Jonathan Cape, 1984.

“Canterbury’s Charter, 700th Anniversary Celebrated, The Archbishop on Freedom.”

The Times 3 Dec. 1934: 8.

Carpenter, Edward. *Cantuar: The Archbishops in Their Office.* Oxford: Mowbray, 1988.

Carroll, Francis M. *Money for Ireland: Finance, Diplomacy, Politics, and the First Dail*

Eireann Loans, 1919-1936. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2002.

“Christian Attitude To War, Anglican Evangelical Debate.” *The Times* 16 Jan. 1936: 7.

“Christian Pacifism.” *The Times* 28 Mar. 1936: 8.

“Christian Unity and World Peace, Dr. Temple on ‘Genuine Synthesis.’” *The Times* 15

Oct. 1931: 7.

“Christians and Fighting, Dr. Henson on ‘Pedantic Pacifism.’” *The Times* 7 Jun. 1937:

16.

“Churches and the Cause of Peace, Faith in the League.” *The Times* 8 Dec. 1933: 9.

“The Churches and Peace.” *The Times* 16 Jul. 1935: 10.

“Churches and Peace, Lambeth Palace Conference, ‘Bound to Uphold the Covenant.’”

The Times 23 Oct. 1935: 9.

“The Churches and Peace, Need of New Spirit in Europe, Dr. Lang’s Appeal.” *The*

Times 13 Jun. 1934: 21.

Clarke, Stuart N. “The Lord Chief Justice and the Woolfs.” *Virginia Woolf Bulletin of the*

Virginia Woolf Society of Great Britain 14 (Sept. 2003): 12-25.

“Convocation of Canterbury, Archbishop and the League, ‘The Ideal Remains.’” *The*

Times 28 May 1936: 10.

“Convocation of Canterbury, The Archbishop on World Peace.” *The Times* 24 Jan. 1935:

7.

“Convocation of Canterbury, Loyal Tributes, Archbishop and ‘A Very Dear Friend.’”

The Times 23 Jan. 1936: 6.

Cross, F. L., ed. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*. 3rd ed. Ed. E. A.

Livingstone. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.

Cull, Nicholas John. *Selling War: The British Propaganda Campaign Against American*

“Neutrality” in World War II. New York: Oxford UP, 1995.

“Curzon Memorial, Unveiling in the Abbey.” *The Times* 27 Nov. 1930: 19.

Daniels, Anthony. “The Man Who Made Scouting.” *The New Criterion*. June 2004: 22-

27.

“The Disaffection Bill, Lord Allen’s Plea for Withdrawal.” *The Times* 27 Oct. 1934: 14.

“The Disaffection Bill, Proofs of a Children’s Annual.” *The Times* 6 Nov. 1934: 10.

“Duty of Self Defence, Lord Hewart on Patriotism, The Territorial Army in Peace.” *The*

Times 20 May 1935: 9.

Ellis, Peter Berresford. *Eyewitness to Irish History*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley,

2004.

Ewing, K. D. and C. A. Gearty. *The Struggle for Civil Liberties: Political Freedom and*

the Rule of Law in Britain, 1914-1945. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Gillis, John. *Youth and History: Tradition and Change in European Age Relations*.

Expanded student ed. New York: Academic Press. 1981.

Goodheart, A. L. “*Thomas v. Sawkins*: A Constitutional Innovation.” *Cambridge Law*

Journal 6 (1936-38): 22-30.

Grant, Mariel. *Propaganda and the Role of the State in Inter-War Britain*. London:

Clarendon, 1994.

“Guides’ Flag of Peace, First Week of Jamboree.” *The Times* 7 Aug. 1937: 12.

Hastings, Adrian. *A History of English Christianity 1920-1985*. London: Collins, 1986.

Heuston, R. F. V. *Lives of the Lord Chancellors 1885-1940*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1964.

Hewart, Gordon. “The Bud of Liberty.” Hewart, *Not Without Prejudice* 44-48.

---. “England.” Hewart, *Not Without Prejudice* 37-43.

---. “The Fascination of the Press.” Hewart, *Not Without Prejudice* 105-13.

---. “The Law of Divorce.” Hewart, *Not Without Prejudice* 114-21.

---. “The Meaning of Democracy.” Hewart, *Not Without Prejudice* 85-91.

---. “Mr. A. P. Herbert’s Bill.” Hewart, *Not Without Prejudice* 122-30.

---. *The New Despotism*. London: Ernest Benn, 1929.

---. *Not Without Prejudice*. London: Hutchinson, 1937.

“The Home of Liberty, Lord Hewart on the English Scene.” *The Times* 19 Oct. 1935: 9.

Hylson-Smith, Kenneth. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England*. Edinburgh: T &

T Clark, 1993.

Hynes, Samuel. *The Edwardian Turn of Mind*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1968.

Jackson, Robert. *The Chief: The Biography of Gordon Hewart, Lord Chief Justice of*

England, 1922-1940. London: Harrap, 1959.

Jeal, Tim. *The Boy-Man: The Life of Lord Baden-Powell*. New York: William Morrow,

1990.

Johnston, John. *The Lord Chamberlain’s Blue Pencil*. London: Hodder & Stoughton,

1990.

Keesing’s Contemporary Archives. 1931-4, 1935-7, 1938-40. London: Keesing’s.

Kidd, Ronald. *British Liberty in Danger: An Introduction to the Study of Civil Rights*.

London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1940.

“The King’s High Almoner.” *The Times* 16 Sep. 1933: 10.

Lang, Cosmo Gordon. “‘The Church and the Clergy at This Time of War’: Being a

Charge Delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese Assembled in the Minster of York

on February 14 & 15, 1916, by Cosmo Gordon Lang, D.D., D.C.L. Archbishop of

York.” London: Spottiswoode, 1916.

“‘Lest We Run Too Far,’ Aims of Scout and Guide Movements.” *The Times* 30 Sep.

1937: 34.

Lilly, Mark. *The National Council for Civil Liberties: The First Fifty Years*. London:

Macmillan, 1984.

Lockhart, J. G. *Cosmo Gordon Lang*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949.

“Lord Hewart on Magna Carta, The King’s Message.” *The Times* 21 Jun. 1926: 11. “Lord

Hewart on the Press, Status of Journalism.” *The Times* 4 Dec. 1922: 14.

“Lord Hewart: Tributes at the Law Courts.” *The Times* 7 May 1943: 8.

MacColl, James E. and W. T. Wells. “The Incitement to Disaffection Bill, 1934.” *The*

Political Quarterly 5.3: 352-64.

MacDonald, Robert H. *Sons of the Empire: The Frontier and the Boy Scout Movement,*

1890-1918. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1993.

MacKenzie, John M. *Propaganda and Empire: The Manipulation of British Popular*

Opinion 1880-1960. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1984.

“Memorial to Lord Davidson.” *The Times* 21 Apr. 1934: 12.

Middlemas, Keith and John Barnes, *Baldwin: A Biography*. Great Britain: Macmillan,

1969.

“Mr. Lansbury on Peace, What He Would Do at Geneva.” *The Times* 14 Sep. 1935: 12.

“Need to Rebuild Peace System, Church Leaders in Conference, Support of Government.” *The Times* 24 Mar. 1936: 18.

“Newnham College, To the Editor of the Times.” *The Times* 6 Mar. 1936: 10.

“Newnham College, To the Editor of the Times. *The Times* 8 Jan. 1937: 8.

Ogilvy-Webb, Marjorie. *The Government Explains: A Study of the Information Services, A Report of the Royal Institute of Public Administration*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1965.

O’Higgins, Paul. *Censorship in Britain*. London: Nelson, 1972.

Ollard, S. L., Gordon Crosse, and Maurice F. Bond, eds. *A Dictionary of English Church History*. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1948.

“Pacifism and ‘Heresy,’ An Explanation by Dr. Temple, Restraint of Violence.” *The Times* 29 Oct. 1935: 19.

“Pacifism and ‘Heresy,’ Dr. Temple’s Reply to Professor Raven.” *The Times* 4 Nov. 1935: 9.

“Pacifism and ‘Heresy,’ The Law of Love, To the Editor of *The Times*.” *The Times* 31 Oct. 1935: 10.

“Pacifist Churches in a Crisis, Archbishop’s Reply to Kent Vicar.” *The Times* 12 Jul. 1934: 16.

“Pacifist Clergy, Archbishop’s Reply to Deputation.” *The Times* 28 Nov. 1936: 7.

“Peace Aim of Scouting: No Politics or Militarism.” *The Times* 13 Aug. 1937: 11.

“Peace and ‘Pacifism.’” *The Times* 19 Jun. 1935: 15.

“Peace through the League, Primate on Proposed Declaration.” *The Times* 4 Aug. 1934:

12.

Petre, Jonathan. *By Sex Divided: The Church of England and Women Priests*. London:

Harper Collins, 1994.

“‘Precious Stone Set in the Silver Sea,’ Lord Hewart on ‘This England.’” *The Times* 24

Apr. 1937: 7.

Proctor, Tammy M. “‘A Separate Path’: Scouting and Guiding in Interwar South Africa.”

Society for Comparative Study of Society and History (2000): 605-31.

Pugh, Martin. *Women and the Women’s Movement in Britain 1914-1999*. New York: St.

Martin’s, 1992.

“The Quality of Judges, Lord Hewart on Full-Bottomed Wig.” *The Times* 1 Feb. 1937:

7.

“The Recall to Religion, Archbishop on Reality, Laity, and Their Faith.” *The Times* 2

Feb. 1937: 17.

“The Right Use of Force, Archbishop on Pacifism, An Appeal to Spain.” *The Times* 13

Oct. 1936: 11.

“Ritual Murder: The May Number of *Der Sturmer*, The Archbishop of Canterbury’s

Protest.” *The Times* 16 May 1934: 17.

Rosenthal, Michael. *The Character Factory: Baden-Powell and the Origins of the Boy*

Scout Movement. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Ross, Ellen. *Love and Toil: Motherhood in Outcast London*. New York: Oxford UP,

1993.

“School Speech Days, ‘The Open Road for Women,’ Lord Hewart on Hard Work.” *The*

Times. 25 Jun. 1923: 17.

“Sedition Bill, Criticism at Oxford.” *The Times* 7 May 1934: 16.

Sharpe, Robert J. and Patricia I. McMahon. *The Persons Case: The Origins and Legacy of the Fight for Legal Personhood*. Osgoode Society for Canadian Legal History. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2007.

Shellard, Dominic and Steve Nicolson, with Miriam Handley. *The Lord Chamberlain Regrets . . . : A History of British Theatre Censorship*. London: The British Library, 2004.

Sidebotham, Herbert. *Political Profiles from British Public Life*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1921.

Springhall, John. “Baden-Powell and the Scout Movement Before 1920: Citizen Training or Soldiers of the Future?” *The English Historical Review* 102.405 (1987): 934-42.

---. “The Boy Scouts, Class and Militarism in Relation to British Youth Movements, 1908-1930.” *International Review of Social History* 16.2 (1971): 125-58.

---. *Youth, Empire and Society: British Youth Movements, 1883-1940*. London: Croom Helm, 1977.

Starkey, David. “Art of Humour.” *Times Higher Education Supplement* 27 June 1997. 28 April 2008 <http://www.sfb.co.uk/speakers/david_starkey/articles>.

Street, Harry. *Freedom, the Individual, and the Law*. 4th ed. Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1977.

Tallents, Sir Stephen. *The Projection of England*. London: Faber & Faber, 1932.

Taylor, Philip M. *The Projection of Britain: British Overseas Publicity and Propaganda*,

1919-1939. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1981.

“The Tiger and His Teeth, Danger in Extreme Pacifism, Bishop’s Warning.” *The Times* 26 May 1936: 11.

“Tributes from Every Pulpit, Archbishop of Canterbury in the Abbey, A Broadcast to the Empire.” *The Times* 27 Jan. 1936: 11.

Vane, Francis Fletcher. *The Boy Knight*. London: Council of National Peace Scouts, 1910.

Wade, E. C. S. “Police Powers and Public Meetings.” *Cambridge Law Journal* 6 (1936-38): 175-81.

Wade, Eileen K. *The Piper of Pax: The Life Story of Sir Robert Baden-Powell*. London: C. Arthur Pearson, 1924.

Warren, Allen. “Baden-Powell, Robert Stephenson Smyth.” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Vol. 45. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. 112-118.

---. “Sir Robert Baden-Powell, the Scout Movement and Citizen Training in Great Britain, 1900-1920.” *The English Historical Review* 101.399 (1986): 376-98.

“Wateler Peace Prize for Lord Baden-Powell.” *The Times* 9 Jul. 1937: 15.

“‘The Way of Peace,’ Archbishops’ Appeal to the Church.” *The Times* 30 Dec. 1935: 6.

Wilkinson, Alan. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Vol. 32. Ed. H. C. G. Matthew and Brian Harrison. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. 456-61.

Williams, D. G. T. “Preventive Action and Public Order: The Principle of *Thomas v. Sawkins*.” *Cambrian Law Review* 16 (1985): 116-26.

Williamson, Philip. "Baldwin's Reputation: Politics and History, 1937-1967." *The Historical Journal* 47.1 (2004): 127-68.

---. *Stanley Baldwin: Conservative Leadership and National Values*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.

"Women at Cambridge, New Buildings for Girton." *The Times* 31 Oct. 1930: 10.

Woolf, Leonard. *Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919-1939*. New York: Harcourt Brace, 1967.

---. *Quack, Quack!* London: Hogarth, 1935.

---, ed. *The Intelligent Man's Way to Prevent War*. London: Victor Gollancz, 1933.

"Work of the C.I.D., Lord Hewart's Tribute, Fairness of British Penal Code." *The Times* 3 Apr. 1926: 7.

Zuhlsdorff, Volkmar. *Hitler's Exiles: The German Cultural Resistance in America and Europe*. New York: Continuum, 1999; translation, 2004.

Literary and Visual Studies

Augustine, Jane. "Preliminary Comments on the Meaning of H.D.'s *The Sword Went out to Sea*." *Sagetrieb* 15 (1996): 121-32.

Barthes, Roland. *Camera Lucida*. New York: Farrar Straus, 1980.

Bluemel, Kristin. "Not Waving or Drowning: Refusing Critical Options, Rewriting Literary History." *And in Our Time: Vision, Revision and British Writing of the 1930s*. Ed. Antony Shuttleworth. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 2003.

Burton, Diane. *An Aesthetic of Witness: The Interaction of Photographs and Nonfiction*

Prose in George Orwell's The Road to Wigan Pier, James Agee and Walker Evans's Let Us Now Praise Famous Men, and Virginia Woolf's Three Guineas. Diss. University of Tulsa, 2003.

Cunningham, Valentine. *British Writers of the Thirties*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.

Donovan, Stephen. "The Muse of *Blackwood's*: Charles Whibley and Literary Criticism in the World." *Print Culture and the Blackwood Tradition, 1805-1930*. Ed. David Finkelstein. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2006: 259-86.

Doolittle, Hilda (H.D.). *Asphodel*. Ed. Robert Spoo. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 1992.

---. *Bid Me to Live: A Madrigal*. Redding Ridge, CT: Black Swan Books, 1983.

---. "HD by Delia Alton." *Iowa Review* 16.3 (1986): 180-221.

---. *Paint It Today*. Ed. Cassandra Laity. New York: New York UP, 1992.

---. *Palimpsest*. Paris: Contact Editions, 1926.

---. *The Sword Went Out to Sea (Synthesis of a Dream)*. Ed. Cynthia Hogue and Julie Vandivere. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2007.

---. *H.D.: Collected Poems, 1912-1944*. Ed. Louis L. Martz. New York: New Directions, 1986.

---. *Tribute to Freud*. Foreword by Norman Holmes Pearson. Introduction by Kenneth Fields. Boston: D. R. Godine, 1974.

Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1998.

---. "Modernism of the 'Scattered Remnant': Race and Politics in the Development of H.D.'s Modernist Vision." *H.D.: Woman and Poet*. Ed. Michael King. Orono, ME: U of Maine at Orono, 1986. 91-116.

-
- Hamann, Brigitte. *Bertha von Suttner: A Life for Peace*. Trans. Ann Dubsky. Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1996.
- Hogue, Cynthia and Julie Vandivere, Introduction. *The Sword Went Out to Sea (Synthesis of a Dream)*. By H.D. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2007.
- Joannou, Maroula, ed. *Women Writers of the 1930s: Gender, Politics and History*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1999.
- Linklater, Andro. *An Unhusbanded Life: Charlotte Despard, Suffragette, Socialist and Sinn Feiner*. London: Hutchinson, 1980.
- Pethick-Lawrence, Emmeline. *My Part in a Changing World*. London: Gollancz, 1938.
- Robins, Elizabeth. *Ancilla's Share: An Indictment of Sex Antagonism*. London: Hutchinson, 1924.
- Sarton, May. *May Sarton: Selected Letters 1916-1954*. Ed. Susan Sherman. New York: Norton, 1997.
- Shaw, Marion. *The Clear Stream: A Life of Winifred Holtby*. London: Virago, 1999.
- Stein, Gertrude. *Paris France*. 1940. New York: Liveright, 1970.
- . *Wars I Have Seen*. 1945. London: Brilliance Books, 1984.
- . "The Winner Loses: A Picture of Occupied France." *Atlantic Monthly* 166.5 (November 1940): 571-83.
- Vellacott, Jo. *From Liberal to Labour with Women's Suffrage: The Story of Catherine Marshall*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1993.
- Zilboorg, Caroline. *Richard Aldington and H.D.: The Later Years in Letters*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1995.

