INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

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 bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI 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.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

University of Alberta

PICTURES OF A FLOATING WORLD: RELOCATING BLOOMSBURY

by

Catherine Ann Nelson-McDermott 

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Department of English

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring 1997

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Catherine Ann Nelson-McDermott

Title of Thesis: Pictures of a Floating World:

Relocating Bloomsbury

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

Year this Degree Granted: 1997

10991-131 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T5M 1B7

Date: December 30, 1996

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled **Pictures of a Floating World: Relocating Bloomsbury** submitted by Catherine Ann Nelson-McDermott in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. Jo-Ann Wallace

Dr. Stephen Slemon

Dr. Edward Bishop

Dr. Ronald Ayling

Dr. Nasrin Rahimieh

Dr. Melba Cuddy-Keane

Date: January 6, 1997

For Marlene, who kept me sane: against all eventualities

ABSTRACT

This thesis, **Pictures of a Floating World: Relocating Bloomsbury**, takes up a debate about the cultural work of Bloomsbury and its political valency within the greater modernist movement using current understandings of postcolonial and colonial discourse theories as its critical framework. It investigates the work of two members of Bloomsbury often overlooked in critical accounts of the Bloomsbury Group, Leonard Woolf and Arthur Waley.

Chapter One focuses on Arthur Waley, autodidact Orientalist, translator of literatures and cultures. It begins by placing Waley in his Bloomsbury context and briefly discussing his life. This chapter looks especially at the places in which Waley's translations and cultural productions intersect with, and differ from, Ezra Pound's translation agendas. This emphasis allows a study of the critical construction of both men. The chapter concludes with a reading of Waley's growth as an Orientalist and the ways in which his interactions with an "actual" Orient could have been, but have not so far been, incorporated into the critical tradition.

Two chapters on Leonard Woolf follow. One chapter looks at Woolf's early career with the Ceylon Civil Service and the fictional works (Stories of the East, The Village in the Jungle) which arose from that interaction. The other looks at Woolf's subsequent political interventions in the British imperialist power structure, rounding out these case studies

of one way in which certain of Bloomsbury's political and cultural interventions might help current academics in the humanities to understand the "given possibilities" to be found waiting in selected snapshots of modernism.

The conclusion makes some suggestions about these "possibilities" and the nature of their inherence in the current (invested) academic tradition of political intervention and cultural construction.

Acknowledgements:

A dissertation is inevitably the work of many people. The care and feeding of the PhD student can be complex and time-consuming for everyone concerned. I would therefore like to acknowledge the never-ending loving care provided by my family and the unqualified support in matters academic and personal given me by my friends and colleagues (each of the many of you). I thank my supervisor and committee for their careful work in guiding me through this long process. I would also like to acknowledge three years of financial support from the Social Science and Humanities Research Council of Canada. As well, I would like to thank Edward Skipworth, Rutgers Special Collections Librarian, for assistance with the Arthur Waley Manuscript Collection.

PICTURES OF A FLOATING WORLD: RELOCATING BLOOMSBURY

Table of Contents:

List of Illustrations:

Page [i] has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It contained a picture of the participants in the Dreadnought hoax in their "Abyssinian" garb taken from Stephen's frontispiece.

INTRODUCTION: CONTESTED TERRITORY

POSING (FOR) THE QUESTION:

In February of 1910 (Bell Virginia Woolf 213), Virginia Stephen, Adrian Stephen, Horace de Vere Cole, Duncan Grant, Anthony Buxton, and Guy Ridley descended on the flagship of the Home Fleet (the Dreadnought) in blackface, posing as the Emperor of Abyssinia and his entourage. His Majesty's Navy, not being able to find a copy of the national anthem of Abyssinia (now Ethiopia), played that of Zanzibar "as the next best thing," to welcome the group aboard (Stephen 46). Adrian Stephen, as the "German" interpreter, interpreted English into "Abyssinian" by reciting passages from Virgil's Aeneid and from Homer (Stephen 41) in as peculiar an accent as he could muster. Duncan Grant's false mustache actually began to peel off at one point (44).

No one noticed.

When the Dreadnought Hoax became public, questions were asked in Parliament about the honour of the Navy and the expenses involved (Bell Virginia Woolf 213-4 [1987]). No one seems officially to have asked such obvious questions as why His Majesty's naval members did not recognize the white skins under the black masks. The centrality of British military might and commerce was defended through a series of (unofficial) ceremonial taps administered to the backsides of Cole and Grant by navy members (Stephen 53-6). British assumptions about Britain's inviolable and very serious centrality carried on undamaged.

This event is representative of Bloomsbury's relationship to the British colonial power structure. It is also representative of a certain canonical approach to Bloomsbury's political interventions in the world. To begin with, the "hoax" is an ironic and parodic gesture aimed at an established power structure which the group believed to be self-serving, overly confident, and just plain lacking in common sense (and a sense of irony). The players, centrally located within that power structure themselves (mostly "in" on the joke because of their association through Cambridge), take on the task of (somewhat inadequately) representing "other" peoples.[1] As well, the political nature of the

---

[1] The group represented here is Abyssinian (Ethiopian). Abyssinia was the only African nation which was not colonized by Western powers. Presumably the hoaxers chose Abyssinia because of the pomp and circumstance involved when one head of a sovereign state visits another sovereign state.

intervention (the suggestion that British officers could not tell Abyssinians from cork-coloured British whites and had such a poor understanding of the geography, language, and dress of Abyssinia that such a hoax was easily entered into by people who themselves took no trouble to study up on Abyssinia[2]) has been completely ignored. The Dreadnought incident is read, if it is read at all, as a youthful joke, a parodic moment the equivalent of an impolite arm gesture. Immortalized in an ironically understated little (in size and content) book, The Dreadnought Hoax, written by one of the participants (Adrian Stephen) and published, years later, by his sister and brother-in-law (Virginia and Leonard Woolf at the Hogarth Press in 1936), the whole production is amusing, vaguely anti-establishment, and most definitely not an intervention generally read as socially or politically significant.

BLOOMSBURY AND ORIENTALISM:

My study takes up an established debate about the cultural work of Bloomsbury and its political valency within the greater modernist movement using current understandings of postcolonial and colonial discourse theories as its critical framework.[3] It focuses on two members of Bloomsbury often overlooked in critical accounts of the Bloomsbury Group, Leonard Woolf and Arthur Waley.

In reviewing Leonard Woolf's autobiography in 1970, Noel Annan, biographer of Leslie Stephen and author of "The Intellectual Aristocracy," maintained that

> If British public opinion today is vastly more sceptical than it was of the necessity

---

[2] Cole and Stephen did make some attempt to learn Swahili on the train between London and Weymouth, where the Fleet was temporarily situated (Stephen 32-3).

[3] Colonial discourse (of which Orientalism can be seen to be a specific category most fully described by Edward Said [cf Boehmer 50-1]) involves the European production of a system of representation about non-European (subject) spaces which structured individual (colonized and colonizer) entries into that system and which was also, reciprocally, contributed to by those individuals. Colonial discourse theory looks at the textual, social, and bodily inscriptions, functions, and effects of this discourse with the hope of intervening in the unquestioned reproduction and expansion of such a system. Imperialism, as for Said in Culture and Imperialism, "means the practice, the theory, and the attitudes of a dominating metropolitan centre ruling a distant territory" (8).

> of...proclaiming as offensively as possible the superiority of the white to all other races, and therefore, its inalienable right to treat them as second-class citizens, some of the credit goes to [Bertrand] Russell and [Leonard] Woolf and their friends. ("Leonard Woolf" 188)

Contemporaries of the Bloomsbury Group such as Q.D. and F.R. Leavis, Bertrand Russell himself, and George Bernard Shaw were less complimentary about Bloomsbury's political ideologies and influences. Dmitri Mirsky, the Marxist critic, went so far as to contend (with a good deal of truth) in The Intelligensia of Great Britain, a work translated into English in 1935, that "the cultured leisure of those enlightened children of the bourgeoisie is ensured them by what shekels come in from colonial and other dependent lands" (387). To equate the Bloomsbury Group's participation in their cultural moment with approval of, or wholesale collusion with, contemporary British imperialism elides, however, the question of what the Group did with its leisure time; such a reading ignores the Group's somewhat awkward relation to its own time.

In 1980, Raymond Williams, working with Marxist and poststructuralist theory, conducted a searching analysis of the Bloomsbury Group's problematic relationship to class and power structures within Britain, in the context of group "work" as it pertains to cultural movements. In "The Bloomsbury Fraction," Williams concluded that the members of this group, most specifically the male members, were "a true fraction of the existing English upper class. They were at once against its dominant ideas and values and still willingly, in all immediate ways, part of it" (156). The relationship of Bloomsbury to the continuation and propagation of imperialist class and power structures, to imperialist modes of thought, is therefore more complex than Mirsky and Annan's conflicting, but equally one-dimensional, statements might lead one to expect. As Rita Felski suggests in 1989,

> Social and discursive practices are meaningful only as specific choices among given possibilities, which in turn exist in relation to past events, which provide the conditions for their initiation; there is no discursive position which is not multiply determined and implicated within ideology. (61)

What sorts of "given possibilities" lie behind such snapshots as that of the Dreadnought Hoax, and where might a search for these "possibilities" take us?

DE-POLITICIZED MODERNISM:

Many current theories of Anglo-American modernism[4] display a tendency to read modernist texts for their proto-postmodern features. In 1989, Vincent Leitch suggests that in the "1970s and 1980s...literary intellectuals couldn't agree whether Ezra Pound was the archetypal modernist or the leading proto-post-modernist" (166). T.S. Eliot, Virginia Woolf, and James Joyce, for example, have now been included in the list of "postmodern" modernists. Such readings make a clear distinction between subject (content) and style. For instance, in his 1993 article "Sex and Credit: Consumer Capitalism in Ulysses," Michael Tratner reads Ulysses' foregrounding of the fragmented, unstable subject(s) as an exploration of a liberating post-modern process/identity, at least as that subject(s) was coming into contact with end-stage capitalism. Tratner's is just one of a large number of critical articles which follow the lead of modernist writers who focused on literary technique.[5] Karen Lawrence has suggested (1992) that during its modern "phase"

> the British tradition fetishized its own disinterestedness. The separation between art and politics was fueled by many of the manifestos of modernism, which stress the formal properties of art and discredit the ties between literature and immediate political and social concerns....ideological representations and discourse have been marginalized in the canonization of modernist literature. (4)

Dominic Manganiello, writing in 1994, echoes Lawrence's

---

[4] As will become obvious, my use of the term modernism spans two meanings. The first is time-based and runs roughly from the end of the Nineteenth Century (though various critics place this date earlier, and I am comfortable with those readings) to the 1940s or even 1950s (a date later than most readings of the modernist period). High Anglo-American modernism can be seen to run from 1910-1930. The second meaning, linked, for me, to the first, can be either context or style based. By context I mean the explosion of protests and changes inherent in such movements as feminism, socialism, Marxism, Keynesian economics, decolonization and nationalisms, anti-fascist and anti-war activity; by style I mean a certain type of formal innovation, which will be discussed above.

[5] Tratner has written on Modernism and Mass Politics (1995) and cannot be seen as a purely postmodernist critic; neither can he been seen as only interested in aesthetics. Nevertheless, this article clearly invokes the supposed resistance involved in the destabilization of form and the fragmented subject, which is a prominent postmodernist theme.

contentions, suggesting that the

> roots of literary modernism have usually been traced back to one of two sources. The New Critics viewed modernism as an offshoot of sceptical relativism, or of this century's new developments in philosophy and science. Current postmodern critiques, on the other hand, follow the modernists' own claims in characterizing modernism as positivistic, ahistorical, and decontextual. (484)

Marianne DeKoven, in her 1991 text Rich and Strange: Gender, History, Modernism, also traces a history of the literary criticism of modernism. She suggests that "Modernist formal practice has seemed to define itself as a repudiation of, and an alternative to, the cultural implications of late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century feminism and socialism" (4). As Bridget Elliot and Jo-Ann Wallace also suggest in 1994, modernism has "traditionally been constructed less as a period than as a style or a series of formal interrogations" (3).

Modernist "form" is a term used to refer to such stylistic techniques as stream-of-consciousness and free indirect discourse, juxtaposition and free verse, imagism--an "experimentalism [that] does not simply suggest the presence of sophistication, difficulty and novelty in art; it also suggests bleakness, darkness, alienation, disintegration....formal crisis" or desperation (Bradbury and McFarlane 26 [originally 1976]). Many theorists of modernism claim that form itself, in the hands of women (and some men), is disruptive of patriarchal, linear, colonizing, grand-historical realist narratives in and of itself. "Such form is seen as subversive," DeKoven says, "because it challenges or undoes the linear, monologistic, hierarchical perceptual and aesthetic modes of the dominant culture" (9). In 1992, Patricia Waugh traces this emphasis on form, in part, to "Adorno's 'negative aesthetics' of Modernism: an art which in making itself opaque and resistant to interpretation would, in its effective silence, refuse consumption even as it partook of a culture of consumption" (4). However, this very valorization of formal innovation "has made it appear blunt, banal, even gauche to discuss modernist writing as a critique of twentieth-century culture--to approach it, in fact, as anything other than the altar of linguistic and intellectual complexity in search of transcendent formal unity" (DeKoven 12). Indeed, Tratner's reading of Joyce makes the argument that modernist politics were based on an out-dated model:

> Most political movements in the early twentieth century pursued goals based on economic models from the nineteenth century: socialist, capitalist, nationalist, and suffragist ideals were defined in terms of autonomy, self-ownership,

> and the removal of external influence. ("Sex" 714)

Thus, for any reading of high modernist works, "the revolutionary impulse of modernism came to reside entirely in the realm of form. It is in poetry, or poetic prose, that form by itself can most readily bear the weight of so much cultural and political responsibility" (DeKoven 188).[6] Indeed, the "establishment of [this type of] recognizably English-language literary modernism [is] usually attributed to the influence of poet and philosopher T.E. Hulme and the impresario efforts of [poet and propagandist] Ezra Pound" (Elliot and Wallace 4). It is in this context that I will use Pound as a representative figure standing in for high modernism and its canonical (critical) construction in the argument to follow.

One of my contentions in this work, as will have become evident, is that some critics have historically tended (and continue) to ignore the expressly political nature of much Anglo-American modernist literature, except in talking about anxious, crisis-driven responses to modernization, psychoanalysis, and the First World War. This type of Amerocentric and Eurocentric reading, in which the metropolises dominate almost by default, continues to be one of the easiest ways to teach the modernists at the introductory post-secondary level. In 1971, responding to the canon available at the time, a canon now associated most closely with high modernism, Lillian Robinson and Lise Vogel suggested that modernism's "underlying assumptions are that _if_ art has race, it is white; _if_ it has a sex, it is male; _if_ it has a class, it is the ruling one. But these matters are almost never part of the 'social context' we are urged to examine" (179). This reading seems to me to respond much more fully to the critical projects of those theorizing modernism than to the multivalent writings of the modernist

---

[6] DeKoven herself reads modernist texts for their self-contradictory nature, using the ease with which they can be taken up and "produced" by and through the American school of deconstruction to support her argument that "the ambivalence toward the twentieth-century revolutionary horizon that characterized the modernist historical moment achieved the defining literary form(s) of modernism in the _sous-rature_ [of the 'feminine'] developed in early modernist narrative" (180). DeKoven makes a feminist intervention, arguing, for instance, that "The Yellow Wallpaper" is a proto-modernist text which foregrounds the experience of women. This intervention does not prevent DeKoven from focusing extensively on form. Ann Ardis (1990) notably takes issue with DeKoven's "defense of the indirect expression or the muting of feminist content through modernist form" (201).

period itself, as is now in the process of becoming fully apparent. And, indeed, as Elliot and Wallace point out,

> As a discourse, "modernism" has, in part, a disciplinary function. A hegemonic "modernism," such as that of New Criticism or Formalism which dominated the academy for four decades, privileges some texts and aesthetics, and renders others invisible; it makes some questions inevitable and others unthinkable. Radical experimentation with form, for example, is "modernist" while radical experimentation with content is not. (15)

Other critics have also taken up the challenge of investigating these assumptions. Felski suggests that critics look at the cultural work performed by a text: "distinctions between texts are not merely constituted through stylistic differences--experimental versus nonexperimental language--but are fundamentally determined by difference of social function as constituted in the context of reception" (157). Thus, a rapidly growing area of modernist critique currently situates itself within the political realm, focusing on the explosion of (contextual) rebellious subjects which haunt modernism's textual productions. These readings are particularly in evidence for analyses of women's modernist writings and for colonial discourse analyses of high modernist/canonical texts.[7]

In the case of the Bloomsbury Group, one very influential critical tradition (beginning with a hostile Leavisite reception, but developed most fully in "formal" and aesthetic terms by the New Critics) has repeatedly split texts and cultural productions from their political and social content while privileging the aesthetics of textual form and reading process. In part, these readings dove-tail

---

[7] See, for instance, the analyses of Forster's A Passage to India in Sara Suleri's The Rhetoric of English India (1992), Lisa Lowe's Critical Terrains (1991), and Jenny Sharpe's "The Unspeakable Limits of Rape: Colonial Violence and Counter-Insurgency" (1991). See also Peter Wollen's colonial discourse and gender theory based analysis of the Ballet Russe, "Fashion/Orientalism/the Body" (1987) and Christopher Reed's article, "Bloomsbury Bashing: Homophobia and the Politics of Criticism in the Eighties" (1991) which, although it does not take a number of feminist critics into account, and completely ignores Bloomsbury's lesbians, does begin a discussion of the critical avoidance of the role homosexuality played in Bloomsbury's interventions in the world around it. A large body of feminist work on modernist women, especially Virginia Woolf, is also now available. This work includes writing on the woman question, anti-fascism, and the politics of empire and the subject.

with a theoretical tendency which transgresses "common-sense" such that "many scholars have become...accustomed to regard power only as a discursive effect" (Said Culture 307 [1993]). However, as I have just argued, form is not enough, regardless of the many poststructuralist readings which privilege a modernist concern with form. Form is one aspect of a modernism which must be viewed in terms of a modernity which functions as "a force of cultural expansionism whose foundations are not only emancipatory but also Eurocentric and patriarchal" (Chow 55 [1993]).

MODERNISM AND TRANSLATION:

Though the various modernist schools can be seen as participating in a western-centred, metropolis-driven project, the period was also a very fruitful time for literary and cultural translation. Following from David Trotter's 1986 article "Modernism and Empire" (to which I refer more completely later) and others, I read this modernist interest in translation and cultural exploration as, in part, related to the perceived sterility of British literature, a sterility which could only be reversed by the incorporation of brutally fertile "primitive" drives into the tradition. Cultural colonization and appropriation began to substitute for the outward progress of Empire, which was now falling in upon itself. This interpretation fits in with a reading of modernism which finds that it is founded in "the wholesale appropriation and refiguration of non-Western artistic and cultural practices by a society utterly committed to the preservation of its traditional prerogatives for gender, race and class privilege" (Slemon "Modernism's" 3 [1989]). The process of appropriation involved not only "others" from the peripheries of the British Empire, but also persons and traditions liguistically and socially "othered" within the metropolises. In the course of an investigation of the cultural use of black dialect by such authors and artists as Pound, Eliot, Stein, and Picasso, Michael North's The Dialect of Modernism (1994) makes the argument that "linguistic mimicry and racial masquerade were not just shallow fads but strategies without which modernism could not have arisen" [i].

It is Ezra Pound to whom the critical tradition most often refers in discussions of modernist "translation." The argument that follows takes Ezra Pound, and (to a lesser degree) T.S. Eliot, to represent high (international) modernism as it developed in contradistinction to various other contemporaneous groups. I see high modernism as focusing on linguistic techniques while refusing to interrogate its own political embeddedness (except in

reactionary terms).[8] In addition, "Responses to Pound's translations were and still are governed largely by a conventional idea of China that has evolved over a long history of Western fascination with the Orient--a history, often, of arrogant assumptions and farfetched mistakes" (Kern [1996]). My reading works against the critical hegemony of that high modernism now being read as, in fact, postmodern in aesthetic effect. Such a reading would argue that "Art is radically autonomous: content is form" (Waugh 18). But content is also content, and sometimes it is culturally specific content.

This disproportionate emphasis on Ezra Pound's style of "translation," I will argue, has crowded out the East which can be seen in the writings of various other modernists. T.S. Eliot, for instance, was well-aware of Arthur Waley's early translations from the Chinese and Japanese. Eliot nonetheless held that Pound was the "inventor of Chinese poetry for our time" in his introduction to Pound's Selected Poems (1928). Similarly, Hugh Kenner wrote of Pound and "The Invention of China" in Spectrum (1967). Both critics focused on Pound's artistic creation of a China appropriate to the contemporary British cultural scene; neither wished Pound to be misread as merely a bad or careless translator, especially in comparison to Herbert Giles (who translated a volume of Chinese verse in 1898) or Arthur Waley. Bloomsbury (in the figure of Waley) has thus been dissociated from the "actual" East with which it was associated (poetically and politically) in favour of the Poundian representation of an East written anew in the mind of the modernist poet. This type of dismissal and erasure makes the eruption of "others" into the modernist space seem less prevalent, less intentional, a happening than was the historical case.

Within the Bloomsbury Group itself, translations were made which influenced (and destabilized) broad ranges of English literature and life. James Strachey translated Sigmund Freud's works, which were published by the Hogarth Press. Virginia and Leonard Woolf, working with S.S. Koteliansky, translated and published works from the Russian "Greats." The Woolfs' Hogarth Press published translations of Rilke, and Arthur Waley translated enormous numbers of Japanese and Chinese works. Various members of Bloomsbury helped popularize translations such as these by reviewing them in major papers and journals.

Arthur Waley's introduction of large numbers of Chinese and Japanese works and their social context to the English-speaking reader has been overshadowed by Ezra Pound's incorporation of Chinese and Japanese "themes" into the

---

[8] I will not discuss James Joyce here. While his style is frequently mapped as postmodern, his works are also now being read for their embeddedness in Irish politics.

canon of English literature to such an extent that Toshiko Kishida-Ellis speaks in 1993 of Japanese classical drama, or Nō, as having been "introduced to the Western world at the beginning of this century by Yeats, Pound, Eliot, and others" (24). In the same year, Stephen Commee's review of A Guide to Ezra Pound and Ernest Fenollosa's Classic Noh Theatre of Japan also suggests that Pound's are the "most widely read and influential translations of Noh plays" (17). These assertions ignore the fact that Donald Keene's 1960 Anthology of Japanese Literature (which is dedicated to Waley) uses Waley's translations of Atsumori and The Damask Drum (along with translations from the Genji and The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon). A Reader's Guide to Japanese Literature refers the 1988 reader to Keene and Waley as "the two best collections of nō plays for the general reader" (Rimer 65). It does not mention Pound at all. Earl Miner's 1958 study of The Japanese Tradition in British and American Literature has suggested that "Waley's translations...are executed with both scholarship and delicacy and are, so to speak, the authoritative English texts. The Pound-Fenollosa version is a poet's translation. [Pound is] Scholarly where he can be, but unfamiliar with the historical, literary, and linguistic contexts" (136-7). The dynamics of whose audience for what purpose become very interesting at this point. These dynamics are particularly evident in critical discussions which pit Pound against Waley in a battle waged upon the ground of literary and stylistic contributions to the English poetic tradition.

Hugh Kenner, in particular, has made a career (beginning in the 1950s) of constructing an influential version of modernism which takes Ezra Pound as its "central figure" ("Making" 58 [1984]). In a "Modernism [which] came to pass because a few men of genius seized a precarious moment's opportunity" ("Modernism" 109 [1987]), Pound, Eliot, and Joyce typify for Kenner the "International Modernism" which was solely the "work of Irishmen and Americans" ("Making" 53) who sometimes lived in the metropolitan centre of London, but were not of it. For Kenner, none of the "canonical works [of International Modernism] came either out of England or out of any mind formed there" ("Making" 53). Bloomsbury seems to provide Kenner with a particular target. He dislikes Virginia Woolf, suggesting that her talent is not first order modernism:

> Virginia Woolf, hating Ulysses, still made haste to exploit its riches. She is not part of International Modernism; she is an English novelist of manners, writing village gossip from a village called Bloomsbury for her English readers...And she pertains to the English

> province, as Faulkner and Dr. Williams[9] to the American: craftily knowing, in a local place, about mighty things afar: things of the order of Ulysses, even. It is normal for the writers of the Three Provinces to acknowledge International Modernism and take from it what they can. ("Making" 57)

Kenner characterized Bloomsbury in 1983, in the words of Donald Davie, as "a lurid and instructive chapter in the history of English Puritanism." Kenner added his perception that F.R. Leavis and D.H. Lawrence might also be dismissed as having Puritan affinities as they "railed against Bloomsbury in what seems from this side of the ocean a family quarrel" ("Responsibilities" 99).[10] Kenner has also suggested that "Waley was but one of the many who rushed in as word of the two shilling pamphlet, Cathay, got around" (Johns "Manifestations" 177).

The argument I would like to present here has less to do with literary "value" or the status of one writer in contrast to another than it has to do with the social "place" of their literary productions. In particular, I would like to suggest that Pound's "translation" agenda fit in with the general recuperation of the "sick heart" of Empire taking place through the incorporation of "peripheral" literatures and experiences into the literature of Empire that I mentioned earlier. Pound's writing (not to mention his literary agenda, in particular as he passed it down through his influence on Eliot) was thus more readily incorporated into the canon of English literature than was Waley's work, which foregrounds the act of translation and the un-English nature of the works in question. Leonard Woolf's work, naturalist narrative fiction and political writing, is rarely mentioned at all as part of a modernist canon, even though Woolf was "an innovator in what might be

---

[9] I wonder if Kenner also takes extensive aim at these writers because they might equally well be seen as "solitary" innovators driven by enormous talent.

[10] Hugh Kenner's personal investment in Pound's (American) modernist importance in contrast to (English) Bloomsbury takes on a slightly ludicrous flavour in a letter written in 1968 to Ruth Perlmutter as he suggests that to the "normal sinological scorn for Pound's reliance on the Fenollosa notebooks, [Waley] appears to have added an essentially moralistic distaste for Li Po, who was drunk too often to suit him. (The English always want their poets sober.)" (132).

called documentary journalism" (Wilson 124 [1978]).[11] In this way, the incorporation of modernists into the canon of English literature, most specifically where that incorporation is based on Pound's "invention" of China, fulfils Edward Said's 1985 observation that "so far as Orientalism in particular and the European knowledge of other societies in general have been concerned, historicism meant that the one human history uniting humanity either culminated in or was observed from the vantage point of Europe or the West" ("Orientalism Reconsidered" 101).[12] My reading links British imperialism to the development of American "neo-imperialist" cultural hegemony. It foregrounds the type of grand narrative of literary history which holds that the "French fathered the Modern Movement, which slowly moved beyond the Channel and then across the Irish Sea until the Americans finally took it over, bringing to it their own demonic energy, extremism and taste for the colossal" (Connolly 4 [1965]). Modernism has often been read as the moment in which "literature" was handed from the Old World to its children in the New World. Rather than reading Pound's nationalism as inevitably distancing him from

---

[11] While I realize that these genres are not traditionally considered "modernist" in nature, Woolf's political essays are similar in nature to the type of work done in the New Freewoman, now definitely part of a feminist modernist canon. I would also argue that lesbian criticism has "recuperated" Radclyffe Hall's naturalist novel The Well of Loneliness on the basis of its political incorporation of theories of sexology rather than on the basis of its technique.

Woolf's publishing work, and his support of his wife, Virginia, are, in contrast, part of the critical narrative of modernism. The nature of his interactions with Virginia are currently the source of some dispute.

[12] Readings which foreground a politicized context continue to come under attack from students of the New Critics. Reed Way Dasenbrock's 1995 review of the debut of Modernism/Modernity suggests that what he finds missing in the "new emphasis on describing works of literature exclusively in terms of their social context is...any appreciation of the aesthetic value of great works of literature." Dasenbrock goes on to suggest that for "modernism to reemerge with its cultural capital intact,...we need to be considerably more comfortable with the ambition to create a masterpiece, as culturally elitist as that may sound to present ears, before we can successfully argue that sustained attention continue to be paid to the central figures of Anglo-American Modernism, including Ezra Pound" (248).

participation in British modernism, I focus on one critical version of Pound, which reads him as the leader of a momentous school (Imagism) which caused a "culturally provincial London [to experience] some of the agitation accompanying the advent of the Modernist movement on the Continent and across the Atlantic" (Zach 231 [originally 1976]). In this reading, Pound and others like him become all that is innovative, regenerative, and modern about literature of the period.

David Trotter's article, "Modernism and Empire: Reading The Waste Land," suggests that the "Modernist apocalypse, that desire to regenerate a decadent society and a decadent literature, was formulated within hearing distance of a kind of 'newspaper cant' which we could identify with militant Imperialism" (143). Trotter finds that this "modernist" view of history, a view which has been reified as the tradition of modernism, involved an "apocalyptic view of history [which] insisted that empires decay from the heart outwards, unless they can be reinvigorated by contact with the colonial periphery, the frontier-zone where civilisation meets barbarism" (145),[13] is extant in many pre-modernist texts (especially in adventure tales) and structures the representative modernist piece, The Waste Land.[14] Trotter documents the fact that Eliot "was at home with the categories and the vocabulary of an intellectual discipline which had encoded anxiety about the degeneration of the Imperial Race" (151) and then adds,

> When Eliot and Pound criticised contemporary society, they did so with the help of those categories. 'After the attempted revival of mysticism,' Pound wrote in 1912, 'we may be in for a new donation, a sort of eugenic paganism.' Eugenic paganism[15] would strip away the layers of

---

[13] Waley phrases this "sick heart" analysis somewhat differently in The Secret History of the Mongols: "When it had barely run half its course the eighteenth century grew tired of itself. Turning away from its classical and Biblical heritage it fled in its dreams to the Druids, the Middle Ages, Egypt, India, China. It looked for new mythologies, new arts and above all for new legislators, such being the term it applied to the supposed founders of ancient civilizations" (11).

[14] Here I think one needs to remember that, although written by Eliot, The Waste Land is also very much a Poundian (editorial and propagandist) production.

[15] The stripping away of "civilized," and therefore repressive, values in order to create a race of the strong (ubermensch in one version) was a preoccupation for some

> half-hearted Christianity, bestowing power and identity on those who could sustain it. (151)

It is in this context that I would like to look at Pound's publication of Fenollosa's "The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry," in particular Pound's opening note which suggests that the essay is not a

> bare philological discussion, but a study of the fundamentals of all aesthetics. In his search through unknown art Fenollosa, coming upon unknown motives and principles unrecognized in the West, was already led into many modes of thought since fruitful in "new" western painting and poetry....To him the exotic was always a means of fructification. He looked to an American renaissance. (357)

The discussion, cast in terms of American verbal and plastic art, foregrounds the "west's" strengthening incorporation of "eastern" fertility, a point to which I will return in the chapter on Waley. Though Pound was clearly more loyal to his American roots than was Eliot, Pound is also constructed by critics (as I have pointed out) as the representative modernist on both sides of the Atlantic. Michael Levenson, for instance, in his 1984 text A Genealogy of Modernism: A Study of English Literary Doctrine 1908-1922, indicates that his reading of "English modernism" in the "specific geographic centre of London" (viii) focuses on the movement "associated with Pound, Hulme, Ford, Lewis and Eliot; Joyce, Woolf and Lawrence loom on the periphery" (vii). Levenson suggests that the "polemical violence of [this] avant-garde is only understandable when linked to a vision of the larger social whole, a vision of that whole as moribund, decadent and stifling to a creative endeavour" (138). Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane, in Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930 (originally 1976), suggest that, after "coming to London in 1908," Pound became "the key figure in Anglo-American Modernist literary politics" (632).[16] Indeed, Pound is often seen as invigorating a

---

modernists. Their valorization of what they saw as "pagan" and "primitive" virtues to be found in outlying cultures, however, was based on a proposed incorporation of those virtues into a white (metropolitan) centre, which would strengthen itself by removing all its weak parts (as well as the outlying parts which might threaten its hegemony).

[16] They also point out that "In the process of inventing Imagism and Vorticism, [Pound's] own work shifted out of a cosmopolitan medievalism into a hard technique of superpositioning" (632). Pound, along with Hulme, took the technique of superpositioning from the formal requirements of Japanese haiku and tanka. Pound also, according to

"culturally provincial London" (Zach 231).[17] Where do Waley and Woolf fit in such a reading?

READING A CONTESTED MODERNISM:

If modernism is assumed to exist always in some form of triangular conjunction with modernization and modernity, if it is "neither economic process nor cultural vision but the historical experience mediating one to the other" (Anderson 318 [originally 1984]), then grand historical narratives which privilege the industrialized and fragmented Western present-time are in no way subverted. It is actually possible, using such a framework of time, space, and artistic activity, to suggest that the writing/cultural conditions of the "Third World" are currently a "kind of shadow configuration of what once prevailed in the First World" (Anderson 328). If one looks only at "form" and a wish-list of theoretical, deconstructive, perfectly "writerly" interventions, rather than at social context, writerly intent, textual content, and textual reception, then it is, indeed, possible to suggest that historical modernism "belongs" to a "First World" which was engaged in an aesthetic quarrel with history. In this way, as Edward Said says, the "metropolis gets its authority to a considerable extent from the devaluation as well as the exploitation of the outlying colonial possession" (Culture 70).

However, if one considers decolonization, cultural translation, and social "progress" as essential modernist projects (situated especially in suffragist/feminist work, psychoanalytic work, nationalist insurgencies, and political work and writing), then a deep split in the modernist "project," a split between form and content, both or either of which can be modernist in intent and practice, becomes apparent. This understanding of modernist practice decentralizes modernism, in a sense, giving less away to

---

Casillo (1991), identified "Confucian and fascist order" ("Return" 125) in the Cantos, offering up "Confucian" values as part of his program for a re-invigorated (white) western society.

[17] Thus, Pound not only takes from the peripheries but becomes them, is critically represented as the "primitive" space which he has usurped. Pound himself encouraged such a representation, constructing himself (or his Vorticist aesthetics), for instance, as the destructive (revolutionary) force which would paradoxically recreate civilization. See also Michael North's 1994 discussion of Pound's use of Black dialect and Brer Rabbit-type "folksy" mythology.

theories which read the western metropolis as a primary (perhaps the primary) site and cause of modernism and focusing more on those disruptive moments in which self-aware practitioners of modernism were so interested, whether in order to retrench against cultural and social change or in order to facilitate the arrival of that change. As Karen Lawrence suggests, "strategically it is hard to abandon a voice and 'a self' that one has never fully 'possessed'" (7). The seizure and liberation of that self is one modernist project. While it is very easy to read failure everywhere in the modernist social project, it is also necessary to read the extent and breadth of that attempt. This liberatory attempt should especially be understood to be occurring in terms of the vexed Subject involved in

> an equivocal process of subjectification: on the one hand, shaping individuals as loci of consciousness and initiators of action--endowing them with subjectivity and with the capacity for agency; and, on the other hand, positioning, motivating, and constraining them within--subjecting them to--social networks and cultural codes that ultimately exceed their comprehension or control. (Montrose 21 [1989])

Following on work already done, as I have suggested, by feminist and other sociopolitical critics and theorists, this work discusses the ways in which postcolonial readings of Bloomsbury, specifically a Bloomsbury not associated with formal innovation, might begin to give us a nuanced understanding of the incredibly contested site(s) of various types and spaces of modernism. If the "great" European, "civilized" wars grew out of colonialism/imperialism, then the imperial process must be included in any reading of the "great" wars, in any reading of Bloomsbury, and in any reading of modernism. Indeed, Leonard Woolf believed the imperial drive which was translated into colonialism fell in upon itself when the outward thrust of colonialism halted and a collapsing imperial space quite naturally caused war to break out in European sites, since the only thing that had kept it out of those sites before that time was the outlet for aggression provided by the colonized lands. Said phrases this point somewhat differently in the 1993 text Culture and Imperialism, stating that, "many of the most prominent characteristics of modernist culture, which we have tended to derive from purely internal dynamics in Western society and culture, include a response to the external pressures on culture from the imperium." Thus, "the extremes of self-consciousness, discontinuity, self-referentiality, and corrosive irony" can be linked to European insecurity caused by this "external" pressure (227).

Current understandings of Edward Said's and Homi Bhabha's work suggest that

> the place of beginning for Bhabha is Said's radical ambivalence over the 'topic' of Orientalism. Orientalism is a discovery in Said's analysis; it is a discipline; but it is also a projection, a myth of desire or of disavowal. Said refers this ambivalence back to a single originating intention in Orientalism, but as [Robert] Young sees it, this is where Bhabha makes his most important intervention into the field of colonial discourse theory, and begins to extrapolate ambivalence away from a term within the colonialist equation to a notion of flaw in the articulation of colonialist administration itself....as Young puts it, 'the representation may appear to be hegemonic, but it carries within it a hidden flaw invisible at home but increasingly apparent abroad when it is away from the safety of the West. The representation of the colonial subject...is not so much proved or disproved...as disarticulated'... in the way it actually <u>works</u> at specific moments of colonialist history. (Slemon "Scramble" 23 [1994])

What my reading here does is to look at the way in which standard readings of high modernism incorporate and elide the ambivalences functioning within the supposedly safe, unwobbling "central" space of Britain, a space somehow <u>not</u> noticeably threatened by the imperium it had swallowed whole. While Bloomsbury is inextricably intertwined with a line of philanthropists which can trace its history back through the Quakers and other morally inspired (and contaminated) groups, it is also a moment of intervention challenging the "hegemonic" centrality of Western visions precisely at the centre, the metropolis of London.

My reading does not challenge Said's central charge laid down in 1978 that Orientalism informs the West's "world" at all levels:

> Orientalism is not only a positive doctrine about the Orient that exists at any one time in the West; it is also an influential academic tradition ..., as well as an area of concern defined by travelers, commercial enterprises, governments, military expeditions, readers of novels and accounts of exotic adventure, natural historians, and pilgrims to whom the Orient is a specific kind of knowledge about specific places, peoples, and civilizations. (<u>Orientalism</u> 203)

It does, however, begin to work with the type of fracture at the centre which Said sees as functioning in Conrad's pre-

modern text, Heart of Darkness.[18] Conrad, Said suggests, was different from the writers who had gone before him because of his self-consciousness, the troubled way in which he related a tale in which there "is no way out of the sovereign historical force of imperialism, and...it has the power of a system representing as well as speaking for everything within its dominion" (Culture 26). And yet, Said suggests,

> Conrad is so self-conscious about situating Marlow's tale in a narrative moment that he allows us simultaneously to realize after all that imperialism, far from swallowing up its own history, was taking place in and was circumscribed by a larger history, one just outside the tightly inclusive circle of Europeans on the deck of the Nellie. As yet, however, no one seemed to inhabit that region, and so Conrad left it empty. (Culture 26)

---

[18] Said's oeuvre, by and large, does not engage in any extended analysis of the British modernist period vis-à-vis Orientalism, but focuses on works written before and after that period. There are two very clear exceptions to this statement. The first is Yeats, who Said reads not as a modernist but as a nationalist poet of decolonization. The second is the Bloomsbury author E.M. Forster, specifically A Passage to India. However, Forster's work is outside the context of my reading precisely because, as Said points out, "the most interesting thing about A Passage to India is Forster's using India to represent material that according to the canons of the novel form cannot in fact be represented--vastness, incomprehensible creeds, secret motions, histories, and social forms" (Culture 241). While Passage, replete with various displays of modernist technique, is frequently read in terms of colonial discourse theories, it cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be read in the politically modernist terms I am proposing. Such a reading would be possible if one were to read for homosexual rights and anti-marriage (woman as property) themes in Forster's works, but this area of intervention is outside the scope of my project. Said also dwells considerably on T.E. Lawrence and the Orientalist nature of his military career and writings. Like Gertrude Bell, however, Lawrence belongs to an earlier understanding of imperialism than the modernist fracture-site that I am here proposing. It makes sense that Said would largely avoid the modernist period, which is, after all, the moment of decolonization (which happened not only at the peripheries, but also at the imperial centre), occurring after the period of colonial and Orientalist ascendency and before that of neo-imperialist (global capitalist) hegemony.

The Bloomsbury modernists whose lives and works I am about to discuss, I suggest, begin to interact with the "something else" outside Conrad's narrative.

What follows, then, is a chapter which focuses on Arthur Waley, autodidact Orientalist, translator of literatures and cultures. It begins by placing Waley in his Bloomsbury context and briefly discussing his life. This chapter looks especially at the places in which Waley's translations and cultural productions intersect with, and differ from, Ezra Pound's translation agendas. This emphasis allows me to look at the critical construction of both men. I focus on Waley's growth as an Orientalist and the ways in which his interactions with an "actual" Orient could have been, but have not so far been, incorporated into the critical tradition.

Two chapters on Leonard Woolf follow my reading of Waley. One chapter looks at Woolf's early career with the Indian Civil Service and the fictional works which arose from that interaction, and another looks at Woolf's (written) political interventions in the British imperialist power structure, rounding out my case studies of one way in which certain of Bloomsbury's political and cultural interventions might help us to understand the "given possibilities" to be found waiting in selected snapshots of modernism.

In the conclusion, I make some suggestions about these "possibilities" and the nature of their inherence in the current (invested) academic tradition of political intervention and cultural construction.

Page 20 has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It was a picture of Arthur Waley at Ham Spray with Lytton Strachey, Carrington, and Paul Hyslop, taken from a photograph interleaved 128-129 in Morris.

ARTHUR WALEY: CROSS-POLLINATION

CENSORED POSES:

My representative snapshot of Arthur Waley exists only in words:

> Mr Kudō Shinichirō, now vice-president of the Mainichi newspaper, recalls that he was a correspondent in London when the Second World War broke out. The authorities decreed that all cables to Japan must be submitted for censorship in English translation; subsequently they relented and agreed to recruit a censor who would read messages in romanized Japanese. Mr Kudō and his colleagues were flabbergasted when this censor turned out to be none other than the renowned scholar, Arthur Waley. What amazed them even more was his affable, considerate attitude under trying circumstances. Owing to the time difference, cables to Japan were frequently not filed before two or three o'clock in the morning; yet Waley never showed the slightest annoyance at being kept up so late, and he was always cheerful and polite to the Japanese correspondents who were ruining his nights. On one occasion, when they gave a party in honour of their censor, he twitted them goodnaturedly with their crude journalese. 'Really, gentlemen, you should polish your language a little', he said. 'I am sure that phrases like "it is regarded" (to mirareru) and "according to informed circles" (kansoku-suji ni yoreba) are not good Japanese. And you, Mr Kudō, won't you do something about your calligraphy?' At Christmas time the correspondents presented Waley with a lacquered Japanese box and were delighted to receive a letter of thanks written in impeccable stanzas of seven-word lines. (Morris 82 [1970])

This snapshot reveals the mature Waley, respected as a translator by eastern contemporaries, and yet clearly linked to an historic association of Orientalists with a certain construction of the east which foregrounds its classical, courtly, virtues. The picture also emphasizes Waley's work with Japanese literature (including the long prose Genji) and scholarly works on subjects such as Buddhism, texts often overlooked in critical constructions of modernism; with very few exceptions, the tradition of English literary criticism compares Waley to (or against) Pound, thereby focusing on Waley's Chinese translations (and most

specifically his early translations of poetry), with the single exception of the Japanese Nō plays. The Waley seen here, however, is not an Imagist or associated with Pound; he is a post-1920s scholar, well-known for his own work in bringing literature of the "East" to the attention of the "West." This is the Waley who "wrote some forty books, more than eighty articles, and about one hundred book reviews, his books alone totalling over nine thousand pages" (Morris 76), producing translations from Ainu, Mongolian, Latin, and Old English which cover most genres: poetry, prose, plays, philosophy, biography, painting, and short stories.

GETTING TO BLOOMSBURY, AND BEYOND:

As with many of the satellite figures of the Bloomsbury Group, scholars have generally been content to by-pass Waley in favour of his better-known counterparts. Indeed, though "Waley was closely associated with Bloomsbury for many years" (Rosenbaum Bloomsbury 302 [1975]), his relationship to Bloomsbury remains a source of some contention. Waley had ties, however, to all of the three Bloomsburies (locational, educational, and philosophical or cultural) identified by George Spater and Ian Parsons in 1977 (35-6). Waley attended King's College, Cambridge, where he was friends with J.M. Keynes, Gerald Shove, Hugh Dalton, Francis Birrell, Roger Fry, and Bertrand Russell (Perlmutter 7). Waley was also a member of the Carbonari Club formed by his particular friend Rupert Brooke. This conversational club was dedicated to the "liquidation of Victorianism" (Perlmutter 8). After leaving the university, he "lived on Gordon Square, along with the Stracheys, Lytton and James, the Bells, the Woolfs, Duncan Grant, Raymond Mortimer, and J.M. Keynes." Though the "Woolfs and Lytton Strachey seldom invited him to dinner,"[19] the "general interest of the Bloomsburyites in esoteric intellectual activities" ensured that Waley "usually appeared at most of their larger social gatherings" (Perlmutter 31). Ivan Morris suggests in 1970 that Waley was "part of old Bloomsbury and was friendly with T. S. Eliot and Ezra Pound; but he never joined the 'Bloomsbury set' or the Vorticist movement" (85). Francis A. Johns' 1983 article

---

[19] Ruth Perlmutter, who interviewed Leonard Woolf on the subject, suggests that Woolf found Waley difficult, "his voice 'depressing,' and despite his athletic prowess, curiously lacking in energy" (20). As neither man seems to have tolerated conversational "chat," each seems to have been a very caring but iconoclastic and sometimes impatient man, and their interests were not exactly calculated to provide them with an easy basis of communication, one wonders that they managed to spend any time together at all.

makes the social, cultural, and educational contiguities most apparent: "Though Waley was not in the inner circle of Bloomsbury, he knew all its members and shared some of their preoccupations, having been exposed inevitably to the work of their mentors such as G.E. Moore and Lowes Dickinson, who became a friend" ("Manifestations" 177).

Even in this short description of Waley's place in Bloomsbury, my debt to Ruth Perlmutter's well-researched 1971 dissertation, Arthur Waley and His Place in the Modern Movement Between the Two Wars, will have become obvious. Perlmutter's is the only book-length critical study covering all of Waley's works, and it incorporates both biographical and literary material. It remains unpublished.[20] There are two published books on Waley. Ivan Morris' Madly Singing in the Mountains (1970) is an anthology of Waley's works prefaced by an extensive anthology of reminiscences and appreciations of Waley and his work. It gives some understanding of the strong impact this brilliant and kindly man had on those around him. The editor of Madly Singing is an important translator of Japanese in his own right and the author of the seminal work entitled The World of the Shining Prince: Court Life in Ancient Japan. Morris freely and often admits to Waley's very formative personal and professional influence. Donald Keene, another important translator and theorist, also provided an "appreciation" for Madly Singing. The final book on Waley is his wife Alison's A Half of Two Lives (1982). This book is not particularly biographically informative in terms of dates and everyday lived experience. It is, however, a fascinating psychological/autobiographical text which incorporates many of the more "gothic" and claustrophobic aspects of the Genji Monogatari into its descriptions of the Waleys' fraught (typically Bloomsbury) relationship. Waley met Alison Grant Robinson in 1929 and obviously cared for her very much, but he only became her husband a month before he died. In fact, at one point their relationship was carried on intermittently because Alison Waley was then living in New Zealand with her first husband, whom she later divorced. The fragmentary nature of their relationship was caused by the fact that Waley was passionately devoted to his long-time partner Beryl de Zoete. Waley lived with de Zoete from 1918 "until she died in 1962" (Perlmutter 32) of Huntingdon's Chorea. He did not marry de Zoete because she held "New Woman" ideas about the trap of marriage. The disease with which she was afflicted had both physical and mental manifestations, leaving de Zoete, a dancer who had studied with Dalcroze and Asian teachers, frustrated and clumsy. Alison Waley portrays her as something of a vengeful living spirit in the tradition of

---

[20] Perlmutter is, however, in the process of preparing a biography of Waley (private correspondence).

Lady Rokujō in the Genji (though the two of them apparently came to an understanding just before de Zoete's death). I am also drawing from the "Outline Chronology of Arthur Waley's Life" in Madly Singing.

Waley, like Leonard Woolf, was born near the end of the nineteenth century (1889) into a professional-class Jewish family. Unlike Woolf's however, his family had occupied that class niche for some considerable amount of time: "Waley came from a long line of Jews...who began to settle in England from about 1725-1765. They were rabbis, merchants, engravers, writers, and barristers" (Perlmutter 2). These were Waley's maternal ancestors. His paternal grandfather had emigrated to England from Germany about 1835 (Perlmutter 351). Waley's father was a "barrister, a writer of economic tracts, a civil servant in the Board of Trade's Labour Department, and first director of the Census of production [a type of Board of Trade survey of goods production]. He was a member of the Fabian Society and a friend of Beatrice and Sidney Webb" (Perlmutter 1-2). Waley attended a preparatory school from 1899 to 1902, where he became Vice-Captain of the cricket team.[21] Leonard Elmhirst, one of Waley's classmates at Cambridge, suggested in a letter to Perlmutter that Waley's uneasy "capacity to freeze people up reflected, I suspect, the suffering that he had gone through as a boy, at school, and also, probably, at College for being and looking like a Jew" (21). Waley, like Woolf and many others, does not appear to have enjoyed his time at school. However, Waley received a "classical scholarship for academic distinction" and thus was able to attend Rugby for three years, and it appears to be here that his love of translation was stimulated by the encouragement of good teachers (Perlmutter 4). His scholarly efforts netted him another classical scholarship, this time to King's College, Cambridge. He "went up" in 1907, three years after Woolf "went down" from Trinity College. At Cambridge, Waley was inspired by the work and influence of G.E. Moore and Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, who was an early connection to the "Far East" for Waley. He also became friends with the people noted above.

In 1910, Waley took a first in part one of the Classical Tripos (exams). An eye ailment prevented him from taking part two. Without prospects of a professorial position (something he would later assiduously avoid in any case), Waley journeyed briefly on the continent before he returned to England and took up a position with the British Museum in 1913. It was here that he first encountered Chinese and Japanese arts and literature. Waley's

---

[21] Taking up a popular sport was something Woolf suggests spared him much bullying and humiliation when he attended public school.

experiences during this time include the sort of anti-semitic, anti-"foreign" hazing Leonard Woolf claimed was not a formative part of his youth. In 1914, two years after the death of his father, while "sunbathing beside a remote river [Waley] had been stalked by boy scouts, who alerted the police, and his name, together with [the] unintelligible characters of the book he was reading, deepened the suspicion that he was a spy" (L.P. Wilkinson quoted Perlmutter 1). His mother subsequently changed her name and those of her children from Schloss to her maiden name, Waley.

In 1929, Waley left the British Museum. He did not take another position, but devoted his time to translation. He seems to have had independent means with which to support this lifestyle.[22] From 1939 to 1945, however, Waley worked as a censor for the Ministry of Information, though he does not seem to have enjoyed the experience. One of his few original poems, entitled "Censorship (In Chinese Style)," documents his outraged civility:

> I have been a censor for fifteen months,
> The building where I work has four times been bombed.
> Glass, boards and paper, each in turn,
> Have been blasted from the windows--where windows are left at all.
> It is not easy to wash, keep warm and eat;
> At times we lack gas, water or light.
> The rules for censors are difficult to keep;
> In six months there were over a thousand 'stops'.
> The Air Raid Bible alters from day to day;
> Official orders are not clearly expressed.
> One may mention Harrods, but not Derry and Toms;
> One may write of mist but may not write of rain.
> Japanese scribbled on thin paper
> In faint scrawl tires the eyes to read.
> In a small room with ten telephones
> And a tape-machine concentration is hard.
> Yet the Blue Pencil is a mere toy to wield,
> There are worse knots than the tangles of Red Tape.
> It is not difficult to censor foreign news,

---

[22] Though it is unclear where the money came from, Perlmutter indicates that Waley "died a wealthy man" (19). Nonetheless, he lived a frugal life, and "So little did Waley care for display that he sometimes gave the impression of being in actual want." At one point, Yukio Yashiro "suggested raising a pension for the man who had done so much to introduce Oriental culture to the West, and was surprised to hear that such a provision was quite unnecessary" (Morris 86).

> What is hard today is to censor one's own
> thoughts--
> To sit by and see the blind man
> On the sightless horse, riding into the bottomless
> abyss. (Secret History 316)

When this poem was published in Horizon in 1940, Waley received an official reprimand for unnecessarily mentioning the number of times the building had been bombed (Perlmutter 324).

Though Waley was appointed an Honourary Lecturer in Chinese Poetry for the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1948, where his duties included functioning as an examiner and giving weekly seminars after the war (Blacker 23 [1970]), he refused offers of a regular teaching position. To quote Morris: "I am told that when Waley was informally asked whether he might accept the Chair in Chinese at Cambridge University vacated by the death of Professor Haloun, his immediate reaction was a murmured 'I would rather be dead'" (85). Waley was elected an Honourary Fellow of King's College in 1945, made a Companion of the British Empire in 1952 (and a Companion of Honour in 1956), awarded the Queen's Medal for Poetry in 1953, and awarded the Order of Merit of the Second Treasure by the Japanese Government in 1959 (Morris 393). Waley was also "a Fellow of the British Academy" (Perlmutter 19). Aberdeen and Oxford awarded him honourary degrees (Johns "Manifestations" 179). As well,

> For [Waley's] seventieth birthday in 1959 Asia Major dedicated an anniversary volume to him, and the list of writings about him grew with the addition of two posthumous tributes from Japan, a memorial issue of Kokusai Bunka in September 1966 and a special number of Hikaku Bungaku Kenkyu in June 1975. (Johns "Manifestations" 179)

INTRODUCING THE "EAST":

Ivan Morris has suggested that without "Waley's books it is unlikely that the classics of the Far East would have become such an important part of our heritage." Morris goes on to suggest that "Waley's writing swept away a mass of entrenched misconceptions and led to a new era in Western understanding of Chinese poetry" (67):

> Waley pioneered knowledge in the West about many subjects other than Oriental literature. His long paper on Zen Buddhism, for example, was published in 1922, at least five years before the first of Dr Suzuki's writings appeared in English. Based entirely on Chinese and Japanese sources, it must be one of the earliest treatments of Zen in any Western language. (68)

Morris' treatment of Waley lets one see the difference

between a tradition of criticism which grounds itself in study of English poetry and the Imagists and the tradition of criticism followed by translators and scholars in what has come to be called, since Waley's time, comparative literature. In the early 1900s, however, the difference between the two critical traditions was not necessarily readily apparent. Chang Hsin-Hai, reviewing recent translations of Chinese poetry for the Edinburgh Review in 1922, for instance, began his article with the statement that

> It seems quite probable that in years to come the influence of the Far East on the poetry of the Western nations will be important and far-reaching. We are witnessing to-day the beginnings of a movement towards the appreciation of the poetic art as it has long been practised in China. (99)

Chang suggested, however, that

> the present spread of Chinese poetry has an intimate connection with the growth of this new movement in English poetry. This connection may possibly prove to be a handicap to the chance of Chinese poetry winning a wider popularity, for the new movement in English Poetry may only be a literary fad and may at any moment lose its popularity and drag down Chinese poetry with it. (101)

Ironically, given Chang's concern for a separate posterity, the association with Imagism proves the basis on which the Chinese poetic tradition continues to be read as important to the poetry and literature of western nations.

How and where is Waley associated with the Imagists and modernism, and how is he part of the appropriative incorporation of Chinese and Japanese literature into English literature (as perhaps a "live tradition")? How did his growing knowledge and understanding of eastern literatures and cultures begin to change Waley's perceptions of the east and his own literary and social project? Have these influences made any impact on literature outside the Imagist school?

And, to begin with, why was Chinese and Japanese poetry of interest at the turn of the century? The fact is that various orientalisms were in vogue. A well-developed tradition of the use of the near East as a space for exploring sexuality, especially transgressive sexuality, was experiencing a period of increased popularity at the end of the nineteenth century. The "binary typology of advanced and backward (or subject) races, cultures, and societies" (Said Orientalism 206) subscribed to by most Europeans allowed them to externalize their sexual anxieties and desires (as lower, uncivilized drives), locating them imaginatively in the "East," where they could be safely explored and

contained (whether literally or literarily): "the myth of 'oriental despotism' had served as a projection of domestic fears on to the screen of the Other. The west described the east to itself in terms which simply reflected its own political anxieties and nightmares" (Wollen 15 [1987]). Specifically, effete masculinity (or despotism), hints of homosexuality, and castrating female sexuality are all often associated with this tradition.[23]

Interest in China and Japan was somewhat different in nature. These countries were exotic but less fully contained within the bounds of western knowledge, desire, and power than was the near East. China and Japan had only comparatively recently become available for the type of extensive investigation (predicated upon travel, mapping, and documentation) already experienced by countries more geographically proximate to Europe. After an initial period of Christian proselytization in the 1500s, Japan had been completely closed to exploration until the nineteenth century. All "foreigners" had been rigidly excluded (on pain of death) from Japan until 1853,[24] when American warships entered the Tōkyō harbour and forced the issue, opening the country to trade under the implied threat of bombardment; goods and people began to flow in and out of Japan. A Japonisme craze followed (1865-1895). In France, for instance, the Impressionists worked out theories based on what they saw as the liberating techniques used by woodblock artists (Miner 69). The craze also swept the United States, reaching its height in the late 1880s and 1890s: "Spurred by the activities of French and English promoters and industrialists, appreciation of Japanese art encompassed both its own aesthetic merits and its effect on the [European] Industrial Revolution" (Weisberg 16-7 [1990]). From 1870 onwards, a push to westernize and modernize Japan was under way, and many foreign advisors were hired by the Japanese government. Ernest Fenollosa is perhaps the best known of this group. As well, "European interest in Japan was greatly stimulated by the Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904. There was a lot of talk and some articles on Japan as the 'Britain of Asia'" (Miner 39). In a space of 50 years, one of the blank spaces of the map had

---

[23] The "Terminal Essay" appended to Richard Burton's The Book of a Thousand Nights and a Night (1886) is one of the classic examples of such an externalization. This type of orientalism is also to be seen in the works of Oscar Wilde and the Decadent school.

[24] One port (Nagasaki) remained open after the 1598 expulsion of western Christians. However, the strictly regulated laws of exclusion allowed only a limited number of Dutch merchant ships to dock there (Miner 6).

become a world "Power."

China was a somewhat different matter, in that it had been "open" for a long period of time, but only as a concession of the East India Company, which held exclusive rights to trade with China until 1834 (and that only through the port of Canton). It was also during this time the preserve of Christian missions, but their concern seems to have been more with proselytizing in China than with providing the "homeland" with information about China. A vogue for chinoiseries had been fostered by Theophile and Judith Gautier in France (1800-1870) (Miner 68), but widespread British interest in China was linked once again to increased information and access to the area. The Royal Geographic Society appears to have been particularly active in China between the end of the EIC concession and the close of the first 10 years of the the twenthieth century (Matthews 77-8 [1977]). The Opium Wars (essentially trade wars by which Britain forced China to allow the trade of opium from India) and their aftermath (the 1842 Treaty of Nanking, which ceded five treaty ports, as well as Hong Kong; the later Anglo-French "enforcement" of the treaty which culminated in the 1860 burning of the Pekin [Beijing] Summer Palace by Lord Elgin) led to an official British government presence in China. Britain also at this time underwrote some of the activities of the "Ever Victorious Army" (run for a time by General Charles "Chinese" Gordon), a semi-official group supporting the Chinese government against the anti-Manchu Taiping rebels. The growing numbers of British persons in China pushed for increased trade and privileged non-citizen status. This behaviour, in turn, led to much anti-foreign activity which culminated in the "Boxer" activity of 1899 and 1900 aimed particularly at British Christian missionaries and the legations. The Boxer movement was supported by a nationalist Dowager Empress who led a coup d'état in 1900. British national honour and commercial interests once again became the excuse for military intervention. Christopher Bayly has suggested (1989) that between 1870 and 1898, a scramble for an "informal empire" in the Far East, especially China, took place. The establishment of such an empire would allow the British "the enjoyment of power in a country without the responsibility of governing its inhabitants" (Atlas 105). Like Japan, China simply could not avoid British attention.

Thomas Richards, in The Imperial Archive (1993), has suggested that during "the heyday of the Empire" the work of the

> Foreign Office was often done by any educated person, however unqualified, working in whatever department, stationed wherever, who felt he had to do it simply because he happened to be British. These people were painfully aware of the gaps in their knowledge and did their best to fill them

> in. The filler they liked best was information. From all over the globe the British collected information about the countries they were adding to their map. (3)

Information, especially that provided by missionaries, trading societies, and the military, was flooding back to various British libraries, museums, private archives, and bank and public record archives. Interested persons could now explore the "far east" on paper. Herbert Giles published the first anthology of Chinese literature in 1898; "Nothing like it had existed earlier in English. The only other major English translation of Chinese poetry had been done in the 1860s and 1870s by James Legge, but it had been restricted to prose renderings of the Confucian Book of Odes" (Winters 56). Giles published a History of Chinese Literature in 1901. Rudyard Kipling visited Japan in 1889 and 1892 and sent a series of essays back to Britain. Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson was inspired by the Boxer movement and European military response to write an essay in which he pretended to be a Chinese man:

> In 1901, Dickinson laid the groundwork (when his "Letters from John Chinaman" began to appear in the Saturday Review) for the characteristic Cambridge mood of disaffection; a distaste for vulgarity, especially as embodied in modern industrialism and British imperialism. As a consequence of these letters, in which he contrasted the ugly aspects of Western civilization with the elegance and non-aggressiveness of China,[25] the Anglo-Chinese

---

[25] Dickinson's "Letters" are part of a long tradition of the "Oriental Tale" in England (and elsewhere). Perhaps the best-known of the genre are Samuel Johnson's Rasselas (1796) and Oliver Goldsmith's Citizen of the World (Lien Chi Altangi; first publication as a separate document 1782, though it had been serialized previously). This type of tale is used as a device for castigating English readers and rarely engages in any knowledgeable way with the "Orient" which is ostensibly its subject. Dickinson's series of eight "letters" takes Britain to task for its obvious failure to put any of its Christian principles into practice, especially in the context of the opium and Boxer disputes. Dickinson proposes that his (John Chinaman's) object in laying "before the British public some views which have long been crying for utterance" involves an attempt "to promote a juster estimate of my country-men and their policy, by explaining as far as I am able the way in which we regard Western civilisation, and the reasons we have for desiring to exclude its influences" (11). See Martha Conant for a comprehensive survey and discussion of the eighteenth-

> society was initiated at Cambridge, which for the first time attracted visiting Oriental students. (Perlmutter 5-6)

In 1907, the China Society (Caxton-hall, Westminster) was inaugurated to promote the "study of Chinese language, literature, history and folklore, and other Chinese matters" (Keller 796 [1934]). In 1917, the School of Oriental Studies (later the School of Oriental and African Studies) at London University opened (Bayly Atlas 201).

Arthur Waley was part of this burgeoning collection and dissemination of information. At Cambridge, Waley was inspired by the work and influence of G.E. Moore and Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson. From 1913 to 1929, Waley worked at the British Museum (under Laurence Binyon, head of the Oriental Sub-Department of Prints and Drawings). Waley began to teach himself Japanese and Chinese in order to read the calligraphic inscriptions which accompanied or were inscribed on prints and paintings:

> I soon began to feel that I needed guidance. I went to the recently-founded School of Oriental Studies, then in Finsbury Circus, and consulted an old missionary, who was in charge of Chinese studies. He was not at all encouraging. 'You'll find the Chinese are very weak in that line', he said, referring to poetry. ''They have their ancient Book of Odes by Confucius, but that is all.' However, seeing that I did not look convinced, he kindly said I might go up to the Library and see if I could find anything. ("Introduction to 170" 133)

Waley thereafter studied on his own, "wad[ing] through the hundreds of uncatalogued volumes of poetry in the School's library" (Perlmutter 15). Various collections in the School's library include preliminary grammars. Precisely which volumes of poetry Waley waded though is unclear, but likely the archival sources were similar to the Chinese collection Robert Morrison presented to the University College of London when he returned in 1824 from Council for World Mission work in China (Matthews 81). The British Museum also has a large archive, as does Cambridge, and Waley had certainly been researching through both.[26]

---

century "Oriental Tale" (1908); also see Said, who suggests that these tales are part of the vast amount of "second-order knowledge" bound up in Orientalism (Orientalism 52).

[26] The Rutgers Library's Arthur Waley collection contains a handwritten notebook on the Acton collection at Cambridge.

IMAGISM AND THE "EAST":

But how did this information explosion interact with British literature? The most important point of contact for literary critics has been the Imagist movement, a movement seen, especially by the New Critics, as of "momentous significance" in its anticipation and creation of "a turning-point in English and American poetry" (Zach 240). In his early study of the influence of Japanese literature on British and American literature, Earl Miner finds that in Japan, Pound and those modernists who were to incorporate "Japanese" stylistics into their writing found "'a live tradition' which has modified, refreshed, and helped shape much of the finest modern English and American literature" (xii). The tradition began with F.S. Flint and T.E. Hulme and the Poets' Club meetings which began in 1908. For this group, "Japanese poetry, especially haiku, seems to have meant primarily three things--concision or economy of style, precise imagery, usually taken from nature, and the avoidance of moralizing or didacticism" (101). The hard technique of super-positioning (building a poem out of images layered one upon the next) is also something Pound took from haiku, as he relates in his discussion of "In a Station of a Metro" in an article entitled "Vorticism" (Miner 112-122).[27] This "tradition" helped Pound to propagate his own theories: "The reasons why Pound became enthusiastic over the supposed ideogrammic quality of the Chinese character [as seen by Fenollosa] are wholly understandable: he was merely projecting his theories about the image to another dimension" (131). Pound's attempt to "bring the cultures of the Orient and Occident together in a gigantic lyric epic" (155, speaking of the Cantos) is part of his concern "with the American idea of a union of cultures which might be expressed in forms borrowed from Japan" (212). Many critics have noted Pound's somewhat cavalier approach to source texts:

> Achilles Fang and Wai-Lim Yip have examined Pound's translations in the light of their Chinese originals, and Hugh Kenner has done the same in the light of the Fenollosa manuscripts. They have all helped clear up the confusion over Pound's errors: some were traceable to Pound's ignorance, misreading, or misunderstanding, and some to Fenollosa's...More often than not, however, Pound's errors seemed deliberate. (Yu 182 [1983])

More recently, Pound's attitude to the Nō plays has also

---

[27] The article was originally published in the Fortnightly, 1 September, 1914. Miner includes an extended discussion of Pound's long-standing practice of super-positioning.

been studied. Pound "preferred to treat these plays as miracle plays partaking of the same character of Eleusinian mysteries, and...he tried hard to make them conform to his idea of a cult of love and Isis" (Commee 18). The Imagists also worked from Sappho's fragments. Sappho seems to have represented the purity of ancient Greek culture, a pristine tradition which upheld their own ideas. Similarly, Japanese and Chinese cultural productions became part of a Poundian, Imagist search for a lost, pure, foundational culture on which they could found their own "new" poetic civilization. Indeed, Pound linked the two explicitly, suggesting in 1914 that it was "possible that this century may find a Greece in China" (quoted Yu 180).

WALEY AND THE IMAGISTS:

Early on in his career, Waley can be associated with the Imagist tradition and its goal of regenerating English poetry. Waley and Pound were friends and together explored some of the works of Chinese poets. Waley attended the Monday evening dinners with Pound, Eliot, and Ford Maddox Ford for several years (see Fuller 140-1). He lunched once a week during that early period with Eliot (141), who even in 1963 sometimes refered to Waley as his oldest friend (140). Waley also collaborated, with Yeats, Pound, and Edmund Dulac, "in the staging of a recital of classic Japanese dance in November 1915" (Johns "Manifestations" 172). These relationships have been significant in forming an analysis of Waley's work which focuses on his early translations from the Chinese. Waley and his reviewers quite often spoke of this work in terms which revealed that they were working with an understanding of translation as informing new ways of viewing poetry written in English. Some reviewers wrote of Waley's translations <u>as</u> English poetry. Humbert Wolfe, for instance, in his introduction to <u>Poems from the Chinese</u> (1927), said,

> These are called "Poems from the Chinese," and we have Mr. Waley's assurance that there are in existence Oriental originals. But if it be so (and, of course, it is), then we have here a literary miracle....Mr. Waley, translating not merely from one language into another, but almost from one planet into another, has produced a body of living poetry, in which there is every reason to believe he re-creates, without distorting, the Chinese poets.
>
> This is an unparalleled feat. But as we are, with about six exceptions in the whole of Great Britain, incapable of comparing the English and the Chinese, we must address ourselves to these poems as though they had been written by an

> Englishman of the twentieth century, and judge them on that basis. (iii)

Waley himself, in his introduction to More Translations from the Chinese (1919), attempted to shape a certain type of critical response, saying that "While many of the pieces in 170 Chinese Poems [1918, Waley's first printed volume of translation] aimed at literary form in English, others did no more than give the sense of the Chinese" in a "crude" way. "It was probably because of this inconsistency," Waley added, "that no reviewer treated the book as an experiment in English unrhymed verse, though this was the aspect of it which most interested the writer" (6).

Following from this Imagistic linkage of translation and poetic use of language, Waley is sometimes seen as a Pound-manqué, a translator merely, while Pound is a poetic "genius" who, despite his loose method of translation, began "a modern renaissance in English translation" (Apter 1 [1984]). For instance, Christine Brooke-Rose's A ZBC of Ezra Pound (1971) uses a comparison between Waley's and Pound's translations of the Analects of Confucius (104-6) as part of an argument that critical objections to Fenollosa's and Pound's conceptions of the ideogram are "irrelevant" (103), because "It is this kind of 'seeing' which has enabled Pound to 'translate' Confucius in a way that brings him alive to us instead of making him sound like an idiot" (103). The comparison which follows is intended to show Pound's "live and active," in comparison to Waley's "flat-footed" (though "no doubt right"), use of words (105). Peter Brooker's A Student's Guide to the Selected Poems of Ezra Pound (1979) uses Waley as a scholarly source for a number of its references, as well as including Waley's comments on and versions of sections of three poems translated by Pound, in its Cathay section (122-50). Tsukui Keith Nobuko and Kathleen Flanagan indicate that Waley's works are scholarly versions against which one can judge of Pound's idiosyncratic translations practices in "Aoi no ue and Kinuta: An Examination of Ezra Pound's Translations" (1979) and "Ezra Pound and Amy Lowell: English Poetics in Renditions of Chinese Poetry" (1986). Gyung-Ryul Jang makes a comment about Waley's habit of trying to have one stress in the english translation correspond to each syllable in the Chinese original, though Jang calls it Waley's "golden 'rule'" (352), in "Cathay Reconsidered: Pound as Inventor of Chinese Poetry" (1985).

Yao-Xin Chang, in "Pound's Translations" (1988) makes brief mention of Waley in an analysis of Pound's sinology and ends with the comment that

> we know...English sinologists such as Herbert Giles and Arthur Waley did courageous and commendable work of translation which, however, does not always afford us total satisfaction. Viewed in such historical and intercultural

> perspective, Pound's work as a translator should be remembered for its strength; and as for its weakness, it is not important and can be easily glossed over. (132)

A more recent contribution to this school of readings, Ming Xie's "Pound, Waley, Lowell, and the Chinese 'Example' of Vers Libre" (1993), presents the argument that all three authors "experimented with new ideas of rhythm and cadence in English, sometimes with brilliant success, which they variously claimed are derived from the Chinese originals but are in fact not strictly grounded in the Chinese models themselves" (68). In the course of his argument, however, Xie says Waley lacks creative strong-mindedness (44), and that he "cannot become conscious of tone and then play with it, since he is as a potential poet simply given over to his prime duty as translator; lacking daring, he thus espouses fidelity to the original Chinese texts" (62). While suggesting that Waley failed to capture the formal poetic qualities of the originals, Xie states that the only "original genius...at this time was Pound, and refashioning an effective lyric modality was a great and protracted struggle even for him" (45).[28] However, it should be pointed out that Waley (like Giles before him)

> happened to be students of Chinese poetry who had set themselves the task of not only translating masterpieces of China but describing vital aspects of Chinese prosody lost in their versions....
>
> Waley, in A Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems,...devotes a whole long section of his introduction to "Technique" (22-26) covering such essential expedients as "Rhyme," "Length of line," "Tone-arrangement," and "Verbal parallelism in the couplet," and emphasizing that "Chinese poetry is noted for its compression and pithiness. (Qian 156 [1995])

Rather than reading against or with Kennerian terms of original genius (debating who is the better poet), however, I would like to suggest that the work of Pound and Waley can be read another way. It is the issue of the cultural use to which these differing types of translations have been put, rather than their value as literature, which I wish to foreground.

---

[28] In contrast, Waley's contemporary Chang (who does not mention Pound, but is clearly refering to the poet in his disparaging remarks about appropriative schools of English poets), approved of Waley and Lowell because "they have given the world the best translations so far produced of some of the most representative Chinese poets" (112-3).

DIFFERENT AUDIENCES, DIFFERENT TRANSLATIONS?:

Eugene Eoyang compares the translations of the Shih Ching done by Waley (as The Book of Songs, 1937) and Pound (as The Confucian Odes, 1954) in "Waley or Pound?: The Dynamics of Genre in Translation" (1989). Eoyang finds that Pound's "translations" were almost invariably surrogate translations, "versions that addressed an audience that would be content with his view of the original" (456).[29] This is true, Eoyang says, despite the fact that "In addition to the consultation, somewhat permissive, of Achilles Fang at Harvard, Pound had resort to at least three previously published translations: James Legge's (1893), Waley's (1937), and [that of] Bernhard Karlgren (1950)" (459). According to Eoyang, while Pound produced surrogate versions of Chinese poetry, Waley produced "contingent" translations designed to "show the intrinsic or extrinsic value of the originals" (457).[30] Eoyang's argument suggests that a translation written for one intended audience should not be judged by the standards used to judge a translation written for a different audience. While I agree with Eoyang's analysis of the differing versions of the Shih Ching, I disagree with the conclusions he draws from making these distinctions. Eoyang finds that where "Pound translated for an audience of general readers, Waley addressed an audience of students and scholars" (457). Reading Waley's "Preface" to the second edition, Eoyang says that Waley "indicated as his intended audience 'Anyone using my book for documentary purposes, that is to say, for the study of comparative literature, folklore, or the like'" (457). In fact, Waley's sentence concludes by referring such a reader to "Professor Karlgren's word-for-word translation and notes" (9), since Waley believes this "volume" to consist of "translation and such notes as can be understood by those who are not students of Chinese" (17). It is his supplement which "deals with technical questions and is meant only for specialists" (17-8), and readers "wanting to know more about the Songs in general and their relation to early Chinese culture may prefer to read appendices I and

---

[29] I think Eoyang is right here, even though Lawrence Venuti (and others) speaks of Pound as a "resistant" translator who foregrounds the translation process (194 [1986]). Pound was "essentially an appropriative translator" (Raffel 62 [1984]).

[30] Eoyang states categorically that Waley's version of the Genji is co-eval, measuring up to "the target as well as the source language audience" (445). Indeed, since, like Old English in Britain, Heian Japanese is not widely read in Japan, many Japanese readers prefer to work through Waley's version rather than the "original."

III before reading the translations" (19).

Waley consistently seems to have conceptualized his intended audience as those who were not students or scholars. In almost every one of his introductions he refered to the "general reader" who had no special knowledge of Chinese or Japanese history or language. In at least one text, Waley took care to point out that the

> present book is somewhat dry and technical in character. But I would not have it supposed that I have definitely abandoned literature for learning, or forgotten the claims of the ordinary reader. My next book...will be utterly devoid of technicalities and indeed in most ways a contrast to this work. (Analects 11)

This "general reader," not surprisingly, shares some of the characteristics of Virginia Woolf's "common reader," devised in 1925, who differed from "the critic and the scholar. He is worse educated, and nature has not gifted him so generously. He reads for his own pleasure rather than to impart knowledge or correct the opinions of others" (1). As in Woolf's case, this common or garden variety reader stood to learn a great deal whether or not she originally began reading for "pleasure."

Regardless of Waley's intentions, however, what seems to be informing Eoyang's argument is a construction of Waley as an academic writing only for a small, elite audience interested in esoteric, tangential oriental works,[31] while Pound is seen as an inspired poet writing for a general English (language) audience. Waley's practice of full annotation, in the form of footnotes, introductions, headnotes, Additional Notes, appendices (the Book of Songs includes four appendices and an annotated Works Cited), and (on one or two occasions) separately published "scholarly" articles, tempts today's critical readers to make the assumption that these books are intended for "educated" readers only. However, given Waley's very idiosyncratic assumptions about the ease with which one might acquire Chinese and Japanese, it is conceivable that Waley hoped his translations and their "scholarly" apparatuses would assist his "average" reader in the acquisition of those very language skills. Waley certainly did not assume his reader had a lack of interest in Chinese and Japanese cultural and historical information. None of his translations is without the type of thick information Waley felt a necessary reading aid for the average reader.

As I earlier noted, Pound's use of the Fenollosa notebooks as a justification for his own poetic crusade to "Make It New" often ignored the specificity of the Japanese

---

[31] Bloomsbury in general was often castigated by contemporaries for the "high brow" nature of its writing.

and Chinese texts with which he worked. Pound followed Fenollosa in misreading the "pictograph" nature of the Chinese and Japanese languages. Fenollosa's contention that Chinese "retains the primitive sap" (379) as a result of its supposed pictorial emphasis, or metaphoric purchase, fits in well with Pound's search for a universal source "of all aesthetics" (357). As Rey Chow (along with many others) points out,

> Chinese "writing" has been a source of fascination for European philosophers and philologists since the eighteenth century because its idiographic script seems (at least to those who do not actually use it as a language) a testimony of a different kind of language--a language without the mediation of sound and hence without history. (18)

Thus, when critics suggest that "Pound's ideogrammic method disrupts [generic] ideological systems" (Kronick 867 [1989]), they participate in the propagation of a system which marks China (and Japan) as a land linked to the pre-history of civilization. Such a theory has a long tradition which is actually based in a teleological view of history which "presumed a single, coherent culture--the Hebraic, classical, Christian civilization of the West" (Miner 12). Thomas Browne (d. 1682), who debated the possibility that "oriental tongues, somewhat confusedly apprehended as a unit, might not be the primitive language which existed before sinful mankind erected the Tower of Babel" (Miner 9), was participating in a "desperate attempt to bring the Far East within the Biblical outlines of history" (20). This civilization which sat outside western history played a "role...in developing Western relativistic thought" (Miner 280).[32] Of course, the view of China as a "mark of absolute cultural alterity, a parallel civilization that might be invested with utopian or dystopian potential" (Holden 62 [1994]), the view that led Hegel and Marx to believe that "China was outside the orbit of history [and] could only be brought within the orbit of historical time by Western intervention," does not exist only in the past. For instance,

> Derrida, in Of Grammatology, valorizes Chinese and Japanese scripts as remaining 'structurally dominated by the ideogram or algebra' and thus reflecting 'a powerful movement of civilization developing outside of all logocentrism.' Here the disruptive nature of China, 'the monstrous

---

[32] Robert Kern provides a general overview of the general history of debates about language(s), language systems, and their conceptual uses in Britain, France, and the United States since the 1500s (12-35).

> unreason and its alarming subversion of Western thinking' that it engenders, while still remaining a 'Western Fiction,' is turned against Western metaphysics. Allowed back into history, the void of China has the potential to undermine history itself, and the intellectual structures that support it. (Holden 64-5)

Robert Kern notes in 1996 that, while Derrida critiques something he calls "Chinese prejudice" ("an exploitation, an ethnocentric absorption of an exotic script into projects and purposes that disregard the real nature of the script"), Derrida

> goes on to exempt Fenollosa and Pound from its effects and to credit what he calls their "irreducibly graphic poetics" with genuine historical significance, as though their encounter with Chinese writing had somehow managed to avoid the fallacious assumptions and idealizing tendencies that characterize most other Western linguistic projects involving Chinese. (7)

The "Orient" thus occupies a split position in western teleologies. It threatens the west's conceptions of the world, but it offers, paradoxically, a site of revision and rebirth <u>for the west</u>. It is this possibility of western rebirth to which Pound looked in 1918, when "after having edited the Fenollosa manuscripts,...[he] declared that in these pioneering efforts Fenollosa was clearly looking to 'an <u>American</u> renaissance'" (Yu 98-9, my italics).

The details of Pound's quarrel with Amy Lowell over "control" of the Imagist name as an important cultural artifact in that renaissance are well-known.[33] Basically,

> It was plain to everybody concerned in the Imagist

---

[33] Pound was a master at control of the literary marketplace. Pound's production of Eliot's modernist "voice" as a programmatic intervention in this marketplace has been given a compelling reading in Lawrence Rainey's "The Price of Modernism: Reconsidering the Publication of <u>The Waste Land</u>" (1989). In particular, Pound's propagandistic activities which caused <u>The Dial</u> to offer an incredible sum for <u>The Waste Land</u> (a text they had not at that point even seen) are investigated. Rainey reveals that Pound represented Eliot's text as a "verse equivalent of <u>Ulysses</u>, a work that epitomised not just the experiences of an individual,...but the modernist claim to a hegemonic position in the institution of "literature"--an ambiguous entity that was distinct yet inseparable from the commercial production of reading matter and discourse" (26). In terms of real dollars, as well as in terms of cultural capital, it <u>mattered</u> who owned modernist poetic practice and how and where that practice communicated itself to a reading public.

> movement that Ezra Pound stood for one set of standards and Amy Lowell for another. What he represented was perfectionism of technique and knowledge of the Great Tradition--Occidental and Oriental--or at least those parts of it that he did not regard with distrust. She seems to have stood for energetic experimentation, for untrameled freedom of the individual poet from the shackles of social and literary custom, and for poetry as a vigorous expression of beauty and emotion. If Pound made the New Poetry into a respected art, Amy Lowell made it popular--from the lecture stand as well as by her own unusual personality and the serious...attempt she made to create a lasting poetry herself. (Miner 161)

Pound and Lowell had a falling out over their differences. When it appeared that Lowell held the loyalty of most of the Imagists, "Pound requested that certain steps be taken to formalize this secession from Imagism. 'If anyone wants a faction...I think it can be done amicably, but I should think it wiser to split over an aesthetic principle' than over personal differences" (Coffman 23-4 [1977]). This quarrel and the resultant careful negotiations over who would use the Imagist name point to the way in which group reputations (and economic viability) hung on individual attempts to sculpt the modernist "voice" as a recognizable series of techniques and activities which would reanimate English literature. A specific type of discourse, a specific type of poetic practice (which, in Pound's case, often shifted ground in order to preserve the claim to "newness"), were de rigeur.

A similar, though more understated, exchange over poetic practice occurred between Waley and Pound. Pound originally (as he did with so many other artists) encouraged Waley to write (translate) poetry, and he asked Waley to submit poems to The Little Review in 1917 (Fuller 139). In 1995, Qian notes that ten of Waley's poems were published in Poetry in February 1918 (130). Pound also gave Waley "advice." Characteristically, Waley has said "I don't think I agreed with it" (140). One of the bits of advice with which Waley does not seem to have agreed had to do with the translation process itself. In the introduction to A Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems (1918), Waley wrote that he

> aimed at literal translation, not paraphrase. It may be perfectly legitimate for a poet to borrow foreign themes or material, but this should not be called translation. Above all, considering imagery to be the soul of poetry, I have avoided either adding images of my own or suppressing those of the original. (19)

Discussing the English language scholarship and translation available at this early date, Waley suggested that it might

be summed up as "All valuable, though not free of mistakes" (21). There was so little of it that Waley had already contributed significantly. Pound reviewed 170 in The Future and

> praised the "labour of scholarship" and the "valuable interpretation of the verbal meaning of the originals." Although [he found it] "heavy-going" and characterized at times by "dead and lifeless phrases," Pound considered the book an improvement on "the trivialities and frivolities" of Waley's predecessor, Giles. Lacking "emotional cadence" and an intensity, it yet remains "the fullest illustration of Chinese poetic subject matter available in English." (Perlmutter 69)

Johns suggests that the review in The Future was in fact "rather patronizing" and that Pound "obviously saw his own method as being disapproved of by Waley who, he said, 'has several slings at translators who endeavour to render the general emotion of the poems, their atmosphere or intensity, rather than direct verbal meanings" ("Manifestations" 179).

As well, Brooker has suggested that "Arthur Waley responded to Pound's translation [of 'The River Merchant's Wife'] by a version of his own given to the China Society at the School of Oriental Studies, London, 21 Nov. 1918" (136). Brooker (like Yip before him) is reading from Achilles Fang's 1957 comments on the fact that Waley included four poems by Pound amongst the 22 he "incorporated as part of [his] paper...[which discredits] Li Po's genius...A life of Li Po and a discussion by Waley of the variant texts of the poems follow" (Perlmutter 71). Fang "speculates that this was 'a shot meant for Pound'" (Qian 194). Many readings of Pound's version are extant; Kern's (197-201) looks at Pound's orientalizing of the text through a type of doubled narrative and then suggests that this version's power as poetry ensures that "even Arthur Waley's version, undertaken to correct Pound's cannot help being influenced by it" (201). Here is a documentable instance in which even a translator attempting to avoid casting his poem in terms of the English tradition runs up against the fact that

> the problem of Chinese translation has less to do with the effort to find accurate or even adequate representations of Chinese poetry than with the problem of representation itself, which is to say the West's problem of acknowledging and confronting its own conceptions of what is other to it before contact with that other is even attempted. (175)

An exchange about control over the translation of Chinese works also occurred between Waley and Amy Lowell. This interaction is particularly interesting because of Amy Lowell's popularizing approach to Imagist poetry, her "shrewd and less provocative" sponsorship of Imagism which

gave the school less shock-value than Pound's sponsorship but more "currency" (especially in the United States) (Zach 233). Johns has documented public and private responses which occurred when first Waley's 170 and then Lowell's and Florence Ayscough's Fir-Flower Tablets (1921) were published in his 1982 article "Arthur Waley and Amy Lowell: A Note." The carefully edited contents of a letter from Lowell were used as an advertisement for 170 by Waley's publisher, and Lowell and Ayscough used an edited version of a review by Waley in advertisements for Fir-Flower Tablets. However, it is quite clear that Lowell's project in working through these translations with Ayscough involved staking out a piece of the imagist "translation" territory, most especially that of accurate translation.[34] Chang noted their careful introduction to Fir-Flower Tablets: "It is true, I think, as Mrs. Ayscough says...that it 'is the first time that English translations of Chinese poetry have been made by a student of Chinese and a poet working together'" (112). Johns refers to the schism with Pound and suggests that, for Lowell,

> Mrs. Ayscough's timely arrival with the proposal to collaborate in Fir-Flower Tablets gave her an opportunity to promulgate Pound's shortcomings more widely than simply in her correspondence and thus...remain in the van [sic] of the modern movement in American poetry....But Miss Lowell could not have been expected to welcome the work of other translators like Waley and Bynner, for it meant that she would not be the sole authority in the matter of Chinese poetry and its interpretation. ("Note" 18)

Waley's review (the part not cited by Lowell) commented on "Ayscough's limited knowledge of the literature, history and geography of China" (Johns "Note" 20). Several reviewers looked at 170 and Fir-Flower Tablets together, including Malcolm Cowley in the Dial. This reviewer called "Pound and Waley 'the enemy,' whose versions Ayscough and Lowell

---

[34] This was a shift in emphasis for Lowell, who began her 1919 "Foreword" to Pictures of the Floating World in the following, pseudo-philosophical, way: "The march of peoples is always toward the West, wherefore, the earth being round, in time the West must be East again. A startling paradox, but one which accounts for the great interest and inspiration that both poets and painters are discovering in Oriental art. The first part of this book represents some of the charm I have found in delving into Chinese and Japanese poetry. It should be understood, however, that these poems, written in a quasi-Oriental idiom, are not translations except in a very few instances all of which have been duly acknowledged in the text" (vii).

successfully challenge in what he calls a skirmish" ("Note" 21). Though Lowell did not win her bid to be considered a prime mover in modernist poetry, her eclipse is much more the result of Pound's uncharitable war on Amygism than of any quarrel with Waley.

Arthur Waley, who also had a stake in accurate translation, has likewise been eclipsed, though initial responses were enthusiastic, and even in Roy Teele's 1949 text Through a Glass Darkly ("his critical and historical survey of English translations of Chinese poetry" [Kern 156-7]), Waley's work is seen as giving hope of both accurate and poetic translations (Kern 174). In "Manifestations of Arthur Waley: Some Bibliographical and Other Notes," Johns suggests that,

> If Ezra Pound's assertion that the great ages of literature are always allied with great ages of translation is true, then those interested in the work of what Cyril Connolly called 'the Modern Movement' would have ample justification, like Connolly in his book, for including in their collections Arthur Waley's translations together with the other works of outstanding originality that appeared between 1880 and 1950. (171)

Ruth Perlmutter also begins her 1971 dissertation on Waley by quoting Connolly. Perlmutter's text is largely, she says, an attempt to justify Connolly's inclusion of Waley in his book. She compares Pound and Waley in her critical section on Waley's Chinese verse and concludes that

> There was a quiet thinking intelligence behind the corpus of modern Chinese verse translation in those first decades of the twentieth century. Pound, Waley and Lowell were seeking a mode as suitable to Chinese verse as to a new English style. Waley took the cue from Pound, and turned to the measure of his day.

Perlmutter's argument (like Johns') documents a canonical neglect of Waley's work amongst scholars of literary modernism,[35] while almost necessarily (by citing Pound as an authority and influence) furthering the critical tradition which sees Pound as an originary genius, one of a very few universal touchstones of Anglo-American modernism, a "key figure in Anglo-American Modernist literary politics"

---

[35] This "literary" neglect is as opposed to the homage paid Waley by translators and students of comparative literature, who are often very much aware of his daunting influence as the great Modern translator of Chinese and Japanese works into English: "as [Donald] Keene observed, it was Waley who set the tone [for the next generation of translators] and they all belong to the School of Waley" (Johns "Manifestations" 180).

(Bradbury and McFarlane 632). Just as the modernist canon was being entrenched, Waley seems to have been relegated to its footnotes, in response, in part, as I have suggested, to the critical work which Hugh Kenner began publishing in the 1950s.

Cyril Connolly himself invokes Pound as the tradition against which to define Waley in The Modern Movement 1880-1920 (1965), an admittedly idiosyncratic attempt to define, in an annotated bibliography, the course of modernism through its high points of publication. Connolly excludes translations,[36] but includes "Waley's Translations from the Chinese which can surely be judged as an original contribution to our poetry" (7). Connolly says of One Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems (1918) that

> In 1915 Pound in Cathay had applied imagism to Chinese verse. Waley was an accurate scholar as well and brought a whole civilisation into English poetry, as he was to bring another one, a second time, into prose with the Japanese Tale of Genji. Today the poems are as necessary and haunting as ever and enshrine the ethical values of G.E. Moore (aesthetic experience+personal relations=the good life) though remaining intrinsically Chinese. While the lyrical and bibulous Li-Po comes down to us through many translations, one might claim that the more reflective Po-Chui is the private creation of Waley... (38-9)

THE CHANGING COURSE OF A LONG CAREER:

Connolly's choice of 170 is in line with the type of Kennerian critical reading which places emphasis on the point in Waley's career (his early association with the Imagists) when Waley was least aware of the strength of the traditions he was investigating. Waley began his career very sure of the cultural supremacy of European literary and artistic traditions. 170 and Japanese Poetry: The 'Uta' (1919) have very telling introductions, though not perhaps telling in the manner Waley originally intended. He began his introduction to 170 with a list of the "principal Chinese dynasties" and then went on to discuss "The Limitations of Chinese Literature" in very Eurocentric terms: "China has no epic and no dramatic literature of importance. The novel exists and has merits, but seldom became the instrument of great writers" (3). Waley found that "In mind as in body, the Chinese were for the most part torpid mainlanders. Their thoughts set out on no strange quests and adventures, just as their ships discovered no new

---

[36] French in the original and in translation is, however, included.

continents" (3). The understandably irritated Chang Hsin-Hai suggested that it would have been prudent for Waley to have avoided such extravagantly "categorical pronouncements" (103). Chang was particularly unimpressed with Waley's attempt to schematize the lives of Chinese poets (life at the Capital, life in "exile" in the provinces, and a retirement dreaming of the old days); "[Waley] would have us believe, I suppose, that for all of [the Chinese poets] there was a definite life-pattern which is divisible into three distinct periods and arranged so fatalistically that there was practically no way of escape" (103-4).[37] A similar approach marred Waley's "Introduction" to Japanese Poetry (1919), in which the "earliest specimens" of Japanese poetry (the Kojiki [712] and the Nihongi [720]) were found to contain some 235 poems, of which "not one is of any value as literature" (5). Waley also suggested, in his discussion of early long poems, that "Japanese poets quickly realized that they had no genius for extended composition" (5).[38] Waley's "Introduction" to the 1962 edition of 170 pointed to his own early over-confidence:

> The first thing that strikes me today, in re-reading the Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems (written over forty years ago) is that the original introduction instead of beginning with 'the limitations of Chinese literature' ought to have begun with something about my own limitations. (131)

Even in 1918, however, though some of his facts are incorrect, and though his sole point of reference was his European heritage, Waley tried to present some outline of Chinese and Japanese history (for instance, he spoke of the Chinese system of education and bureaucracy which sent poets as functionaries out to the provinces), poetic characteristics and language use (including rhyme, line length, tones, and verbal parallelism), and philosophy (for instance, Taoism). Waley incorporated into 170 a large section on Po Chü-i (772-846) which includes biographical detail, a discussion of Po Chü-i's poetic theories, and some information about contemporary reception of Po Chü-i's poetry and his subsequent reputation and repute in Japan. Chang singled out Waley's work on this artist, generally

---

[37] It may have been this justifiably irritated tone which prompted the editor of the Edinburgh Review to dissociate himself from the review, writing that the "article expresses a Chinese writer's personal opinions of recent translations of Chinese poetry" (114).

[38] The notion is particularly foolish, given the respected position of the Man'yōshū's (eighth century) long poems in the Japanese poetic tradition.

considered one of the best of T'ang poets, for attention (111-2). The translations in Japanese Poetry, Waley suggested, were "chiefly intended to facilitate the study of the Japanese text; for Japanese poetry can only be rightly enjoyed in the original" (8).[39] Waley's first public productions reveal an uneasy attempt to present Chinese and Japanese poetry to a western reader; these texts contain the translations and history within a western context and agenda, while also researching the history and background to the text as valuable in its own right. Waley insisted on the need for a type of faithfulness to a valuable source language text. This is likely the reason that Chang's review does not speak of Waley as one of the Imagists, a group of which Chang disapproved because of its attempts to co-opt the poetry of the Far East to its own agendas:

> Unfortunately, some of the translators seem principally anxious to use the Chinese poets as witnesses in support of their own theories of the poetic art, and the spirits of the Chinese poets are not infrequently summoned to vindicate the translators' several positions. Among the readers too, there sometimes lurks the thought that Chinese poetry is the early prototype of the contemporary poetry with which they are familiar....
>
> I am not concerned with the merits of this new poetic creed. But why should people say that in the Chinese and Japanese poetry they find the real embodiment of these very ideas. (102)

Lee Winters, who did a word-count study of the Imagist poets in 1956, including Amy Lowell and Ezra Pound, has found that "the English appreciation of Chinese poetry in the early years of the twentieth century was almost wholly prepared for by the development of affinities in the vocabulary of the natural world plus an adaptable verse structure and an implicative technique in English poetry itself." He further suggests that, to the degree such an "appreciation was not prepared for, that is, in the peculiarly human and domestic materials of Chinese poetry, as well as in its peculiarly untranslatable tonal patterns, adaptation...has not been observable in English poetry" (151). The "post-translation work of these poets showed no major changes brought about by experience with Chinese, but a small increment of vocabulary characteristically Chinese" [i]. Only in Waley's work does Winters discover

---

[39] Waley adds that "since the classical language has an easy grammar and limited vocabulary, a few months should suffice for the mastering of it" (8). This statement displays Waley's facility with languages, as well as his mistaken assumption that most readers shared that facility.

> a poet...using the implicative techniques used by Pound, but adapting them to material fundamentally unlike that of any other of the major translators in its emphasis on human relationship [a specific characteristic of certain Chinese poetry as defined by Winters' word-count analysis] and its considerable attention to the commonplaces of the domestic household....The total effect of these differences is an imagery in which the human world is quantitatively more important than the natural world. But Waley's contribution, we have seen, is special in that contemporary poets made little use of his strongly domestic content in their own poetry. (152)

Waley's work, in fact, almost always attempted to understand the socio-cultural background to the work he was translating. He consistently made use of, and participated in, the scholarship available to him, whether that scholarship was Chinese, Japanese, or English (or several European languages), though his scholarship became more exacting and productive as his career progressed. In a number of cases, however, Waley had to produce the English language scholarship as he went along. Johns says that "Waley was in full possession of the current scholarship, though never obtruding it on the reader, and not hesitating to depart from it when he saw fit" ("Manifestations" 174).[40] Perlmutter characterizes Waley as a "thorough scholar" who, with "ever-deepening interest in the Orient...brought its treasures to the English-speaking world, expanding its intellectual thresholds" (143). Morris points out that Waley "always insisted on reading all the available material before he formed his own conclusions" (68-9). Yashiro Yukio, "the eminent Japanese art historian," recalls Waley "walk[ing] about with the Kogetsu-shō commentary of the Genji Monogatari" (Morris 70) (first volume 1925). Waley often referred readers to areas in which he felt particularly enabled by Japanese and Chinese scholarship. For instance, in the "Preface" to The Travels of an Alchemist (1931), Waley said that, in

> dealing with the history of medieval Taoism I have ventured upon completely new ground, the subject having been scarcely touched upon by European or by modern Chinese writers. The reason for this neglect has been the inaccessibility of the Taoist Canon. But since its re-publication by the

---

[40] Johns cites as a "good example from the Analects...'the amazing discovery, tucked away in a note, that the character wei in one of the sayings had not been recognized by the commentaries as the name of a person" ("Manifestations" 174-6).

> Commercial Press of Shanghai in 1923-1925 this huge corpus, consisting of some fifteen hundred works, has been at the disposition of European scholars, and it is strange that they should hitherto have made so little use of it. (ix)

In the "Preface to the First Edition" of The Book of Songs (1937), Waley wished to express his "gratitude to the editors of the Harvard-Yenching Index Series for their Concordance to the Shih Ching, published in 1934" (11).[41] In The Analects of Confucius (1938), he said that he would act "on the principle recently advocated by that great scholar Ku Chieh-kang, the principle of 'one Confucius at a time'" (14) in writing "a version...which attempts to tell the European reader not what the book means to the Far East of today, but what it meant to those who compiled it" (77). Waley's works in general, then, tried to mediate between

---

[41] Waley also foregrounded his own anthropological interest (as opposed to Pound's interest in the Confucian commentary) by stating that the Concordance has "furthered our understanding of the songs more than all the thousands of volumes which have dealt with the book since the second century B.C. Indeed, before its appearance no serious, independent study of the text was possible" (Book of Songs 11).

Page 49 has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It reproduced an excerpt from the Kogetsu-shō version of the Genji.

innovative scholarship, traditional (Japanese, Chinese, European) interpretations, and the needs of a non-specialist reader. Indeed, the Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai (Society for International Cultural Relations), in its "Preface" to Waley's The Originality of Japanese Civilization, speaks of Waley as "an outstanding authority on Chinese philosophy and Japanese literature....His translation of The Tale of Genji (1925-33) has done more than any other single piece of translation to familiarize the Western reader with Japanese literature and culture" (4).

In all his works, Waley attempted to give his European readers contact points (along with thick descriptions of traditions, histories, and scholarly debates) by which they might more readily understand "Oriental" literatures and cultures, comparing similar and dissimilar beliefs and activities across the cultural divide. A number of these comparisons involve productions of European literature in "Eastern" terms. In the "Introduction" to The Nō Plays of Japan, under the subtitle of "Restraint," Waley "tried to illustrate...how the theme of Webster's 'Duchess of Malfi' would have been treated by a Nō writer" (27). The result is striking; the gory action "does not take place before our eyes, but is lived through again in mimic and recital by the ghost [of the Duchess of Malfi]. Thus we get...a vision of life...painted with the colours of memory, longing or regret" (27). My personal favourite is Waley's interpretation of William Blake's work through Taoist philosophy in "Blake the Taoist" (1948).[42] Waley began with an anecdote: "Some twenty years ago the Chinese poet Hsü Chih-mo took down a book from my shelves and after reading a few lines he exclaimed, 'This man is a Taoist!'" (358). Waley then compared Taoist philosophy about the role which "vision" plays in negating or going beyond contraries to Blake's concept of "Imagination." Waley read Blake's work through this philosophy and then looked at the historical possibility that Blake might have had access (through conversation with Joseph Priestley, for instance) to a Latin version of the Tao-te Ching which was acquired by the Royal Society in 1788. Finally, Waley explored Blake's surprising contradictions (especially in relationship to Satan) for what light they can throw on scholarly arguments about the authorship of Taoist texts, concluding that

> the study of Blake proves (what we might in any case have suspected) that mystics are not always consistent, and that if in a given work Confucius is sometimes derided and sometimes treated as the

---

[42] I cannot resist citing Waley's attempts at "translating bits of Wordsworth out of iambic" because a "good deal that's wrong with Wordsworth is the Miltonic iambic line" (Fuller 145).

> fountain of all wisdom, this does not necessarily mean that the book in question is by a number of different hands. (363)

In this reading, neither tradition is superior; it is the resonance between the two that makes the reading of Blake interesting.

Towards the end of his career, Waley translated and interpreted a number of works which were intended to give Chinese points of view on interactions with imperialist Britain. Yuan Mei (1956) includes an appendix which gives Yuan Mei's account of "Anson's dealings with the Chinese at Canton" in 1743. These "dealings" involve Anson's protracted, involuntary stay at Canton on the way home from an engagement with a Spanish galleon as part of the Anglo-Spanish war. Waley's translation of Yuan's version makes it clear that Admiral George Anson's belief that the Chinese were impressed by the "courage and efficiency displayed by Anson and some of his sailors in helping to put out a fire at Canton" (205) was a complete misunderstanding. The Chinese, as Yuan Mei's account makes clear, wished Anson to give up his Spanish prisoners as "Tribute." When he did so, this action meant to the Chinese that he

> was admitting the suzerainty of China over Great Britain....Apart from ancient historical examples, the word Tribute (kung) implies this; for it means what an inferior offers to a superior. The Governor-General assumed that Anson knew the symbolic significance of handing over prisoners-of-war and that he would not be willing to part with them except under the strongest possible pressure. But in reality 'Mr. Anson was extremely desirous to get rid of the Spaniards, who were a great incumbrance to him.'

Waley concluded, in his trademark laconic style, that "It was a typical game of diplomatic blind man's b[l]uff" (208). In The Opium War Through Chinese Eyes (1958), Waley

> made no attempt to give a complete consecutive story of the war, either from the military or the diplomatic point of view. What I have done is to translate and put into their setting a number of intimate documents...which tell us (in a way that memorials and decrees fail to do) what the war felt like on the Chinese side. (7)

This growing emphasis on the perceptions of those peoples once presented almost as a background for his literary project was reflected in Waley's changing attitudes towards the great cultural plunderers, Aurel Stein and Paul Pelliot. One of the texts Waley wrote for the British Museum is A Catalogue of Paintings Recovered from Tun-Huang by Sir Aurel Stein, K.C.I.E. (1931). Waley here reported that the items in question (subsequently split between the British Museum and the Museum of Central Asian Antiquities in Delhi)

were "recovered" by Stein from "a walled-up chapel at the Caves of the Thousand Buddhas during his second Central Asian journey, in 1906-8" (ix). The ironies involved in calling theft recovery are, I expect, immediately evident to my reader; they might not originally have been so obvious to Waley, and even if they were, it was surely politic not to point them out. The paintings form part of the basis for Waley's Introduction to the Study of Chinese Painting. Waley also based some of his work on material Pelliot obtained by theft, thanking "Professor Pelliot for lending me a reproduction of the Tun-huang MS" (12) of the Analects. It is only in the "Preface" to his rendering into English, in 1960, of pieces of popular literature "found" by Pelliot and Stein at the Tun-Huang site (as Ballads and Stories from Tun-Huang: An Anthology), that Waley made any moral objection to this theft. Waley first indicated that Stein was acting on behalf of the British Museum and the (Colonial) Government of India in 1907 when he bribed "the Taoist Wang Yuan-lu...to hand over large numbers of MSS and paintings on silk." Pelliot "made a similar haul" in 1908 which was "not so large as Stein's but more discriminating, since he could read Chinese and Stein could not" (237).

Waley next made the point that the "Chinese regard Stein and Pelliot as robbers" and suggested that the reader should imagine how "we should feel if a Chinese archaeologist were to come to England, discover a cache of medieval MSS at a ruined monastery, bribe the custodian to part with them, and carry them off to Peking" (237). Waley seems to have felt some need to account "historically" for the "conviction of both Stein and Pelliot that they were behaving in a normal and irreproachable way" (237). In order to do so, Waley pointed to the nineteenth century assumption that "in the lands of the Near and Middle East no one was capable of understanding or appreciating relics of pre-Mohammedan culture and that their removal to Europe for conservation and study could not reasonably be resented" (237). Rather than dissenting from or engaging with the assumption that "in Moslem countries...conversion to Islam had long ago completely divorced the inhabitants from their remote past," Waley gave that belief weight by instead arguing that the Chinese had never lost contact with, or interest in their own past (237). Some idea of the ways in which various "branches" of Orientalism influenced each other and were (and are) differing expressions of the same hegemonic drive can been seen at work in this account, where the "Far East" is conceptualized as more civilized than the "Near East," which is understood as having experienced some sort of break with, and loss of, its own history, for which the British and French could therefore become legitimate guardians. Waley ended this discussion by returning to the individuals who were the representatives of cultural imperialism in this "exchange": "Stein was of course aware

that the Chinese were more interested in their own remote past than were, for example, the Bedouins." But, Waley added,

> I was never able to convince [Stein] that the Chinese scholars who in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries wrote about the geography and antiquities of Central Asia were anything more than what he called 'arm-chair archaeologists'; though they had in fact, as Generals or administrators, spent far more time in Central Asia and travelled far more widely than Stein himself. (238)

Stein saw himself as somehow a better custodian of Chinese civilization than Chinese scholars because he had explored, collected, and could now archive his findings in a place in which western history might categorize and incorporate them. As for Pelliot, Waley added, he did

> of course, after his return from Tun-huang, get into touch with Chinese scholars; but he had inherited so much of the nineteenth-century attitude about the right of Europeans to carry off 'finds' made in non-European lands that, like Stein, he seems never from first to last to have had any qualms about the sacking of the Tun-huang library. (238)

It is perhaps this last sentence, which implies that no European had the right to carry off the cultural properties of (generic) non-European lands, and implicitly compares Tun-huang to that famously "sacked" library, Alexandria, which most condemns the thefts by these two "archaeologists" on whose "work" Waley based some of his own. One sees both the change in opinion and the ways in which it is difficult for those in possession of plundered works (illegitimate power) to divest themselves of these spoils. Waley's perceptions, while they changed as his (literary) geographical horizons expanded, were not infinitely expandable. While a life-time of creating and living in the contact zone between the literatures, histories, and philosophies of differing cultures seems to have opened up new vistas of intercultural relationships, Waley could only stretch so far and no further. This difficulty was perhaps made worse by the fact that Waley's contacts with China and Japan (like Pound's) were limited to friendships with expatriot Japanese and Chinese persons and readings of texts. It is unsurprising, given Edward Said's suggestion that "Academic Orientalists for the most part were interested in the classical period of whatever language or society it was that they studied....the Orient studied was a textual universe by and large; the impact of the Orient was made through books and manuscripts" (Orientalism 52), that neither the Imagists nor Waley translated

contemporaneous Japanese or Chinese poets.[43]

Even given these difficulties, Waley's Orientalism did follow a course of progressive engagement with the subject of his investigations. Waley noted in An Introduction to the Study of Chinese Painting (1923) his own limitations of knowledge but suggested that "so little is at present known of Chinese art or of Chinese civilization in general that there is some case, at any rate in Europe, for fragmentary and imperfect works." He stated that his one "claim to consideration is that [he has] not attempted to hide the gaps in [his] edifice by a delusive facade of omniscience" (8). Indeed, like Virginia Woolf in A Room of One's Own, Waley was given to listing aspects of texts and cultural histories with which he had not dealt and which he wished some bright young scholar would take up. As well, Waley's approach to civilizations attempted (not always successfully) to avoid a belief in historical drives and cultural regeneration (of the "sick heart" nature) through the incorporation of "Other" spaces. "Murasaki's Affinities as a Writer" (1933), for instance, discusses the writers and styles with whom and which the Heian Japanese author Murasaki Shikibu and her text (early eleventh century) have been compared. Finally, the text of the Genji Monogatari is compared to certain caves in Spain in which "the natural formation of the rock seems in succession to assume a semblance to every known form of sculpture":

> That such should be the impression that Murasaki's book makes on us remains surprising only if we cling to the false conception of human development as a ladder, to a particular rung of which every civilization must at any moment have attained. On the contrary, a civilization is a mosaic, and it is natural that when we see the stones arranged in a new way, we should feel at first that they do not belong together. Failure to understand this is particularly fatal when we are confronted with an arrangement so very unfamiliar as that presented by the cultures of the Far East....[T]here are no

---

[43] However, unpublished translations of Japanese poems "written during the revolutionary period from 1860 to 1868" exist in the Waley collection at Rutgers (Johns "A Collection" 60) and The Opium War is not based on classic texts. Neither is Yuan Mei. Indeed, Waley specifically mentioned that he hoped this biography might "in particular do something to dispel the common idea that all good Chinese poetry belongs to a remote antiquity" (204). The younger generation of Bloomsbury (William Plomer, who went to Japan, and Julian Bell, who taught English literature for a time at Wu Han University in Central China [Henig 423]) did journey to the "Far East."

> 'stages' [of civilization], but simply patterns sometimes fairly similar, sometimes wholly different. (332)[44]

REPRINTS:

It is my argument that "translations" which fed into a modernist style and project which foregrounded language use in English and a well-recognized and orientalized "East" were more readily assimilated into the production of an English poetic tradition than were "accurate" and well-researched translations of "Other" literatures and cultures. Thus, critical construction of a certain canon (most especially one which privileged individual genius) has made the cross-cultural sites of exploration and "possibility" constructed during the modernist period difficult to get at. Such a reading papers over the moments at which other cultures influence and change western culture, framing a formal picture which largely excludes Waley from the modernist canon. It causes us to "forget" that Waley set the tone for the next generation of translators (Johns "Manifestations" 180) and that Waley's translations did and do have a place in readings of English literature and history. I am not the only scholar, for instance, to notice Waley's influence on Virginia Woolf (most particularly in the case of Orlando, written shortly after Woolf had read Waley's translation of the Genji).[45] I find it encouraging, however, that Zhaoming Qian and Robert Kern have begun to look beyond Pound's influence to give discussions of Waley's impact on William Carlos Williams and Gary Snyder, modernist and contemporary American poets. Qian's reading (which focusses on the importance of Buddhist philosophy to Williams) is especially interesting in light of Winters'

---

[44] This is, of course, the same Waley who was insisting in 1964, in a review of Ivan Morris' The World of the Shining Prince, that there was not "much inherent obscurity in the Heian style" and that what "causes the obscurities in Genji is the fact that Murasaki, like other great novelists, sometimes writes badly. I cannot accept as good writing any passage that leaves the reader in doubt as to its meaning." Waley does add that "Allowance must also be made for textual corruption" (378). As this statement ignores the fact that obscurity is one of the markers of Heian writing, and as it also ignores the fact that Waley makes some effective use of free indirect discourse in the Genji, I am not sure that Waley's use of the word "obscurity" is at all transparent.

[45] See my "Virginia Woolf and Murasaki Shikibu: A Question of Perception" (1992) and Suzanne Henig's "Virginia Woolf and Lady Murasaki" (1967).

finding that only Waley foregrounded the "emphasis on human relationship" and "considerable attention to the commonplaces of the domestic household" found in the Chinese poetry Waley was translating (152). These themes are also particularly prevalent in Williams' work.

I agree with Stephen Slemon that the modernism with which critics commonly engage was involved in "the wholesale appropriation and refiguration of non-Western artistic and cultural practices by a society utterly committed to the preservation of its traditional prerogatives for gender, race and class privilege" ("Modernism's" 3). What I am suggesting here, however, is that Waley is one of the fracture sites which might be pried open to discover that some modernists were producing early versions of our own current critical projects, especially those cultural and political projects conducted out of western universities. Rather than suggesting, however, as do some of the critics I cited in the introduction, that certain modernisms can be read as proto-postmodernisms, I am suggesting that modernism has not yet been left behind. The chapters on Leonard Woolf which follow place Woolf's project as a forerunner of present postcolonial interventions. Where Waley was a type of cultural translator whose interventions took place within the fields of comparative literature and translation, Woolf made intentional political and cultural interventions at the levels of British government and literary and mass communications.

Page 57 has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It was a picture of Leonard Woolf with the Ratemahatmayas outside the Kandy kachcheri originally interleaved 160-161 in Woolf's Growing.

LEONARD WOOLF: SOWING UNCERTAIN SEED[46]

THEATRE OF THE ABSURD:

The second volume of Leonard Woolf's autobiography, Growing, includes a picture of the 28 year old Leonard seated in front of the Kandy kachcheri (government court/office) with a large group of much older Ratemahatmayas (headmen) of the Central Province of Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) in 1908 (interleaved 160-1).[47] His starched solemn white presence at the very front and centre of this group, complete with high white collar and tie, a slight, deferential space open to either side of him, proclaims his institutional power. And yet this is the man who wrote to Lytton Strachey on his arrival in Colombo that he felt as if he "were playing the buffoon in a vast comic opera" (Letters 67) and who complained of the Kipling-like, unreal quality of the English in Ceylon:

> The white people were...in many ways astonishingly like characters in a Kipling story. I could never make up my mind whether Kipling had moulded his characters accurately in the image of Anglo-Indian society or whether we were moulding our characters accurately in the image of a Kipling story. (Growing 46)

How did Woolf's understanding of himself survive the splendid farce, a farce of monumental status, in which he knew himself to be participating? Did it? And did anyone notice?

Certainly a number of recent critics have argued that Woolf's imperialist vision survived Ceylon intact. Christopher Bayly opens his 1993 discussion of the history of information flow and control in India with the suggestion that even though Woolf was quickly soured on colonial government, he

> remained a devout believer in the individualist myth that sustained colonial rule: the idea of the lone colonial officer and sage, standing at the centre of a web of untainted knowledge, the man who knows the country. British rule might be saved

---

[46] A shorter version of this chapter was presented at the Canadian Association of Commonwealth Literature and Language Studies Conference hosted by Carleton University in May/June 1993 as "Philanthropic Modernism."

[47] Frederic Spotts' edition of Leonard Woolf's Letters (1989) reprints this picture between pages 282 and 283 and dates it.

> from damnation if liberal judgement were based on pure information. The problem was that, at some level, information had to come from a 'native informant', and agent, a spy, an 'approver' who turned King's Evidence, and by their very nature, such agencies could not be trusted. ("Knowing" 3-4)

Bayly bases this argument in some of Woolf's self-representations in volume one of his autobiography. Similarly, Nancy Paxton makes use of the second volume to open an argument, published in 1992, about the differences in male-gendered and female-gendered imperial autobiographical writings. She begins by pointing out that Woolf painted a picture of himself as a colonizer who was forced to perform "before a captive [colonized] audience." Paxton says that Woolf

> describes himself as someone "always, subconsciously or consciously, playing a part, acting upon a stage. The stage, the scenery, the backcloth before which I began to gesticulate...was imperialism." While Leonard Woolf thus acknowledged the crisis in legitimation of the "imperial I" that accompanied modernism and psychoanalytic thought, he did not publish his confession until fourteen years after the British surrendered control of their Indian empire in 1947. His remarks invite us to see the world created by British colonialism in India as a stage where the "imperial I" was consolidated and protected against the subversive threats he admits. (387)

The problem with Bayly's and Paxton's uses of these autobiographies is that the brief citations from Woolf do not develop into readings of Woolf; they instead take his self-representations out of context in order to provide openings for arguments which have little to do with Woolf. Paxton and Bayly read the moments at which Woolf foregrounded his complicity in the imperial system without reading his accompanying analyses of that system.

Studies which focus on Woolf, however, also often read Woolf's autobiographical works as "documentary" background to Bloomsbury or the modernist period of imperialism, rather than as self-constructions. Woolf's other works (for instance, fiction such as <u>The Village in the Jungle</u> and <u>The Wise Virgins</u>, and political treatises such as <u>Empire and Commerce in Africa</u> and <u>Imperialism and Civilization</u>) are largely ignored. Selma Meyerowitz, in her 1982 study of Leonard Woolf, suggests that he

> is generally known as either the husband of Virginia Woolf or as part of the writers and artists in England known as the Bloomsbury Group. Yet a study of Woolf's life and work reveals that

> he had a considerable influence on his society as an important writer, one whose literary and political work reflected the history of his time. (1)

More recently, however, SP Rosenbaum's study Edwardian Bloomsbury (1994) looks at "Leonard Woolf's Ceylon Writings." This chapter explores Woolf's early fictional writings through the framework provided by the much later Growing in order to read the resonances between Woolf's Ceylon-based fiction and his autobiography in the greater contexts of Bloomsbury and modernism. Rosenbaum makes links between Growing and writing by Conrad, Forster, Kipling, Mill, Ruskin, Rousseau, Freud, Hardy, James, and Orwell (392-400, 412). He also gives extended descriptions of Woolf's early texts, pertinent letters to and from Lytton Strachey, and Woolf's later autobiography, as well as surveying Bloomsbury and modernist responses to Woolf's fiction, especially The Village in the Jungle (391-437), as part of a larger argument that, "If the idea is extended to other forms of exploitation and control than national ones, imperialism could be seen as perhaps the central concern in Bloomsbury's criticism of English life" (117).

While I would not go so far as to read imperialism as Bloomsbury's central concern (and I resist any homogenization of "other" forms of exploitation into specifically imperialist concerns), my contention here is that, while Woolf's work and writings are reflective of the specific problematic imperialist discourse inherent in the history of his time, they also participated in a political modernist project which made it possible for certain aspects of his time to have erupted (however partially and abortively) into possibility and change. Through his position as a colonial servant in Ceylon and his subsequent writing on the subject, Woolf participated in something Edward Said defines as a corporate Imperial drive to "formulate the Orient, to give it shape, identity, definition with full recognition of its place in memory, its importance to imperial strategy, and its 'natural' role as an appendage to Europe" (Orientalism 86). However, Woolf also spent most of his life lobbying the Labour government, in and out of power, to decolonize Britain's territories and colonies. He was for 27 years Secretary of the Labour Party's Advisory Committees on International Affairs and Imperial Questions. Woolf's anti-imperialist work (some of it written on behalf of the Advisory Committees), to which I will return in the next chapter, was a precursor to much academic anti-imperialist work today and also an important source of current United Nations policies and crises. In the beginning, of course, he was not necessarily marked for such a career. The following extended reading of Woolf's early life and his "Ceylonese" fiction analyzes the troubled and partial nature of these beginnings.

BIOGRAPHICAL AND IMPERIALIST BEGINNINGS:

Leonard Woolf was born in 1880, just shortly before the first "scramble for Africa" really got under way. His life and career(s) are in many ways almost paradigmatic of the troubled period of time which started in the age of the Raj and culminated in decolonization. Woolf's grandfather gave "his family a British middle-class education, thus enabling them to abandon the family tradition of commerce and to be more thoroughly absorbed into British life" (Wilson 11). Quentin Bell suggests that Woolf was

> one of a large Jewish family; his father Sidney Woolf, Q.C., was able, hard-working and prosperous; but not sufficiently prosperous to leave his family much to live on when, very suddenly and in the prime of life, he died, leaving a widow and nine children. The Woolfs met this catastrophe with the supple fortitude of their race. Somehow the children were given a good education. Four of whom Leonard was one, gained scholarships to Cambridge, and it was there that he formed the friendships which were to determine the course of his life. ("Introduction" xvi [1979])

Woolf won scholarships to both St. Paul's School and Trinity College, Cambridge where, in 1902, he was elected to the very elite Cambridge Conversazione Society, also known as the Apostles. Woolf was "presumably the first Jew to become one of the Cambridge type of Apostles" (Parsons and Spater 154). This very select group of society's "best" believed that entry was only a function of brilliance of mind, but the society itself actually functioned as an exclusive old-boy's network.

Though Woolf and others were later to deny that his Jewishness made him an outsider, Woolf's frequent citation of the Dreyfus case,[48] and his smattering of articles on "Palestine," as well as his portrayal of the Davises in The Wise Virgins, suggests a less comfortable reading of Woolf's positionality. In December of 1894, Captain Alfred Dreyfus, a French Jew, was convicted of treason in a closed trial and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. It soon became clear that the charges had been trumped up and that Dreyfus's Jewishness had played a large part in the decision. It was this case over which Emile Zola wrote his famous J'accuse, addressed to the President of France and others; he then had to flee the country in the face of governmental charges and a jail conviction. It was not until 1906 that Dreyfus was cleared of the charges and given the position of Major as something of a recompense (Keller 116-126). In 1964, Leonard

---

[48] Barbarians at the Gate (1939) is particularly eloquent on the subject.

Woolf was still suggesting that "the forces of reaction and barbarism...had suffered a tremendous defeat in the Dreyfus case" (Downhill 36). Parsons and Spater write that Woolf's dismissal of his Jewishness was associated with his dismissal of sectarian religion. They point out that Woolf's passionate belief in a "civilized life" was a combination of "the Semitic vision: justice, mercy and tolerance, with the Greek vision: liberty and beauty" (154). Roger Poole believes in his 1978 text The Unknown Virginia Woolf, that, in The Wise Virgins, Woolf's major preoccupation was that of race: "His sense of being Jewish, and to that extent his sense of being cut off from equal and acknowledged commerce with the gentiles, is insisted upon for page after page" (78). While I agree that the novel does foreground the difference between Jews and gentiles, it is the main character, not Woolf, who dwells in such depth on his sense of isolation. Peter Alexander makes the case (1992) that "it seems very likely that some at least of [Woolf's] urge to reform society by involving himself in politics came from his feeling of having been socially rejected as a Jew" (69). Rosenbaum also notes Woolf's peculiar reticence about his Jewishness (Edwardian 396).

Woolf's background, then, was that of a working class Jewish family uneasily assimilated into the middle and upper-middle classes, and Leonard Woolf was always something of an unfashionably intense sort who, unlike the rest of his college set, latched on to issues of social responsibility.[49] In a 1979 conversation with S.P. Rosenbaum, Julian Fry suggests that Leonard Woolf was much too nice a person to be intolerant of concerns foreign to his own. He also says that, when he was a boy of ten or eleven,

> Leonard struck me suddenly as having lived another life outside the sort of life my father and his friends were living. What hit me was when he once said, "You know it's a pretty hard thing when you have to go out and shoot people's cattle because they've got rinderpest." That's the only thing he mentioned, when I was in hearing, of his time in Ceylon. This told me Leonard Woolf had been quite different from anything that Duncan Grant or Morgan Forster had been. He could bring experiences from a world they knew nothing of to his daily life. ("Conversation" 131-2)

---

[49] See, for instance, Woolf's own account in his autobiographies of the debate with Maynard Keynes over whether Moore's philosophy ought to be considered to have moral components (I will return to this point in the next chapter). Parsons and Spater refer to this debate as well (33), as do all of Woolf's biographers.

When asked whether he felt "Bloomsbury" had undervalued Woolf, Fry responded, "I dare say they did. You know, someone who can dispassionately appraise you and who is really within your group is someone to be a little bit afraid of" (132).

In 1904, after graduating from Cambridge, Woolf sat the Civil Service exams, and, not having studied sufficiently, did not pass high enough up on the list to enter the upper ranks of the India Civil Service or the Home Civil Service. His best option, therefore, was the Ceylon Civil Service section of the Colonial Civil Service, which he joined in October of 1904. The British were well-entrenched in Ceylon, having taken the place of the Dutch as colonizers in 1796. They controlled the island by 1815, and the civil service had a long tradition and a fully developed administrative system by the time of Woolf's arrival. Leonard Woolf's rise through the Ceylon Civil Service was little short of meteoric, and he found the Service a good outlet for his rather obsessive work habits and his somewhat dictatorial nature. He learned both Sinhalese and Tamil, proficiency in one of which was required as "a qualification for promotion of civil servants to higher posts than that of assistant" (Zeylanicus 94 [1970]). Woolf was also reprimanded twice for lecturing his superiors in an official document and had a run-in with the Jaffna Tamil Association, one of whose members accused Woolf of hitting him with a riding crop:

> My unpopularity in Jaffna was not undeserved. I meant well by the people of Jaffna, but, even when my meaning was well, and also right -- not always the case or the same thing, my methods were too ruthless, too much the "strong man." The difficulties and the friction made me for the first time dimly perceive the problems of the imperialist. It is curious, looking back, to see how long it took me to become fully conscious of my position as a ruler of subject peoples. But I remember the moment when for the first time I became fully aware of it and the awareness brought my first doubts whether I wanted to rule other people, to be an imperialist and a proconsul....It shocked me that these people should think that, as a white man and a ruler of Ceylon, I should consider the brown man, the Tamil, to be one of "the lesser breeds" and deliberately hit him in the face with my riding whip to show him that he must behave himself and keep in his place....And perhaps for the first time I felt a twinge of doubt in my imperialist soul, a doubt whether we were not in the wrong, and the Jaffna Tamil Association and Mr. Sanderasekara in the right, not in believing that I would and had hit him in the face, but right in feeling that my sitting on

> a horse arrogantly in the main street of their town was as good as a slap in the face. (Growing 111-4)

Woolf's time in Ceylon in fact coincided with the beginnings of a popular movement for constitutional reform (Zeylanicus 150). Thus it was that Woolf became aware of the necessity for a great deal of

> dreary work. It had a political or social object. My seven years in the Ceylon Civil Service turned me from an aesthetic into a political animal. The social and economic squalor in which thousands of Sinhalese and Tamil villagers lived horrified me; I saw close at hand the evils of imperialism and foresaw some of the difficulties and dangers which its inevitable liquidation would involve. (Journey 153)

In 1911, uncomfortable with the workings of imperialism and hoping Virginia Stephen would marry him, Woolf resigned from the Ceylon Civil Service. He began work on The Village in the Jungle shortly before he married the granddaughter of Sir James Stephen, "Permanent Under Secretary for the Colonies and architect of imperialism under seven changes of government" (Marcus 80 [1987]). Woolf married into the family of the man who was the "chief ideologue of British 'benevolent' imperialism" (83) and who "coined the phrase 'the mother country'" (82) and the metaphor it implies of the colonies as sickly or weak (backward) children.[50] Leonard Woolf worked all his long life to dismantle the Imperial system supported so very enthusiastically by his wife's uncle Fitzjames Stephen,[51] who suggested in Liberty, Equality, Fraternity that "women and the working class must

---

[50] Leonard Woolf had a measure of personal revenge upon the memory of this man, as Peter Alexander relates: "In 1961,...William Plomer was staying with Leonard, and noticed in the garden a stone Victorian bust of a serious-looking man. He asked who it was. 'It's James Stephen, the one who was Colonial Secretary,' said Leonard. Then after a pause he added scornfully, 'He looks it, doesn't he?' Another pause: 'I invariably use it to pumpship [urinate] on.' The incident seemed to Plomer, twenty years younger than Woolf, a belated instance of the old-fashioned and extreme anti-Victorianism of Bloomsbury" (17). To Alexander, the incident seems a belated instance of Woolf's repressed anger at something Alexander reads as Virginia's family class-based (Victorian) pride. I find the incident a rather clear, if amusing, indication of Woolf's frustration with the colonial system.

[51] A number of critics have suggested that this man is a candidate for identification as Jack the Ripper. See Marcus' article.

be kept down forcibly in order to show the colonies how rebellion will be treated" (Marcus 90).[52]

VISIONS OF AN INCURABLE RATIONALIST:

Leonard Woolf opened Imperialism and Civilization (1928), his "most thorough and lengthy anti-imperialist statement" (Edmonds and Luedeking 37 [1992]) with an epigraph which stated that "men moralize among ruins." The ironic distance this quotation cast over his political treatise shadowed Woolf's career. The ironic, sometimes sardonic, and rationalist humanist pose Leonard Woolf adopted in his works transmuted and occasionally vitiated an otherwise anguished protest against the western, particularly the British, imperial system. Stressing a rational approach to social change, Woolf's political theories, in the final analysis, were troubled in their attempts at transforming imperialism because a "scientific" rationalism has been one of the tools used to justify European imperialism. As well, disinterested rationalism is a weak weapon against imperialist and capitalist self-interest. Woolf himself gestured to this point when he spoke of John Maynard Keynes's Memoir Club essays: "in one important point he is, I think, wrong. It is true that he and his generation believed in the efficacy of reason, but it is not true that any of us believed in the rationality of human nature" ("Beliefs" 993). As Edward Bishop has quipped, Woolf was a "Don Quixote of rationalism." Woolf understood the often ineffective nature of relying on reason, musing that "even in politics, where reason is so suspect and so unwelcome, I have an absurd, pig-headed feeling that one ought to use one's reason" (Downhill 88). And, indeed, Woolf assessed the impact of his "rational" protest on the world (rather too harshly) as largely non-existent:

> Looking back at the age of eighty-eight over the fifty-seven years of my political work in England, knowing what I aimed at and the results, meditating on the history of Britain and the world since 1914, I see clearly that I have achieved practically nothing. The world today and the history of the human ant-hill during the last fifty-seven years would be exactly the same as it is if I had played pingpong instead of sitting on committees and writing books and memoranda. (Journey 158)

---

[52] This brief biographical section owes much to Leonard Woolf's autobiographies (1960-1970) and Sir Duncan Wilson's political biography of Woolf (1978). Interested readers should consult these texts. Wilson's text, however, does not give a great deal of space to Woolf's experience in Sri Lanka.

In making this point, however, I do not wish to be misread as including Woolf in Edward Said's widely accepted revision of Mirsky's and Georg Lukacs' early critiques of modernism.[53] Hostile receptions of Bloomsbury varied widely in their points of attack. Marxist interpretations of Bloomsbury's works and activities were particularly virulent, in some cases simply because Bloomsbury's members, while sympathetic to the aims of Marxist thought, and socialist in theory and intent, did not fully endorse the party line propounded by the central Communist parties. In the case of some other critics, Bloomsbury, its interest in aesthetics, and its background in the "intellectual aristocracy" simply seem to have provided an easy target. Bloomsbury was too rooted in its privileged background ("highbrow") to understand the working class according to the Leavises, for instance. It also attacked the "wrong" cultural icons (such as nationalistic military figures). Finally (and ironically for Bloomsbury, given its participation in leftist, feminist, anti-imperialist, anti-homophobic projects), as Marianne DeKoven has noted, the New Critics lumped Bloomsbury in with other modernisms and, "with the cooperation of those aspects of modernism indisputably in harmony with their project, ... define[d] modernism as the politically retrograde phenomena -- sexist, racist, elitist, fascist, even 'royalist' -- that has become so easy to condemn" (12). DeKoven suggests that

> the issues which, for early modernist narrative, were raised by actual political movements, socialism and feminism,[54] and by the deformations of patriarchy-capitalism-imperialism to which those movements were a response, came to be assigned in high modernism to history itself. (188)

In this way, modernist political activities were relegated to textual (formally innovative) responses to a political reality with which modernists, Bloomsbury's members included, could not hope to engage effectively. Patently political modernist interventions can thus be defined as pursuing outmoded "goals based on economic models from the nineteenth century: socialist, capitalist, nationalist, and suffragist ideals were defined in terms of autonomy, self-ownership, and the removal of external influence" (Tratner "Sex" 714).

In "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors" (1989), Said suggests that the great

---

[53] Luckacs was writing on modernism in the 1930s, though translations began in the 1950s.

[54] DeKoven groups post-colonial protests under these terms.

> historical narratives of emancipation and enlightenment have lost their legitimation in large measure as a result of the crisis of modernism, which foundered on or was frozen in contemplative irony for various reasons, of which one was the disturbing appearance in Europe of various Others, whose provenance was the imperial domain. In the works of Eliot, Conrad, Mann, Proust, Woolf, Pound, Lawrence, Joyce, Forster, alterity and difference are systematically associated with strangers, who, whether women, natives, or sexual eccentrics, erupt into vision, there to challenge and resist settled metropolitan histories, forms, modes of thought. To this challenge modernism responded with the formal irony[55] of a culture unable either to say yes, we should give up control, or no, we shall hold on regardless: a self-conscious contemplative passivity forms itself, as Georg Lukacs noted perspicaciously, into paralyzed gestures of aestheticized powerlessness. (222-3)

I would argue that Said's analysis is actually a critique of the formalized high modernism represented in such texts as Eliot's The Waste Land and Forster's A Passage to India.[56] Sterility and inaction are the focal points of these texts, and the peripheries do paralyze the centre. In A Passage to India, the English cannot leave India; they cannot love its inhabitants; they are presented with a great "mystery" which they cannot unravel. Nothing happens and everyone suffers because of it. In this chapter, however, I wish to concentrate on the fractured political nature of the anti-imperialist fiction written by Leonard Woolf, on its differences from, complicities in, and resistances to the metropolitan history of imperialism and colonialism.

EARLY PAINTINGS OF EMPIRE, WARTS AND ALL:

Woolf's early fictional works situated in the "exotic" site of Ceylon (Sri Lanka), display a fatalistic vision of what he was later to term the "conflict of civilizations" (Imperialism and Civilization). In the three Stories of the East (orig Hogarth 1921), West meets East in a troubling set

---

[55] A number of thorough explorations of the functions of "formal irony," racism, and the "sick heart of empire" myth in the works of some of the most widely renowned modernists are available. See especially Trotter and Spurr (1994), as well as Casillo on Pound's anti-semitism in "The Desert and the Swamp" (1984). See also Sara Suleri and Sharpe (Allegories and "Unspeakable Limits") on Forster.

[56] See Sharpe on the importance of the Amritsar massacre in Passage.

of interactions. Selma Meyerowitz suggests that "the three short stories...reveal aspects of Eastern culture, but also emphasize the role of the British in the East and the effects of class and caste barriers, common to both British and Ceylonese society on human behaviours" (44). The narrative vehicle used to present this clear moral, however, distances both the reader and the object of her reading, problematizing any simple reading of these tales. The "exotic" East remains exotic and distant. In "A Tale Told by Moonlight" and "Pearls and Swine," for instance, the stories are buffered by not one but two narrators. As with the problematic frame narrative in Heart of Darkness, the frame-tale narrators do not clearly enough distinguish themselves from the system under discussion. They maintain an ironic relation to some parts of the tale they relate, but provide no implicit or explicit condemnation of the entire colonial system of which they are an ambivalent part.

Rosenbaum highlights the constructed nature of these tales, focussing particularly in the case of "A Tale Told by Moonlight" on the Conradian frame, but suggesting the tale is "hackneyed, sentimental and without any of Conrad's complex irony...Its main interest for the literary history of Bloomsbury lies in the narrator's view of the novelist" (Edwardian 403). Rosenbaum notes the fact that Elizabeth Heine considers Forster to be Woolf's source for the Reynold's figure (403), and thus Rosenbaum reads "Tale" as a "fictive extension of [Woolf's] commentary on Forster's early novels in the letters to Strachey and Sydney-Turner" (404). While this reading is viable, one can also read some similarities between the tales' characters and Woolf himself (a point to which I will return in a moment).

Briefly, in "A Tale Told by Moonlight," an unnamed narrator relates a tale told to him originally by a character named Jessop, an enigmatic figure who once catalyzed a romance between a white male acquaintance (Reynolds) and a Sinhalese prostitute (Celestinahami). Reynolds despairs of Celestinahami's ability to understand or return his soul-stirring love. He leaves Sri Lanka, and Celestinahami kills herself. As Mervyn de Silva suggests in his 1963 introduction, "the story is marked by a curious ambivalence" (liv). This ambivalence is especially noticeable in terms of a lack of clear markers indicating who is to be pitied or envied and whether it is Reynolds or Celestinahami who has experienced the real passion of love. Celestinahami's dramatic gesture in the face of Reynolds's cheap and "dirty" gift of a large amount of money before he makes good his escape from a relationship he can no longer tolerate (264) does seem, however, to make her the more likely tragic protagonist. And in this reading, both Reynolds and Jessop must be read as deeply ironized characters.

It is true that, in this tale, the narrator rather

admires Jessop, the enigmatic character who originally relates the rather sordid interlude. Jessop presents Celestinahami as soft, ancient, child-like, and animalistic. His story plays up the absolute tragic misunderstanding inherent in civilization's attempt to interact with a "non-civilized" race. Even given the tale's possible ambivalence about the nature of the tragedy, the internal narrator's (Jessop's) unchallenged presentation of the two "lovers" leaves the civilized/uncivilized dichotomy in place. However, one of the white women with whom Woolf became involved in Sri Lanka, the 18-year old "Gwen" of Woolf's autobiography, was described by Woolf in much the same terms as Jessop uses for Celestinahami. Parsons and Spater say that "Leonard admired Gwen's body, but he could see right through her 'two big cow eyes which could never understand anything which one said' even though they looked 'as if they understood everything that has ever been, is or will be'" (53). Woolf, who was at this point in his life very much missing the intellectual exchange and exploration he felt he had experienced at Cambridge, was impatient with most of his less educated contemporaries. It was "Gwen" of his desire for whom Woolf wrote "I am beginning to think it is always degraded being in love: after all 99/100ths of it is always the desire to copulate, otherwise it is only the shadow of itself, & a particular desire to copulate seems to me no less degraded than a general" (Letters 128). It may be difficult to avoid reading passages of this story as if written out of certain specific encounters in Woolf's life, such as the "Gwen" episode and Woolf's short period of living with a "burgher concubine" (Letters 107) in Jaffna in 1905. If, however, one makes this type of reading, positing that Woolf is somehow represented in either Jessop or Reynolds (or some combination of the two), the story becomes scathingly ironic and, given the Bloomsbury and Moorean valorization of truth and self-awareness, self-damning.

"Pearls and Swine," the second tale, was reviewed in the Daily Mail, and "according to the reviewer...'will rank with the great stories of the world'" (Parsons and Spater 94). The story is again narrated by an unnamed narrator who relates a story originally told by a civil servant of some 30 years' time. This "commissioner" is driven to tell his tale by his irritation with the foolish comments his fellow upper middle-class Englishmen utter while sitting about in a club. The commissioner's story speaks of the time he supervised a pearl fishery "assisted" by a foolish young public school graduate and a rapacious, Kurtz-like figure.[57] This Kurtz-figure, White, dies a horrible death

---

[57] Again, the story is based in Woolf's experience of the pearl fishery at Marichchukkaddi (see Letters 112-6) but should not be read autobiographically.

in the throes of delirium tremens, and his death is compared to that of an Arab fisherman, which is serene and somehow noble. The generic nature of the racial appellation (White) condemns all Europeans, particularly the capitalist adventurers in foreign ("coloured") countries.

"Pearls and Swine" is a more outspoken piece than "A Tale Told by Moonlight." The narrative stance (of both the internal and for the external narrator) is quite clear, but, like Heart of Darkness, the text is about the atrocities of the (atavistic) black heart of civilization as they become readily apparent through their metaphoric connection with an "uncivilized" wilderness. As well, the "timeless" community of the Arab pearl fishermen, in contrast to White and the English "home" community which allows him to exist, is used as a stick with which to beat Woolf's complacent white readers (in the Oriental Tale tradition). The title itself refers to Matthew, Chapter 7. This is the chapter of the Bible which begins by admonishing its readers, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Verses 2-5 expand on this commandment, while verse 6:1, the verse cited in the story's title, reads, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend you." Just who represents the dogs or swine here (the clubmen, White, the colonial space) and who ought not judge what other character, space, or practice is a question left implicit and unanswered. The aspect of divine threat is also notable, given that Woolf was later to suggest that imperialists would likely reap the violence they had sown in colonized lands. Matthew 7 also contains the verse which says, "Ye shall know them by their fruits" (16). Is the allusion another comment on the Commissioner's foolish, racist, and violent compatriots? Ironically, the parable of the talents (Matthew 25:15-30) is the text usually used to support imperialist attempts to justify "colonial conquests...[by] demonstrat[ing] that the colonist is a better steward of the earth than the native" (Coetzee 31 [1988]).

In both tales, the reader is plunged into an unfamiliar reality for the purpose of showing up the inadequacies of the familiar as it interacts with the unfamiliar. A radical difference continues to exist between "civilized" and "uncivilized" spaces and races. In "Pearls and Swine," the "commissioner" who tells the internal tale is experienced and competent; he deals humanely with the troubles caused by both "uncivilized" and "civilized" behaviour. While the colonial/imperial system is shown to be based on greed and oppression (as in "A Tale Told By Moonlight"), the character himself is meant to be attractive; he is a character who displays a "moral discipline" (Meyerowitz 49) not evidenced by "civilized" or "uncivilized" characters around him, except perhaps for the frame-tale narrator, also a colonial civil servant. Thus, while a lack of civilized moral

discipline leaves the colonial system prey to evil scavengers, and the "commissioner" speaks bitterly of the greed rampant in the home (English) government, no clear-cut condemnation of the well-meaning civil servant develops. In fact, the civil servant's fitness to rule is born out both through his ability to maintain order at the pearl camp (through his strength of character, he single-handedly controls thousands of Arabs, thieves, etc.) and his clear moral superiority over the raw recruit, White, and the English parlour-chair rulers to whom he tells the tale: "One's final impression of both these stories is that of a mind deeply conscious of its confrontation with a strange, disquieting and alien element and striving hard to wrestle with and master it" (M. de Silva liv). Similarly, Rosenbaum says "Pearls and Swine" is "finally not so much a critique of imperialism as of some of its assumptions" (Edwardian 407).

"The Two Brahmans" is also told by a third person narrator and relates the tale of two Brahmans who pollute their caste, one by fishing (for the joy of the activity) and one by carrying earth on his head (for miserly reasons) while digging a well. The caste-based persecution they receive as a result of these actions passes down through the generations and a marriage between their descendants is prevented by parental greed which finds expression, on the part of both families, in accusations of caste pollution.

"The Two Brahmans" seems the simplest of these three tales; indeed, Rosenbaum dismisses it in a short paragraph, without even mentioning the tale's title, as a "slight, non-realistic satire" (Edwardian 404). However, as a simple moral tale focusing on the Ceylonese caste system and published in the same book as "A Tale Told By Moonlight" and "Pearls and Swine," the tale provides another, allegorical possibility. While the story does not deal with the British legal entrenchment of the caste system, under the conditions by which the British assumed sovereignty in Ceylon, they supported the chiefs who had surrendered that sovereignty in the first place:

> The chiefs exercised an authority and exacted feudal services inconsistent with British ideas of the rights of subject peoples, for under their ancient laws and customs which the [1815 Kandyan] Conventions sought to preserve, these feudal overlords held jurisdiction over the people and decided lawsuits and other disputes according to [traditional] notions of caste and social status. (Zeylanicus 89)

Perhaps the "moral" about inflexibility and the stupidity of the way in which people cling to caste or class-based beliefs while they destroy lives is meant to be read in terms of the other two tales and to say something about the

British socio-political system.[58] Woolf elsewhere discussed the similarities between the British and Indian caste systems: "Only a person who has lived among the four great castes of India can fully appreciate how much stronger the caste system is in Richstead,"

> and the caste system alone explains the existence of The Poor Dear Things....Now obviously you cannot try to do good to your own castes or to castes higher than your own without insulting them; and the really low castes, which form the great lower classes, are so curiously constituted that they are inclined to resent any attempt of the wives and daughters of the lower and middle middle-class to enter their homes and do good to them. (Wise Virgins 116-7).

Though a less intrinsically ironic tale from the point of view of Woolf's own style than the other two tales in Stories of the East, "Two Brahmans" is an extremely complex piece, especially in comparison to Manel Ratnatunga's much later revision of Woolf's original tale, included in her 1979 collection of Sri Lankan "folk tales." Ratnatunga says she rewrote Woolf's story because

> it was such an incisive comprehension of our Jaffna Tamils by an alien that I wanted to preserve it as a folktale....The Jaffna [Woolf] wrote about, the Brahmins and their way of life, all that is no more. It is Eelam territory, the terrain of terrorism, acclaimed as more virulent than any other known form of terrorism. Their leader is of very low caste. The 'Two Brahmins' would have long since fled, either to Canada or to live with us Sinhalese in the rest of Sri Lanka. (unpublished correspondence)

To begin with, Ratnatunga departicularizes the tale of "Two Brahmins," setting it in a folk tale "frame," while Woolf set it in a particular place. Ceylonese folk tales begin with a "once upon a time" phrase: "Once in a certain country, it is said" (Ratnatunga Folk Tales 91) or "Once in a certain country there lived, it seems" ([5]). They do not begin, as Woolf's story does, by invoking a specific (though likely in this case fictitious) Tamil town in "the north of Ceylon" (280). Neither do they discuss the way in which the particular town in question has "slept and grown" in its unchanging way for centuries (280). Woolf's version of the story gives scenic descriptions of "dusty roads" and "palms

---

[58] Roger Poole certainly makes this interpretation of The Village in the Jungle, reading that text in terms of (generic) caste systems and Leonard's uneasiness about his relationship with Virginia Stephen Woolf (74). Peter Alexander makes a similar reading.

and orange and lime trees" (280), descriptive matter helpful for the western reader. As well, the introductory paragraphs incorporate extensive ethnographic description of the social interactions and history of the Brahmin caste. This description has the effect of foregrounding an exotic group, which "did no work, for there was no need to work" (280), in an unfamiliar setting, though clearly parallels could be drawn here with any number of "upper class" sections of any number of societies. This exoticizing buys into stereotyped views of "natives" as lazy and "primitive," and one is reminded of Said's discussion of the "'false consciousness' of colonialists unwilling to accept that the natives' refusal to work was one of the earliest forms of resistance to European incursion" (Culture 307). Woolf's added suggestion that "quite suddenly one of the gods, or rather devils, laid a spell upon" (281) the compounds of the main characters completes a narrative setting which both distances and paradoxically provides some sympathetic links between the "superstitious," "irrational" villagers and the "rational" western reader who holds the characters in her/his mind.

Ratnatunga's revision halves Woolf's brief tale, largely through the removal of psychological narration. By this term I mean narrative dealing with the feelings and thoughts of characters, explication of motive and character. Woolf's Chellaya has a wife who is "too talkative and ha[s] a sharp tongue" and a neighbour "who [is] on bad terms" with him and "whom he hate[s]" (281). The everyday irritants of Chellaya's life are contrasted to the "unruffled" waters of the lagoon and "gently" moving fishers (281), and he is thus given some motivation for his action. He is a much more contemplative character than Ratnatunga's Chelliah. As with The Village in the Jungle, Woolf seems to have been concerned with offering the point of view of the "native," but here the attempt fails, largely because of an unsuitable narrative distance which Woolf's ironic relation to the caste system and human frailty did not quite let him get beyond.

Ratnatunga's "Two Brahmins" foregrounds human frailties in a more clear-cut way than does Woolf's original because it does not open sympathetic resonances between reader and character. The tensions between castes and pure human stubbornness and greed are pointed up in Woolf's version, while it is greed and stupidity only which seem Ratnatunga's focus. While the revised version suggests only that "the village got to know. Chelliah was fishing" (93), Woolf included a paragraph about the reaction of the villagers:

> Very soon a strange rumour began to spread in the town that the Brahman Chellaya had polluted his caste by fishing. At first people would not believe it; such a thing could not happen, for it had never happened before. But at last so many

> people told the story, -- and one man had seen Chellaya carrying a net and another had seen him wading in the lagoon -- that everyone began to believe it, the lower castes with great pleasure and the Brahmans with great shame and anger. (283)

Curiously, it may be Woolf's very attempt to render "sympathetically" a character and a way of life foreign to the western reader which gives this tale its very friable texture. It is the intimate and particularized nature of the story which allows this reader to assume a knowledge of a "real" place with "real" characteristics. In both versions, Chellaya and Chittampalam are contrasted, but in Woolf's version, Chellaya is a much more significant part of the action. Chellaya thus becomes not an example of a character trait (caste-breaking), but something closer to a round character who experiences a very human longing for something outside tradition. By the time one reaches the repeated motif as it expresses itself in Chittampalam, one feels that he too might be a "real" character, though a much less sympathetic one. And the village and its hypocritical actions in "castin[ing] them out forever from the Brahman caste" while "if people of other castes talked to them of the matter, they denied all knowledge of it" (284) take on a very significant role in the tale. A certain theme of hypocrisy begins to loom large. In contrast, the village of Ratnatunga's version is entirely Brahmin, and the folk tale nowhere mentions the reactions of anyone other than the village inhabitants themselves to the "pollution." Chellaya's individual "protest" against the strictures which guide his life is emphasized by Woolf's paragraph describing Chellaya's torment and exclusion after the village's discovery of his "pollution." The object of his "longing" (285) is described in positively lyric terms:

> All day long in the temple and in his compound he sat and thought of his evenings when he waded in the blue waters of the lagoon, and of the little islands resting like plumes of smoke or feathers upon the sky, and of the line of pink flamingoes like thin posts at regular intervals set to mark a channel, and of the silver gleam of darting fish. (284)

The reality of his predicament is driven home through Woolf's inclusion of the idiomatic phrase "and, as the saying is, his fat went off in desire" (285).

In the dénouement of the story, Woolf's version contains several paragraphs describing the thought processes of the great-great-great-grandsons of Chellaya and Chittampalam (285), the "four generations" later of Ratnatunga's version. Not only are the fathers' thoughts on both sides of the doomed marriage proposal relayed by the narrator, the customs attendant on the matter are once again

elaborated for the reader:

> Now however that his son himself suggested the marriage, [Chellaya] approved of the idea, and as the custom is, told his wife to go to Chittampalam's house and look at the girl. So his wife went formally to Chittampalam's house for the visit preparatory to an offer of marriage, and she came back and reported that the girl was beautiful and fit for even her son to marry. (285)

The process continues and the reader learns that

> As is usual in such cases the father of the girl wants the dowry to be small and the father of the boy wants it to be large, and all sorts of reasons are given on both sides why it should be small or large, and the argument begins to grow warm. (286)

In Ratnatunga's version, the stupidity of the latest generation of Chelliahs and Chittampalams is discovered quickly and without narrative elaboration. Woolf's original tale, however, makes a point of repeating the falling out:

> the quarrel was healed and they began to discuss again the question of dowry. But the old words rankled and they were still sore, as soon as the discussion bean to grow warm it ended once more by their calling each other "Fisher" and "Pariah". The same thing has happened now several times. (286)

This repetition takes away from the pointed foolishness of the event and makes it seem as though the narrator actually speaks with intimate knowledge of real events. And thus the "caste" problems of and between Ceylonese (about which Woolf might have chosen to write in any number of ways) are subsumed to a relation of instances of stupidity and small tragic moments overlaid with "authentic" moments of description of a certain Ceylonese setting and certain traditions and modes of speech.

In general, Woolf's "Two Brahmans" is a tale of a Ceylonese Brahmins taken out of its own social context and held out to the view of "home" (English) citizens[59] such as those depicted in "Pearls and Swine." "The Two Brahmans" sits uneasily next to "Pearls and Swine" and "A Tale Told by Moonlight" because it lacks the sophisticated narrative structure of either, and yet the narrative's ambivalence is marked and troubling. "The Two Brahmans," because of its distanced (third-person, "factual") narrative, functions to give information about a particular (non-English) society and a "lesson" about a particular political reality. While the narrative is sympathetic towards the character of

---

[59] The stories were originally published in Britain rather than in Ceylon.

Chellaya, and his transgression certainly seems small enough to the western reader, the structure of the tale leads inexorably to a revelation about the inflexibility and hypocrisy of the entire Brahman section of Yalpanam (and by extension the entire Brahman caste of Ceylon, and perhaps the social underpinnings of the British caste and imperialist system). Quite possibly the true intended reader of this tale was Woolf himself, implicated in the perpetuation of the Ceylonese caste system's social inequities and well aware of that fact. Woolf's early stories do seem to exhibit aspects of the formal and frozen irony characteristic of some other modernist works. The stories betray an early inability to view a way out of the imperialist position, to see a future in which the British civil servant and observer might have removed himself from the equation.

Some of the problems with the narrative distance maintained in all three tales grow out of a theory about something Woolf was, by 1928, to term "conflicts of civilization." In Imperialism and Civilization, Woolf came to the conclusion that the stronger Western civilization had already irrevocably contaminated the "less developed" civilizations. Because it was the more powerful and furthest developed, Western civilization could not be prevented from dominating other civilizations, but Woolf hoped it could be persuaded to dominate in terms of rational philanthropy. Woolf was thus in an ambivalent position. While he clearly objected to the atrocities committed under the European (and the United States') imperialist system, his final solution, the League of Nations, was an outgrowth of that system. I will develop this point at greater length in the next chapter. Here it will help to know that Woolf's position was in some ways a result of his belief that "in politics and history once something has been done radically to change the past into a new present, you must act not upon a situation which no longer exists, but upon the facts that face one" (Journey 186). The sheer pragmatics of his vision thus prevented Leonard Woolf from engaging in activities a current postcolonial critic might consider to be truly radical politics. Village in the Jungle and Stories of the East display the clear incompatibility of the European and Ceylonese civilizations. The European protagonist (or author) might admire the tragic reality of the "Other," or pity it, as that "Other" struggled against an inevitable fate which s/he did not and could not comprehend, but the European was not touched by that reality. Indeed, in some ways the (male) European in these two texts is almost inevitably the carrier of that tragic reality.

READING THE VILLAGE:

The inability of cultures to work alongside one another is fully displayed in The Village in the Jungle (1913),

where even the British character who, anthropologist-like, seems to understand the situation most thoroughly, cannot intervene in a miscarriage of British justice. Crooks and criminals happily carry on their business within this "rational" system, but the child-like and innocent "true" villagers are destroyed by it. Village illustrates Woolf's later argument about the need for Other cultures to change in order to accomodate for and to a deforming European impact. The "East" must become like Europe, and those who remain "true" to another "civilization" will be wiped out. Village explores the terrible impossibility of a meaningful exchange guided by imperialism between civilizations.

The modernist period coincided with the end of the British Raj and the beginnings of decolonization and the rise of national literatures written in English. In any study of the historical links between the English literary tradition and Commonwealth literatures, the first British "novel wholly about indigenous living with only indigenous people as [its] main characters" (Goonetilleke 72 [1975]) is obviously an important point of reference. To date, however, a significant proportion of the criticism on Leonard Woolf's The Village in the Jungle has occupied itself with the contention that this novel, while set in rural Ceylon (then Ceylon), is actually "symbolic of the condition of modern man" (Flood 78 [1973]).[60] This argument perhaps results

---

[60] Alexander goes so far as to suggest that the novel's "central and abiding theme" is not "anti-imperialism, nor even man's struggle against the trials of life, symbolised by the encroaching and threatening jungle that surrounds the village. The theme that runs thoughout The Village in the Jungle, appearing repeatedly and with apparently endless variations, is sexual desire contending with social incompatibility" (73). Alexander bases this reading on a belief that it was Woolf's "marriage with Virginia which dictated the dominant theme of...The Village in the Jungle, and that theme is sexual attraction between those separated by social or other inequality. Leonard was intensely aware of the social gulfs separating him from Virginia, and he focuses on them in this novel as if trying to answer a vital question" (4). The pitfalls involved in such a biographical reading, one which ignores Woolf's ability to clearly analyze the differences between the Woolfs' and the Stephens's social backgrounds, as well as the facts that there are various groupings of these "inappropriate unions" and that the most inappropriate are those based in sexual violation and rape (not just desire which is somehow misplaced), lead Alexander to suggest that the "novel ends with a powerful dreamlike image of lust and incompatibility, as the woman who is the last survivor of the doomed village, abandoned and dying, is attacked by a great black shadow

from a desire to bring Woolf's text on-board as one of the canonical, "apolitical" texts of modernism, a critical gesture which also makes the text one of Lukacs's "paralysed gestures of aesthetic powerlessness." A more interesting reading involves a recognition of the conflicted relationship between modernism and imperialism and between Woolf's "colonialist" positionality and the anti-imperialist themes in the text. Our temporal distance from 1913, however, is such that both the subtle social Darwinism of Village and its not so subtly antagonistic presentation of the British administrative presence in Ceylon require extensive explication. Leonard Woolf stated more than once that, in writing The Village in the Jungle, he worked out for himself his anti-imperialist beliefs. Some critics, including Lilamani de Silva, are sceptical about this claim. de Silva, writing in 1991, says that this text "indicate[s] an affiliation with a deep-seated and seemingly inherent imperialist ideology" and that the text works by

> presenting a fatalistic picture, one in which colonialism is simply another of the many inevitable misfortunes in the lives of subjects Woolf casts as innocent, helpless, primitive victims. Woolf's critique of imperialism is vitiated by indicating that the misfortunes of the villagers stem from the petty corruptions and evil of other Ceylonese, as well as the ever-present oppressivity of nature itself. (12)

A recognition of the fact that the "ideological conditions of a text's production are never singular but always several" (Ahmad 24 [1987]) allows critics and students of the modernist period to begin reading such highly conflicted and "fractional" texts for what they reveal about the relationship of modernism to imperialism and the construction of postcoloniality.

The Village in the Jungle, set in the rural Ceylon Woolf administered as a member of the Civil Service for seven years, is the story of a "hunter," Silindu, and his twin daughters, Punchi Menika and Hinnihami. Silindu angers the headman of his village (Beddagama). The headman's response initially takes the form of an abuse of his power to give or withhold chena and gun permits, which behaviour could mean the villager's starvation:

> At the end of a disastrous year of drought and disease, in which both daughters' children and Hinnihami herself die, a money-lender, Fernando, settles in the village in an effort to collect his outstanding debts from the villagers' 'chena'

---

from which white tusks curl up....The image of bestiality...powerfully suggests Leonard's awareness of the gulfs between himself and Virginia" (74).

> crops.[61] [Fernando] tries to persuade Punchi Menika to leave [her husband] for him, and the headman [Babehami] tries to persuade [the husband, Babun Appu, who is the cousin of the headman's wife] to let her go. When they fail, they rig a case of robbery against Babu[n]. (Wilson 42)

In a powerful court scene, the innocent "Babu[n] is...sentenced to six months imprisonment" even though the judge suspects that there is something he does not understand behind the case. "Silindu then kills the headman and [the moneylender], gives himself up and receives a death sentence" which is commuted to 20 years' imprisonment. Babun Appu dies in jail. After a period of sharp decline, the village, in the person of its last survivor, Punchi Menika (Wilson 42), is literally ingested by the jungle in the form of a wild boar.

What little criticism has been written on The Village in the Jungle falls into several, sometimes simultaneously argued, approaches. Early criticism focuses somewhat self-consciously on the relative worth of the novel vis-à-vis the English literary tradition or the modernist tradition (especially in comparison to A Passage to India). Most critics make a point of referring to the novel's importance in the Sri Lankan literary canon. Sri Lankan critics have a different interest in placing Village in the context of a received canon than do some "western" critics; readings which include an argument that the novel not be ignored merely on the basis of its Sri Lankan setting are very different in quality from those which make an appeal to what I will call prescriptive universalism. The gist of this argument is that, while the novel is set in Ceylon, its actual or "hidden" meaning lies in its exploration of the state of the Human soul (meaning, I take it, the white western soul explored so often in the texts of the high modernist canon). This argument is nicely summed up in David Flood's suggestion in 1973, mentioned earlier, that Woolf's "story of jungle village life [is] symbolic of the condition of modern man" (78). Another series of arguments focuses on the text's mimetic purchase, debating the novel's "truth claim," its ability to accurately represent the "primitive" villagers. Other readings have included discussions of Woolf's position as an imperialist or as an anti-imperialist. These readings tend to use Woolf's own statements about his position on imperialism to support

---

[61] "The cultivator burns down a portion of jungle, roughly clears it and then sows a crop, usually kurakkan, a small seeded variety of millet. No manuring or care of the plants is taken, but the return is good as the soil is virgin soil. After a few crops, however, the plot is abandoned for another new plot." (Diaries lxii)

claims for or against Woolf. The autobiographies may be used as glosses on the novel. Rosenbaum, for instance, reads Diaries in Ceylon and Growing in comparison to The Village in the Jungle and says,

> The diaries describe in their documentary way the world of the novel, including some of its happenings, while the autobiography retrospecively evaluates the experience that led to its writing. Looking at the novel in the context of both the diaries and the autobiography brings out more clearly the naturalism of the work and its subtext about imperialism. (Edwardian 423)

I wish to suggest that, with the exception of the argument that The Village in the Jungle tells us something about the-state of the (ungendered, unraced, disembodied) soul of Humanity, all of these readings are in some senses supportable. Woolf's novel is in some ways stunningly imperialist while at the same time it is a passionate subversion of imperialism. It is this very ambiguity which makes Village one of the representative texts of a politically engaged modernism.

The Village in the Jungle makes its point or moral (which runs something like "humanity's oppression of its own members, especially imperialist oppression, is worse than the senseless killing and evil found in an uncaring Nature") through the use of a "beast fable" schematic (Gooneratne "Waste Land" 24 [1972]). Villagers are depicted not only in terms of specific animals but also as animal-like: "The spirit of the jungle is in the village," says the narrator,

> and in the people who live in it. They are simple, sullen, silent men. In their faces you can see plainly the fear and hardship of their lives. They are very near to the animals which live in the jungle around them. They look at you with the melancholy and patient stupidity of the buffalo in their eyes, or the cunning of the jackal. And there is in them the blind anger of the jungle, the ferocity of the leopard, and the sudden fury of the bear. (11-12)

One thus comes smack upon the standard tendency of the imperialist and the anti-imperialist engaged in colonial discourse to de-nature the "Other" (brown people, women, children) by writing her/him through the readily available metaphors of the animal or child. Troping, according to Stephen Slemon in 1987, is a particularly colonialist gesture ("Cultural Alterity" 105). I think it is this readily available trope, rather than "the influence of the Mowgli stories" (Rosenbaum Edwardian (425) which provides the framework for animalistic descriptions of humans in The Village. Woolf's fiction makes extensive use of the social Darwinist distinction between "non-adult" and "adult" races. J.M. Coetzee defines Social Darwinism as the

> set of interlocking biocultural theories that explain the rise and fall of groups within societies and the rise and fall of societies themselves....Social Darwinism in essence teaches that groups fail to flourish because there is something "in" them that is teleologically unsound. These groups are (tautologically) labelled unfit. Thus Social Darwinism in its crudest form explains the poverty of the poor, the enslavement of the enslaved, the criminality of the criminal as in some sense biologically predetermined, and so provides a scientific basis for a totalizing ethic in which "incidental suffering" can be ignored as "the great scheme of perfect happiness" unrolls. (144)

Writing in 1987, Benita Parry sees this tendency as part of a "nationalist/utopian discourse--[which is based on a belief in] the divinely ordained task of Europeans to rule, guide and elevate backwards peoples as a trust for civilization. That the language of ascendancy...was shared by the spokesmen of empire and their 'critics' suggests its hegemony" (54).

Given this reading, Woolf's Village seems, and is, undeniably a culpable participant in the rhetoric of colonialist discourse. His village is part of the jungle. His villagers think along "primitive" lines while they live a primitive life. His characters act out their lives and loves as part of a natural cycle which is represented to the reader by a "civilized" western narrator. The jungle and its animal life regulate the villagers' lives, and, in the end, the village and the villagers are literally ingested by the jungle. Selma Meyerowitz clearly, if unwittingly, signals the gap generated between "primitive" protagonists and "sophisticated" reader when she suggests that the novel's third person narration is

> appropriate to both characterization and theme. The external narration allows Woolf to present the story as a tale, to fill in details of location and customs for the non-Ceylonese reader. Moreover,...none of the characters develop enough self-consciousness to be the source of an internal narration. This parallels their relationship to experience; they are controlled by external forces -- nature, the caste economic and social system, mysticism and individual greed rather than being in control of their own lives. (40-1)

Oddly enough, Meyerowitz says this even though she also talks about the production and relation of folk tales by certain characters as indicative of the imaginative life of the villagers. In this way, then, the narrative structure, and the critical interpretation it generates, actually reproduces the social oppression Woolf was arguing against

by reinscribing the Eurocentric presumption that the "First World, is where major calamities are history-making, transformative, while in poor, African or Asian counties they are part of a cycle, and therefore something like an aspect of nature" (Sontag 84 [1988]). Village has major areas of confluence with the vast number of texts and treatises which separated viewer from viewed and elevated one above the other in a supposed evolutionary ranking of societies.

This said, however, it is not true that Leonard Woolf's text operates only on this register and does not specifically and markedly target imperialism itself or that the anti-imperialist "symbolism is inexplicit. Only in the inability of the novel's Assistant Government Agent to uncover what has been happening in the village of Beddagama is the simple failure of colonial justice made manifest" (Rosenbaum Edwardian 431). It is not the case, as Lilamani de Silva says, that a postmodernist reading which reads against the novel, in its margins, is the only reading which makes the novel anti-imperialist (125-6). Nor is it true that

> In The Village in the Jungle...the jungle is a symbol, not of "the evils of imperialism," but of an oppression inherent in the nature of things, of hopelessness, joylessness, limited mental development, limited grasp of the internal and external worlds in which man lives, beast preying on beast, man on man. (Workman 17 [1975])

It may, however, be the case, as Rosenbaum suggests, that the specific background to the novel (he comes to it through the "oblique commentary" of the Diaries) is necessary for an understanding of the anti-imperialism of the novel to emerge (Edwardian 431).

Though the villagers are troped as animals and their life is primitive, the descriptions of village life are, as far as possible, accurate, given that Woolf was an outsider who did not live in the village as a villager and refused to consort with the villagers except in his capacity as Assistant Government Agent (never as friend or equal). Many Sri Lankan critics have commented on the verisimilitude of his description. However, these critics clearly are of the Sri Lankan educated class and not privy to village life either, especially since the villages Woolf was describing had practically ceased to exist soon after Woolf's resignation from his position as AGA in 1911. A.J. Gunawardana presents this argument in his 1979 article on the Sri Lankan film version of Village. Gunawardana says of The Village in the Jungle, that, "though hardly known outside the country that inspired it," the text is

> a novel of great distinction. In the words of Lester James Peries, Sri Lanka's leading film-maker, who is now engaged in translating the novel

> into cinema: 'Woolf's is the best novel written in English about Sri Lanka. In fact, it has no parallel in English writing about Asia -- Woolf got closer than any other Western writer to the heart of Asian life.' (26)

In part, this closeness, according to Gunawardana, is a result of the fact that Woolf resisted the tendency to romanticize the characters in Village; the text has "no tendency towards 'noble savage' portraiture" (26). The measure of the text's authenticity, Gunawardana suggests, is the "quick assimilation of the novel into modern Sinhala fiction; the Sinhala translation, first published in the 1940s, is no longer looked upon as a translation" (27). Woolf's physical descriptions are said to display careful similitude even in 1979: "Jungle and village as painted by Woolf still survive in the country's southern extremity. Only the people are different -- certainly not the disease-stricken jungle dwellers of Woolf's time" (27).

Village carefully funnels all strands of the narrative towards the bottleneck of the British court system and the British jail. It is the "civilized" agents in this tale and the "civilized" legal and colonial system which encourages the disaster which occurs and which eventually act as a doppelganger of the "evil" jungle:

> it is evident that the British civil servant who inquires into a village murder understands the circumstances, both personal and social, that have brought it about, but is unable to see justice done since the law does not take such circumstances into account. British rule is seen as immediately well-intentioned, but in the long run inevitably destructive of the values of instinctive life, capable of exploitation and distortion by the corrupt and the greedy. (Gooneratne Diverse Inheritance 7 [1980])

"Civilization" (British colonialism or imperialism) wipes out the village. And as the court stands doubled outside its open doors by the waiting jungle, it is hard to tell which tropes which and which is the greater "evil." Elleke Boehmer says, in her 1995 Colonial and Postcolonial Literature, "white authority seen from the village point of view is so remote as to be otherwordly. Colonialist justice is a grim farce of irrelevance and misunderstanding which leads eventually to the extinction of the community" (141).

It is the "civilized" government agents in this tale and the "civilized" legal and colonial systems which create the conditions necessary for the disaster which occurs. The British system, which systematically starves people by refusing them chenas and game and by imposing a "body tax," forces the villagers deeper and deeper into a debt culture which also starves them. And though this "debt culture" may have had its origins in a pre-British system, it was

certainly under the British that it reached its full "evil" potential, as even the imperialist socialists Sidney and Beatrice Webb were forced to admit in 1912:

> Our law courts are honest and unbribable, but they are by no means racially unprejudiced; the magistrates commit many oppressions on poor and humble folk, largely because they do not regard their liberty as anything like so sacred as that of a white man; our procedure has encouraged an enormous amount of litigation and chicanery; its very excellence and rigour has greatly increased the evil power of the money lender. It seems doubtful whether a rural village, if it could give an opinion, would not rather be without our whole civil courts and civil procedure, and without our criminal law -- preferring its old way of dealing with its own cases in village panchayat [a group of respected village elders]. (Webbs 210)

Woolf himself, in his official Assistant Government Agent's diary, protested the British chena policies specifically because they starved villagers and fuelled the debt system (86). He attempted to set up a system where the government advanced seed for chena cultivation on the understanding that the government would be paid out of the crop itself (75). Rosenbaum also notes that the ineffective chena systems in the Diaries become one source of power for the headman in Village (Edwardian 432).

Ironically, the sole official purpose (as explained in Governor Maitland's much quoted 1808 "minute" or directive) of the British civil servant in Ceylon (and India) was to produce prosperity for the "native"; the British were, therefore, doubly culpable in their imposition of an administrative and legal system which allowed, indeed encouraged, unscrupulous elements to take advantage of those who did not understand its workings. As Ranajit Guha says in his 1988 text An Indian Historiography of India,

> Much of what was distinctive about British rule in India [and similarly in Ceylon] and set it apart from the Dutch, French and Portuguese regimes elsewhere in Asia, derived precisely from this characteristic combination of politics, economics and law. And it was this combination again which provided the emerging colonial state with a node for structural developments in its apparatus at both the administrative and the ideological levels. (4)

Woolf very carefully documented this particular structural culpability in The Village in the Jungle. Silindu and his family are doomed once Silindu crosses the headman (rather than a village council), a man appointed by the British agents because he is the only member of the village who can write his name. In 1826, the British had passed a regulation

requiring that "even a superior village headman should be qualified to read and write English" (Zeylanicus 103). The failure of British education systems in Ceylon is hinted at in the fact that the headman cannot actually read and write English; he can merely spell his name. Silindu's family flaunts British expectations by maintaining itself through "lazy" chena cultivation and "illegal" hunting. As Duncan Wilson notes in 1978, "The spread of Idleness was an important bogey for early Victorian economists" (36), and imperialist expectations of appropriate "native" energy expenditures remained unrealistic and punitive through the Edwardian era. Woolf later had some very scathing things to say about this bogey in writing about British abuse of the Masai:

> And when the white man has got his cheap labour on a legal maximum or standard wage, tied to his land or his mine by the power of the European State and by the law--not forced labour because the labourer is not forced by the lash or iron, but only by taxation, law and starvation--when we have obtained all this, and the happy African, expropriated from all the best land of Africa, is working nine hours a day for twopence a day upon his master's land, and his children of fourteen years are producing "excellent results" at one penny a day (without food), then we Europeans are to congratulate ourselves, because, as Mr. Chamberlain explained, we are not only doing good to ourselves by getting cheap labour, but also doing good to the natives by convincing them "of the necessity and dignity of labour" at twopence a day. (Empire and Commerce in Africa 350-351).

The headman would have no power over Silindu and the other villagers except that he is the source of chena permits, gun permits,[62] and debt management. He is the site at which the British administration interacts most often and most intimately with the village. He is the British system

---

[62] The Matale rebellion of 1848, the immediate cause of which was the "imposition of a 'gun tax' against which there was protest in Kandy" may be a historical reference point for Woolf's mention of gun permits. In response to the protest over permits, the British Governor, "mindful of what had happened in 1803 and 1818, the series of attempted rebellions since and the inflammatory nature of recent demonstrations which went to the extent of proclaiming kings, took serious notice" and over-reacted: "Troops were called out. Matale, Kandy, Dambulla and Kurunegala were placed under martial law. Two hundred persons denounced as rebels were shot and hanged and others publicly flogged and imprisoned" (Muttukumaru 111 [1987]).

as it is represented in the village. Thereafter, each level of administration merely compounds the oppression to such an extent that the good-willed judge is carried along by his complicity and acts merely to the letter of a law which cannot but oppress the villagers. British law literally kills Babun Appu by imprisoning him unjustly; it punishes Silindu but not his tormentors; and it stands in opposition to the peaceful but ultimately ineffective (in Woolf's presentation) morality offered by several Buddhist characters in The Village in the Jungle. In Growing, Woolf pointed out, that, for him, Buddhism was a beautiful dream, but one which human interactions made an impossibility in practice. The Buddhist characters in Village discuss, in a very Woolfian way, the venial futility of mankind's general way of being in the world: "All this doing and doing,--running round and round like the red ants--thieving, stabbing, killing, cultivating this and that. Is there much good or wisdom in such a life?" (262). This depressing positionality stands in opposition to the peaceful morality (predicated on the individual's own ethical relationships to the world and the cosmos around that individual) of Buddhism. These Buddhist possibilities, brought up by incidental characters (a trader on the road to a religious festival and a "mad" old man), are first denied by Fernando's vicious intervention (he bribes a "holy" man at the festival to say Punchi Menika should submit to Fernando's lust) and then by the court's revision of Silindu's death sentence to a very monotonous life sentence. Even Silindu's, perhaps temporary, peaceful resignation to this life is undercut when a defeated Babun Appu refuses to partake of the complete submission and acceptance Silindu preaches. The death of Babun, Punchi Menika's discovery of that fact, and then the dissolution of the village and Punchi's literal absorption into the jungle, which events are all the direct result of imperialist interventions, are too horrific to allow a philosophy of acceptance to influence the reader's reception of the text.

INVADING THE IMPERIAL BODY:

Woolf's relentless representation of a destructive European intervention in Ceylon may also make use of and subvert the discourse provided by imperialist disease-model texts of the time. Helen Tiffin discusses an early, very popular treatise on malaria (WHS Jones' 1907 Malaria, A Neglected Factor in the History of Greece and Rome) which took the already deeply entrenched line that malaria and fever were tropical or "Other" in origin and that they broke down the barriers between brown bodies and white bodies, leaving the white body prey to a degenerative descent into Man's primitive conscious. To begin with,

> European penetration, colonisation and destruction are reprojected [by Europeans] as fear of the

> breakdown of the European immune system, producing a horror autotoxicus [autoimmunity] catalysed by contact with (abused/diseased) native bodies. (7)

White contact with native bodies was linked to ativistic descent and "evolutionary reversion" (6). Malaria and "tropical" fevers could be put forward as the source of the "degraded" behaviour of imperialists. Tiffin makes a strong argument for reading Heart of Darkness as a case study of biomedical discourses which link "hostile penetration" and "mutiny from within." Tiffin says,

> Heart of Darkness is about the necessity yet impossibility of boundary drawing -- in colonialism, in disease and immunology; about the "civilized" and "savage" selves and the way in which the tropics and illness in particular -- fever, yellow fever and malaria -- invade and erode those physical and psychic barriers on which colonialist practices and governance depend. (8)

Tiffin adds,

> In the popular interpretation of Heart of Darkness contact with an atavistic African savagery and disease posed the threat of erosion of the essential boundaries between "primitive" and "civilised" resulting in the corruption, madness and death of the European tourist/explorer/official and the potential breakdown of imperialist ideologies. (13)

Similarly, in "Pearls and Swine," White's fever is caused by delerium tremens; the link to alcohol suggests a pre-existing moral weakness in "White," brought out by his sojourn in the tropics, where he has acted completely without restraint. Rosenbaum notes that the "louche white man 'gone under' is a commonplace in Eastern fiction" and suggests that the characterization of White obviously "derives from Kurtz's end in 'Heart of Darkness'" (Edwardian 407).

If Heart of Darkness can be read as metaphorically representing the way contact with black bodies infects white bodies and minds which then degenerate to a primitive state (e.g. Kurtz), Village can be read metaphorically as representing the way in which white bodies spread a contagion through groups of brown bodies, causing them to be unable to deal effectively with their physical surroundings as well as with the "sheer civilized brutality" ("Pearls") of both white bodies and those brown bodies most like white bodies. It is brown bodies which die on contact with a

virulent white system of government. Endemic[63] behaviour, with which a village council might once have dealt effectively, becomes epidemic and deadly. Brown bodies begin to prey on each other through the medium of British law. In this context, Leon Edel misreads Village in 1979 when he suggests that "evil...resides in the depths of the primitive Self" which is "ever prey to terror, personifying it in terms of spirits and devils, the devil from the bush" (117). The jungle stands in for the imperialist law, which, like malaria, kills dispassionately. Malaria, as a number of critics including Yasmine Gooneratne have indicated, is the disease to which the village, Beddagama, most literally succumbs.

And while I do not want to read current understandings of medicine backwards, it was quite literally the white population in Sri Lanka which provided the breeding ground for a new epidemic rather than endemic strain of the malarial organism (a parasitic protozoan) which killed mostly brown bodies. Tiffin points to the way in which inconsistent quinine treatment during the Vietnamese war produced a highly resistant strain of malaria and to the way in which it is white bodies which provide the necessary non-resistant pool which allows a disease to become epidemic rather than endemic. Exactly the same type of sporadic medication activity was carried out by the British in Ceylon Indeed, Woolf (who himself suffered from "tropical" fevers, both malaria and typhoid [Spotts 62 -- 1989]) was much concerned with the sporadic nature of quinine distribution among non-whites in Ceylon. In 1909, he sent an article entitled "Malaria Prevention in India" (clipped from the Times) to his superiors in support of his contention that the system of quinine distribution in place was "wrong" (Diaries 110). Woolf, of course, did not know of the development of resistant strains of malaria, but he did know that inconsistent and "inadequate" (Rosenbaum Edwardian 432) prophylactic treatment was useless.

Metaphorically, the analysis is not anachronistic at all. Not only was WHS Jones' Malaria "so popular it was republished after the first world war in 1920" (Tiffin 5), malaria (as noted) was frequently cited as the source of imperial decline (Tiffin 3-4ff). Malaria was also in circulation as a metaphor. For instance, in 1910, the National Committee for the Prevention of Destitution described poverty as "'a disease of society itself,' as a 'moral malaria' which degraded people physically and spiritually" in 1910 (Webbs xvii). The fact that Ceylonese

---

[63] 1. present in the community at all times. 2. a disease of low morbidity that is constantly present in a human community, but clinically recognizable in only a few. (Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary)

poverty was not being addressed adequately by the British-run governmental system in Ceylon had not escaped Woolf's notice.

ENDEMIC POLITICS:

This disease metaphor also functions in an analysis of Woolf's political writings on imperialism. For Woolf, or so one might extrapolate from his works, an "Other" culture (especially the further that political body's colour from white), once exposed to "Western" civilization, must incorporate "western" knowledge as a type of strengthening antibody. "Western" civilizations, the source of the continuing exposure, should, however, act rather as a physician and provide the "patient" with guidance (care) and, from time to time, with preventative and/or contestatory inoculations (democratic systems, literacy, farming methods etc.). For instance, Woolf lobbied extensively for an effective League of Nations which would bind itself to protect weak nations from strong ones. Woolf seemed to vacillate between a moral insistence that Britain had responsibilities because she had taken up the lion's share of imperialism and a clear knowledge that the "general effects of European [imperial] policy...have been almost wholly evil" (quoted in "Ethics" 310). Throughout his life, Woolf seems to have vacillated between the interpretation systems vouchsafed him by a conservative education and the different realities he could see working themselves out in the situations in which he found himself. In this he was not different from many of his contemporaries, it merely seems that Woolf was willing to subject himself to learning within the space Mary Louise Pratt calls the "contact zone" between civilizations (9 [1992]), the space in which disparate cultures and persons from those cultures interact with and influence each other. It was living in this contact zone in Ceylon which taught Woolf that, while he was a very able and effective benevolent dictator capable of working within the British imperial system, the "days of paternalism...were over; I had been born in an age of imperialism and I disapproved of imperialism and felt sure its days were already numbered" (Growing 247-8).

Woolf's fictional and political works are examples of early anti-colonial theory and practice which fully display the tension between resistance practices and, in this case, the philanthropic individualism supported by and in part supporting "scientific" understandings of hierarchical rankings of races and civilizations. A critical refusal to see resistance in modernist works of protest while manufacturing it in aesthetic terms, can allow modernism to be rewritten in terms of aesthetic retreat. Modernism is thus sealed off from its own social forces except in the special case of the destabilizing form of "avant garde" work, and more currently in the case of "recovered"

feminisms. The problem with readings which erase troubled yet sometimes effective resistance in past movements is that such readings "forget" that the

> difficulty with the question [of relationships] is that there is no vantage outside the actuality of relationships between cultures, between unequal imperial and nonimperial powers, between different Others, a vantage that might allow one the epistemological privilege of somehow judging, evaluating, and interpreting free of the encumbering interests, emotions, and engagements of the ongoing relationships themselves....we are so to speak of the connections, not outside and beyond them. (Said Orientalism 216-7)

In a sense, modernism is our "secret sharer" and excavating its resistant and resisting contradictions should tell us much about our own equally ambivalent practices.

Page 91 has been removed due to copyright restrictions. It was a picture of Leonard Woolf with Nehru in 1936 reproduced in Parsons and Spater (77).

LEONARD WOOLF: GROWING

In Downhill All the Way, Leonard Woolf described his receipt of a letter from Jawaharlal Nehru in February of 1936 "saying he would very much like to have a talk" with Woolf:

> We talked in the bare room [in which Nehru was staying] with the door of the room open and the door of the flat open and, as it seemed to me, all the doors in the world open. This is not calculated to give one a sense of privacy and comfort on a cold February afternoon in London. I liked Nehru very much as a man; he was an intellectual of the intellectuals, on the surface gentle and sad....It was a rather strange and inconclusive conversation. I had thought and still think that he had intended to discuss politics and, in particular, imperial politics from the Labour angle with me. And in a vague way we did talk politics, the problems of India and Ceylon; but it was pretty vague and somehow or other we slipped into talking about life and books rather than the fall of empire or empires. After about half an hour I got up to go and Nehru asked me where I was going. I said that I was going to walk to the House of Commons to attend a Labour Party Advisory Committee there and he said that he would walk with me as he would like to go on with our conversation. When we got down into the extraordinary sort of gloomy well outside the front door..., we found waiting a press photographer who wanted to take a photograph of Nehru. Nehru insisted upon my being included in the photograph. The gloom of Artillery Mansions, of London on a February afternoon, of life in the middle of the twentieth century, as it weighed upon the future Prime Minister of India and the Honorary Secretary of the Labour Party Advisory Committee on Imperial Affairs, and on their dingy hats and overcoats, is observable in the photograph. We then walked on up Victoria Street to the House of Commons, talking about life and literature on the way. We parted at the door to the central lobby and I never saw Nehru again. (231-2)

The strength of Woolf's belief in the importance of unfettered human relationships which focused on such "universally" important qualities of life as literature and

intellectual intercourse is very clear in this snapshot. The comparative ease of communication between individuals, no matter what their cultural background, is depicted against a backdrop of political difficulties and gloomy failures, particularly failures arising out of the British imperial centre of London. How did Woolf's belief in the effectiveness of meaningful communication intersect with his political beliefs and actions? Just where and how did Woolf's individual rational intervention intersect with the discourse of British imperialism?

BEGINNING ANEW:

In 1912, Woolf joined the women's suffrage movement (Edmonds and Luedeking xiv). He met Margaret Llewellyn-Davies through his wife, Virginia, and worked extensively with the Women's Co-operative Guild thereafter. His writing for the Guild brought him to the notice of the Webbs and the Fabian Society,[64] who found his political experience and his classically "reasoned" type of argumentation attractive. At the end of 1914, Woolf was commissioned through Beatrice Webb to write what became a report on international government for the Fabian Research Bureau. His work here led to the publication of the first blueprint for the League of Nations (used extensively by the Foreign Office in preparing the British Draft Covenant [Spater and Parsons 83]). With Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson, Woolf founded the League of Nations Society (the Executive Council of which included A.J. Hobson and H.N. Brailsford), which body had the "object of gaining public acceptance for the idea of some sort of League" (Wilson 84), an aim pursued "principally through the magazine War and Peace" and through a 1917 series of articles in the New Statesman (Wilson 84). Near the end of 1918, this body merged with the League of Free Nations Association to become the League of Nations Union. Woolf was again on the Executive Council; Viscount Grey, Herbert Asquith, Arthur Balfour, and David Lloyd George were honourary presidents (Wilson 86). Woolf's writings subsequent to this period continued to dwell on the importance of the League in terms which suggest his belief that this system of checks and balances, while not perfect, was the only workable solution to problems created by international relations. Philip Noel-Baker, in delineating

---

[64] The Fabians were "a socialist society founded in England in 1884 favoring the gradual spread of socialism by peaceful means" (American College Dictionary); the Fabian Research Bureau was, as the name suggests, the research arm of the organization. The Bureau, particularly in its later incarnation as the New Fabian Research Bureau, had a tendency to be more left and radical than the Fabian Society itself.

Woolf's involvement with the League of Nations, suggests that Woolf

> played an important part in giving concrete form to the general ideas about a League then current, and in particular in launching the conception of the League's technical, social, economic and financial work, which has developed into a dozen U.N. Agencies, from the [International Labour Organization] and the International Bank to the World Meteorological Organisation. (quoted Spater and Parsons 83)

Woolf was involved in journalism and gave editorial guidance to a number of journals: War and Peace 1917, International Review 1918, Contemporary Review 1919, Nation 1920, Political Quarterly[65] 1929-30. These dates indicate the years in which Woolf began his editorial duties; he was active in some of these positions for many years. He also reviewed for the TLS, the New Statesman, the Co-operative News, the Labour Leader, the Independent Review, the Athenaeum, the Nation, the Economic Journal, and the New Weekly, among others. Wilson suggests that "Woolf was an innovator in what might be called documentary journalism. He started with a rationalist's dismay at the paucity of facts on which even an intelligent public could base its judgments on foreign policy, and with a good scholar's concern for letting documents speak for themselves. He realised, too, that careful selection of facts without any comment can do much to persuade the reader into certain trains of thought or conclusions" (124).[66] Luedeking's early bibliography (1972) emphasizes Woolf's perception of his political project in terms of this journal work, specifically as that work was produced in Political Quarterly:

> This periodical represents a kind of culmination of his efforts toward educating people to accept international government and to accept a policy of permitting Great Britain's colonies to develop their own governments. He described the Political Quarterly as a left-wing paper of the highest respectability written by experts for experts as a means of influencing opinion. (123)

Woolf also became involved with the Parliamentary Labour Party, which body appointed him Secretary of its Advisory Committee on International Questions in 1918 and Secretary

---

[65] Woolf was one of the founding editors of this last publication, and he was on the board of several others, including that of the New Statesman.

[66] For more information on Woolf's journalism see Wilson, Parsons and Spater, or Luedeking and Edmonds and Luedeking.

of the Advisory Committee on Imperial Questions when it was created in 1924. As well, Woolf states that for "many years [he] was elected a member of the executive committee of the Fabian Society, for 10 years [he] was chairman of the Fabian International Bureau, and for even longer was a member of the Colonial Bureau" (Downhill 218). Woolf's political literary activity was prodigious; Spotts writes in his 1989 edition of Woolf's Letters that Woolf produced "more than thirty works of nonfiction, a five-volume autobiography, well over a thousand reviews and essays, dozens of pamphlets on international political questions and countless memoranda for the Labour Party and the Fabian Society" (265). Woolf's work for the Parliamentary Labour Party's Advisory Committees alone is indicative of his relentless energy:

> For nearly 30 years [he writes] I was secretary of the 2 Advisory Committees, each of which met in the House of Commons on alternate Wednesdays....We simply bombarded the...active politicians with reports, briefs, recommendations, policies covering every aspect, question, or problem of international and imperial politics. (Downhill 221)

Between 1931 and 1939, to give an example, 120 meetings of the Advisory Committee on Colonial Affairs (Imperial Questions) and 16 of the Joint Committee on the Demand for Colonies were held. Woolf attended "practically" all 136 meetings (Gupta 228ff [1975]), took minutes, and prepared many of the "initial drafts of policy statements" (Gupta 26) on matters arising out of these meetings.

Woolf's political beliefs were situated well to the left of Labour, as his affiliations with the Union of Democratic Control (which began as an "ex-parliamentary Foreign Policy Committee of the Liberal Party" [Wilson 58]) and the New Fabian Research Bureau indicate. He was extremely politically cogent, prophetic almost, on many issues, including that of the nascent Soviet Union. His Barbarians at the Gate (1939) was the "first Left Book Club work to criticize the Soviet Union, and it scandalized Club members and others on the far left" (Spotts 423). "So far as the control and use of power goes," Woolf wrote, "there is no difference between the position of Stalin and the group which surrounds him and that of Hitler and Mussolini and the groups surrounding them" (181-2). Woolf's correspondence with Victor Gollancz, the prominent socialist publisher who commissioned the book and then attempted to delay its publication, reveals much about Woolf's personality and what amounted to a policy of righteous indignation. Knowing he was in the right, Woolf was immovable. Alone of all the influential graduates of Cambridge who found some philosophical guidance in G.E. Moore's influential Principia Politica, Woolf publicly insisted that political and social "good" was more important than, the "personal relationships"

type of "good" usually associated with that text.[67] This belief left him free, as he saw it, to play gadfly to the State and its less responsible members. For Woolf, as his letters and memoranda document, social responsibility was almost always associated with justifiable outrage.

DEVELOPING AN ANTI-IMPERIALIST ARGUMENT:

One area in which Woolf managed to consistently irritate influential persons was that of policy on, and practice in, the conduct of British imperialism. Beatrice Webb, an early supporter of Woolf's, spoke of Woolf as "an anti-imperialist fanatic" (quoted Wilson 116). As his relationship with the Webbs developed and his political experience increased, Woolf slowly became less impressed with the Webbs than he had at first been; a polite estrangement took place over their view "that in a world likely to remain extremely imperfect the British Empire was on the whole a force making for the spread of democratic civilisation" (Wilson 103). While Woolf himself originally professed this position (cf Part II International Government), by 1918 he had moved to "something very near the totally anti-imperialist views of some of the U.D.C. thinkers" (Wilson 103).[68] In a 1919 pamphlet on the obligations of mandatories and imperial powers drafted for the International Questions Committee, Woolf's "main case is the classical Liberal one for the widest extension of free trade principles" as an anti-hostility measure (Wilson 162). He argued that imperialism was in fact a case of inter-European nationalist aggression temporarily channelled outside Europe. Woolf originally explored the argument that "the exploiting of 'tropical and sub-tropical peoples' was contrary to Labour interests" (Wilson 163). He equated the imperialist with the capitalist and maintained that class domination anywhere, with its artificially low standard of living and unreasonably inflated profits for a few individuals, ought to be objected to by all good socialists, regardless of whether such a situation existed in England or the West Indies.

Woolf's argument later changed, moving away from the standard Labour solidarity argument to an emphasis on the morally unsupportable nature of imperialism and an almost Biblical insistence on the way in which the economic-inspired sins of the father, enjoyed and exacerbated by the

---

[67] It does seem that Maynard Keynes deliberately overstated the impact of the philosophy of "personal good" on the Cambridge-educated members of Bloomsbury, especially given the socialist nature of his economic reforms.

[68] Wilson is here speaking of H.N. Brailsford and A.J. Hobson.

son, were almost certain to end in just retribution visited upon future generations. He suggested that only immediate restitution would stay the almost unavoidable development of militant nationalism occurring in the colonies as a direct response to imperialist depredations. Here his essential objection to imperialism, was that, "as a rationalist," he saw that "Empire was wrong in itself, and produced results that were pragmatically unjustifiable" (Wilson 115). In some senses, the change was a manifestation of changes in Woolf's audience, from the rank and file Fabian/Labour membership to the "educated" man and the inner circles of the Fabian Bureau and the Labour Party. These changes also reflected both a growing distance from his position as a member of the Ceylon Civil Service and a growing knowledge-base about the world-wide effects of European imperialism.

Partha Sarathi Gupta, in Imperialism and the British Labour Movement, 1914-1964 (1975), has suggested that Labour displayed in action one of the following three, sometimes contradictory, ideologies: "the anti-annexationist 'little England' view, or the Fabian efforts at economic and social engineering, or MacDonald's ideal of combining minimal interference within the framework of an imperial standard that could be enforced from outside" (13). Little Englanders were opposed to expansionist imperialism, making the argument that such activity did not focus national resources on the economic and social advancement of England. The argument did not necessarily advocate decolonization. Fabian arguments tended towards expansionism and active imperialism. "Minimal interference" was a rather vague policy in opposition to aggressive expansion but constructing Britain as the benevolent centre of a well-behaved empire. In practice when in power, however, Labour, as represented by such people as Sidney Webb and Clement Attlee, was often unabashedly imperialist. In fact, there was a split in the Parliamentary Labour Party between those who thought self-government in the colonies (most particularly Africa) would never happen and those who hoped it would. The split coalesced on the Imperial Questions Committee as a struggle between those influenced by E.D. Morel and those represented by Woolf and Norman Leys. Morel (not a member of the committee itself) was an "author and journalist...a leading proponent of greater democratic control of foreign policy" (Spotts 216); he was chief organizer of the Union of Democratic Control, and he was "famous for his revelations about the exploitations of the Congo under King Leopold I of Belgium" (Wilson 58). Morel was in favour of African tutelage and supported the policy

of "indirect rule,[69] deplored the emergence of westernised Africans, and considered 'that in no period of time which can be forecast will the condition of West African society permit of the supreme governing power being shared by both races'" (Gupta 53).

Woolf's views on imperialism had rapidly passed through the Fabian and Morel-type understandings. Woolf's position on the matter developed into an argument that "every nation should have the right to govern, or misgovern, itself. As early as 1918, he had advocated immediate independence for India as well as for Ceylon, Burma, Egypt, Iraq and Ireland" (Spotts 377). In his "Memorandum to the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party" submitted on behalf of the Imperial Questions Committee in January of 1926, Woolf delineated three levels of colonial territories for the purposes of de-colonization; he referred to the mandated territories such as Iraq and Palestine, "which should [immediately] be given self-government in accordance with the terms of the Mandate and Balfour declaration," to the crown colonies excluding those in Africa, which should also immediately be given "the measure of self-government demanded by the[ir] inhabitants," and to the colonies in Africa: "Here the African inhabitants are not in a position to govern themselves....the grant of self-government would merely mean that the inhabitants would fall into the power of the white settlers, who would usurp all political power" (Letters 393). That the three levels were not necessarily based in a hierarchy of races, a point to which I will return later, is indicated by Woolf's support for immediate West Indian decolonization. In 1933, for instance, the Hogarth Press published C.L.R. James' The Case for West Indian Self-Government. What the two parties in the Imperial Questions Committee had in common, however, was the "belief that the extension of formal Empire was definitely more beneficial than the irresistible depredations of private companies and fortune hunters" (Gupta 54).

This split between the two groups carried over into a split between official Labour policy and actual practice when in power. Officially adopted policy was often of a near radical nature, advocating, for instance, immediate home rule for many colonies and drastic increases in expenditures on education for non-white colonial citizens. In 1925, the Advisory Committee on International Questions attempted to

---

[69] Those interested in Lord Lugard, indirect rule, and unabashed pro-British "colonial development" might find instructive Margery Perham's Colonial Sequence 1930 to 1949: A Chronological Commentary Upon British Colonial Policy Especially in Africa . Also of interest is her correspondence with Woolf over his "savag[ing]" of Lugard in Empire and Commerce in Africa (cf Spotts 439-50).

have instituted as policy a recommendation that "Labour foreign policy should be executed as far as possible by Labour supporters" (Wilson 160). Ramsay MacDonald, a politician known for his opportunism and his failure to implement Labour Policies (and a man Woolf truly despised) opposed this policy, and it was never put into practice. The deep splits between factions, as well as between policy proposal and implementation, were a source of continuing bitterness for Woolf and were, in his evaluation, the fundamental reasons Labour did not live up to its own expectations vis-à-vis the peaceful dismantling of imperialism. He also considered these splits a major contributing factor in the unpeaceful demise of the British Empire. His sympathies in this demise lay squarely with the colonized who actually had to live through the painful, often violent, process of de-colonization. For instance, Woolf expended much energy attempting to "arrange an official inquiry" (Spotts 375) into the draconian crackdowns (including the invocation of martial law, widespread unjustified detainment, and a collective fine) which occurred in connection with "religio-communal" clashes between Buddhists and Muslims which took place in 1915 in Ceylon (Zeylanicus 158). Governor Robert Chalmers was eventually recalled over the matter.

In October of 1922, Woolf ran for Parliament (in the former Combined English University Constituencies riding) as a Labour Candidate and, along with rearranging the Treaty of Versailles,[70] promised the "complete abandonment of the policy of imperialism and economic penetration and exploration which has been pursued by us from time to time in the Near East, Mesopotamia, Persia and China." He also suggested that it was

> essential that the promises of self-government made to India and Ceylon, and of independence to Egypt, should immediately be carried out with scrupulous honesty, and, further, that those methods in our government of the so-called backward races of Africa which are leading to their subjection and exploitation should be fundamentally revised. (Downhill 39)

This platform did not, on the whole, endear him to potential voters. Of course, Woolf also advocated a "more progressive income tax and super-tax, higher Death Duties, and a levy on 'fortunes exceeding L 5,000'" (Wilson 133). It is hard to

---

[70] Both Woolf and Keynes were well aware of the possible consequences of the anger and resentment created in Germany by the excessive war-guilt and reparations clauses. As it turned out, they played prescient and ineffective Cassandras who foresaw the advent of World War II but whose good advice was widely ignored by those in power.

pinpoint just which of his policies would have appealed least to the electorate. The policies on the Empire, however, continued essentially to be an outline of Woolf's position on Imperial matters. In Downhill All the Way, published some 45 years later, Woolf maintained that, when

> a hundred years hence the historian can calmly and objectively survey what we have seen and suffered, he will almost certainly conclude that fundamentally the most crucial events of the period were the revolt in Asia and Africa against European imperialism and the liquidation of empires. (235)

Deploring the "misery and massacre" of the whole process, Woolf went on to state that

> a very great deal of this misery and massacre would have been avoided if the imperialist powers had not blindly and doggedly resisted the demands of the subject peoples, but had carried out their own principles and promises by educating and leading them to independence. (235)

Woolf's beliefs about imperialism were explored in Imperialism and Civilization (1928). Michael Edmonds who, together with Leila Luedeking, published a bibliography of Leonard Woolf's works in 1992, suggests that this is Woolf's "most thorough and lengthy anti-imperialist statement" (37). In fact, Empire and Commerce in Africa (1920) is probably the most thoroughly researched, but Imperialism and Civilization (which started out as a series of lectures to the Union of Democratic Control and included material used in Empire and Commerce) gives a comprehensive overview of British colonialism world-wide and incorporates much of Woolf's other work on imperialism. If one makes allowances for the fact that Imperialism and Civilization is only a representative overview and does not incorporate Woolf's later thinking on the matter (he did not resign from the Labour Party's Advisory Committees, for instance, until 1945, and his autobiographies, published between 1960 and 1969, are also sources of political thought), Imperialism and Civilization does reveal much about Woolf's relationship to the material realities of politics as performed within and through the British political and publication systems. Imperialism and Civilization is divided into chapters headed "Conflicts of Civilizations Before the Nineteenth Century," "Imperialism in Asia," "Economic Imperialism in Africa," "The Inverse of Imperialism," and "The League of Nations and a Synthesis of Civilizations." Edmonds and Luedeking give a quick overview of the text:

> [Woolf] starts from the assumption that the "belligerent, crusading, conquering, exploiting, proselytizing civilization" of Europe must now face the revolt of the Third World peoples they colonized...After surveying the history of

> imperialism in classical times and contrasting it with modern forms [especially that of economic imperialism], he describes in detail how Europeans have conquered and exploited Asia and Africa for their own benefit. He concludes by recommending that the League of Nations hold mandatory powers to the terms of Article 22 and act more vigorously to stabilize the politics and finances of colonial areas in an attempt to end imperialism. (37)

This abstract (perhaps tactfully) neglects to mention Woolf's discourse on the "Inverse of Imperialism," which is an argument devoted to the development of "alien enclaves" (134) within a homogenous society. By "alien enclaves," Woolf meant the large numbers of African-Americans in the United States, whites in South Africa, and the then rapidly developing white population in Kenya. Woolf deplored these developments; they led to racial friction and conflict. In Imperialism and Civilization, Woolf stressed his belief that the artificial maintenance of a black underclass would not be viable over the long-term. While he suggested that the League of Nations could not intervene in the cases of the United States and South Africa ("indeed the evil in those cases is so deep-seated and obstinate that a satisfactory solution is not immediately attainable" [134]), he called on the League body to prevent further deterioration of the situation in Africa through the control of immigration and emigration in mandatory territories and between States (members of the League).[71] In short, Woolf felt that the

> creation of alien enclaves by immigration must always be an extra-ordinarily dangerous political experiment and should be discouraged. But this is a principle which must be applied universally or not at all. If in this sense Europe is to be for the Europeans, and America for the Americans, and Australia for the Australians, Asia must be for the Asiatics, and Africa for the Africans. And that will mean the end of imperialism, the end of conflict, and the beginning of a synthesis of civilizations. (134-5)

Woolf unmistakeably elided the past and present conditions of imperialism here, choosing to focus on

---

[71] He was later to make the same argument about Palestine, calling for integration between Palestinians and Jews. After visiting Israel in 1957, Woolf admitted to an admiration for the energy and cohesion displayed by its inhabitants. He continued, however, to deplore Israel's hardline insistence on partition, even though he was sympathetic to the vulnerability of the country's strategic position.

changing the contemporaneously extant realities which had grown out of the practice of imperialism. His anti-imperialism tended to be practical rather than theoretical in nature. That this was a deliberate choice on his part, and behaviour not unexpected from a political analyst and advisor, is revealed in his insistence that in "history as in politics you have got to deal with situations as they are, not as they were twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty years ago" (Letters 455). In 1924, however, on the issue of enclaves, Woolf aligned himself against racist restrictions being placed on Indian immigration to Kenya (cf Wilson 173). This anomaly shows that his argument in Imperialism and Civilization was implicitly an argument against white settlers who were seeking to dominate the areas into which they had settled. His argument in Imperialism and Civilization also advocates full integration as a necessary solution to the "alien enclave" problem in the United States and South Africa, sardonically suggesting that the only, impractical, alternative was the wholesale deportation or slaughter still nostalgically suggested by some racist commentators. This full integration is not an argument against multiculturalism; it is a protest against economic and social segregation. Thus Woolf seems to have been attempting to prevent political control from falling into the hands of unscrupulous whites in British Africa, while also calling for full political equality amongst and between races in the United States and South Africa.

Jenny Sharpe has noted the way in which the "idea of the colonial encounter as a Manichaean battle between civilization and barbarism" functions as a sophisticated ideology providing for the recuperation or denial of any advances made against racism in her 1993 work Allegories of Empire:

> Unlike earlier forms of territorial conquest, modern colonialism is guided by the moral imperative to bring the colonized into civil society. The deferral of self-rule built into it, however, simultaneously extends Western civilization to the native and encodes its failure. (6-7)

This widespread attitude, still prevalent today, displays its workings in such actions as the United States' unilateral embargo against Cuba and its activities in Latin America and Southeast Asia, as well as the United Nations' (US-driven) rather high-handed activities in Saudi Arabia, as well as in advertising for "foreign aid" agencies which, while attempting in all good faith to alleviate hunger in the "Third World," purvey what have been termed "famine pornography," images of the starved residents of "underdeveloped" countries they wish to assist. This attitude is presented in terms of belligerent "uplift" as late as 1964 in a Main Themes in European History text,

entitled Imperialism and Colonialism, in which one of the editors suggested that

> the record of colonization is scarcely barren. Colonial empires have not been founded on negations--to paraphrase Lord Balfour's reference to the British Empire. However traumatic an experience for those, at the receiving end, the expansion of Europe overseas has been a powerful agent of what is fashionably called modernization. (Curtis 24)

This particular text includes as its first offering an essay which contends that

> imperial expansion has been responsible for the maturation of non-Western cultures as well as for the cultivation of remote or uninhabited regions. Colonial empires have come and gone but the task of breaking down the obstacles to the ultimate integration of human cultures continues unabated....[M]odern civilization and colonization are two sides of a coin that is more than five centuries old. (26)

Clearly, this attitude is the unacknowledged parent of such currently fashionable terminology as that designating countries as "developed" or "underdeveloped" and the popular misreading of the term "Third World" to equal that same underdevelopment. And it is this typology (and the moral and scientific superiority built into the understanding it provides) which is used to justify western interventions in non-western social and political spaces. Woolf in fact articulated his resistance to the more obvious aspects of such a "discourse of race--that is, a regularity of dispersed statements that hierarchically arranges the families of man" (Sharpe Allegories 5), refusing to countenance any biological definition for racial characteristics. He doubted, for instance, whether there was "any great difference in the chromosomes of the various tribes, races, and nationalities that have inherited and desolated the earth." It was, he felt, the case that "their way of life, their laws and traditions and customs, the fortuitous impact and the logic of events and history have gradually moulded the minds and characters of each so that often they differ profoundly from one another" (Journey 128). Woolf wrote this passage in the context of a discussion of the racial history of the Jews, in a text written at the end of his long life, but his feelings on the matter are also explored in "The Political Advance of Backward Peoples," an essay published in a collection of Fabian Colonial Essays in 1945. In this essay, Woolf focused on the importance of democratic government:

> [T]he ultimate aim of our colonial government in Africa should be...democratic self-government of Africa and Africans by Africans. There is only one

> fact which could invalidate that conclusion, namely, if it were true that Africans belong to a race so inferior morally and intellectually that they are incapable of acquiring the knowledge, experience, and moral qualities necessary for self-government in the modern world. There is in my opinion absolutely no evidence of any such racial incapacity. (94)

Denying any innate racial disparity or heredity, then, Woolf did, nevertheless, seem to buy into the "historicist understanding of the passage of time as progress and discrete events as parts of a totality." In particular, he worked, somewhat ambivalently, with the "grand narrative of Europeans carrying the torch of civilization to undeveloped regions of the world" (Sharpe Allegories 12). Benita Parry, in her study of colonial discourse theory itself, speaks of early colonial discourse theory:

> Affiliated to the hegemonic explanatory order and written within the same ideological code as the discourse of colonialism, this putative oppositional discussion rebuked colonialism as the unacceptable face of Western civilization, while endorsing the affirmations and prohibitions authorized by the culture pursuing and implementing colonial power. (33)

The influence of this colonial hegemony can be seen in Woolf's writings on society and social organization. In Principia Politica (1953), Woolf stated that his concept of civilization hinged upon the civility of actions and deeds, but went on to show that it also hinged upon European concepts of civilized society, specifically European aesthetic criteria (particularly in "The Last Hundred Years" and "Social Standards of Value"). What emerges from this long argument is Woolf's belief, based in utilitarian thought, that the expression of social "good" could be linked to "civilization." This utilitarian belief suggests that the greatest good should be provided for the greatest number of persons through the most comprehensive set of social organizations. Woolf's text uses loaded words such as "barbarism" and "civilization" in the lead up to a discussion of the relative merits of "modern" dictatorships and democracies. Democracy, Woolf held, while based on a mechanical system not intrinsically valuable, provides, through the organized vote of political equals, a government "elected by and responsible to the citizens" (86). This machinery is seen as one way of working towards "good" communal life (87). And a "good" communal life for Woolf is one which provides for the separation of politics and religion through the rationalization of religion (70), and places an emphasis on human value, truth, reason, justice, humanity (70), and beauty (71). I do not find any of these culturally determined terms to be fully or completely

defined by Woolf in this work. Where this argument displays the problematic modernist tendency to give modernity an unchallengeable, world-wide reification is in Woolf's suggestion that the "social and political disasters of the 20th century, which have been as catastrophic as any in human history, are mainly due to...social nostalgia, to our refusal or inability to adjust our communal and individual lives to the conditions imposed upon us by an entirely new form of society" (101). However, Woolf's argument is significantly different in nature from, for instance, John Stuart Mills' suggestion that the "sacred duties which civilized nations owe to the independence and nationality of each other, are not binding towards those to whom nationality and independence are certain evil, or at best a questionable good" (quoted in Said Culture 96).

In Principia Politica, Woolf was trying to work out just what exactly the historical background was to European communal psychology. Wilson suggests that an "important implication" of Woolf's belief in the social-psychological profile he sets forth in that text was the possibility that social and political "policies did not come into being by any fatal necessity. They resulted from states of mind which were themselves the result of ignorance, prejudice, laziness and unwillingness to apply logical argument" (118). Therefore, Woolf felt that reason and edification, judiciously applied, could eventually change social policy. It was this reasoned type of edification Woolf tried to apply to British international politics, with what he considered to be an abysmal success rate. In his later life, Woolf recalled that his association with the Apostles and G.E. Moore fostered the "worship of reason; we believed in the efficacy of reason as other religions had believed in the efficacy of prayer...and what was even more disastrous, we attributed to human nature a rationality which it had never possessed" (quoted Parsons and Spater 32).

Principia Politica also documents Woolf's clear belief in the power of the principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity, generally as expressed through democratic activity. This belief is articulated through a rehearsal of the ways in which those principles have resonated throughout the European system, especially in the instances of the early Greek social reform, the French Revolution, and the British Reform Act of 1832 (41). These principles are then something Woolf both calls on the British to uphold in their relation to the Empire and suggests will "ferment" away amongst the subject peoples until Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity cause these peoples to refuse their subject position. In particular, Woolf suggested that

> European civilization, with its ideas of economic competition, energy, practical efficiency, exploitation, patriotism, power, and nationalism, descended upon Asia and Africa. But with it it

> also carried, involuntarily perhaps, another set of ideas which it had inherited from the French Revolution and the eighteenth-century forerunners of the French Revolution. These were the ideas of democracy, liberty, fraternity, equality, humanitarianism. They have had, as I hope to show, a profound effect upon the later history of imperialism, for they have led to the revolt of the subject peoples against it. (Imperialism and Civilization 34-5)

Thus, in some of his writings, it seems that, although Woolf wished colonized peoples well, he also felt that their societies and futures would inevitably be organized along "orderly" European lines:

> The imperialist is inclined to overestimate the value of good administration and sound and honest finance, but those who are against imperialism should not go to the opposite extreme and underestimate them. The kind of administrative and economic system which imperialism at its best developed in India and Egypt conferred immense material benefits upon those countries, and under modern conditions, which are the results of Western civilisation, life becomes hardly tolerable unless there is a fairly high standard of political and financial stability and efficiency. Imperialism deserves full credit for the stability and efficiency which often accompanied its dominion. (122)

Inevitably, then, given his valorization of efficiency and his emphasis on the importance of the League as an international force for political and social well-being, Woolf's solution to the ills of imperialism as expressed throughout Africa was a benevolent mandate system by which "natives are to be safeguarded and they are to be helped to adapt themselves to Western civilization, to stand alone under the strenuous conditions of the modern world" (129-130).[72] Staving off western civilization required incorporating its structures. "The end in view," according to Woolf in Imperialism and Civilization, was an "African population, with its own institutions and civilization, capable of making the most economic use of the land, able to understand Western civilization and control the forces which it has let loose upon the world, governing itself through organs of government appropriate to its traditions and

---

[72] It was this valorization which led him to insist, during his time in Sri Lanka, that all official mail would be answered on the same day it arrived, a practice, as one observer wryly noted in a 1962 review of Growing, "never attempted before or since" (Fernando 219).

environment" (131).

Benita Parry identifies as a "nationalist/utopian discourse--the divinely ordained task of Europeans to rule, guide and elevate backwards peoples as a trust for civilization." As she points out, that the "language of ascendancy in these virtuoso texts was shared by the spokesmen of empire and their 'critics' suggests its hegemony" (54). Its "hegemony" is, in part, based on the fact that its critics were working within with this well-entrenched system while trying desperately to change it. While on the one hand saying that the ideals and ideal organizations of "Western Civilization" were good, Woolf also, on the other hand, suggested (especially in his autobiographies) that no matter what the system, rule of one people by another was bad. Woolf's vision in Imperialism and Civilization was, then, one of an interconnected set of societies or civilizations built on the European model. Woolf's emphasis on dealing with a world already contaminated by western imperialism led him to advocate economic liberty (a valorization in keeping with his self-identification as a labour socialist) and an invitation into the European "good life," a "levelling" of the playing field undertaken through a "raising" of the colonized end of the field.

Woolf's understanding of imperialism might best be assessed through another look at Jenny Sharpe's work. Her understanding of hegemony and ideology are taken from Stuart Hall's suggestion that human responses to ideology are expressed along a continuum:

> Instead of each social group having its own ideology in the form of a world view or sets of ideas, the same belief system "interpellates" or hails different social groups according to their different conditions of existence. The concept of interpellation is best understood in terms of Hall's description of ideology as a process that involves not simply the encoding of events but their decoding as well. Encoding provides a range of preferred meanings that are "read" according to one of three kinds of codes: dominant, negotiated, and oppositional. A dominant decoding accedes to the preexisting order, while an oppositional one wrenches a sign out of its precoded frame of reference and places it in an alternate one. "Decoding within the negotiated version contains a mixture of adaptive and oppositional elements: it acknowledges the legitimacy of the hegemonic definitions to make the grand significations (abstract) while, at a more restricted, situational (situated) level, it makes its own ground rules--it operates with exceptions to the rule." The line between preferred and excluded

> meanings, normalcy and deviancy, incorporated and oppositional practices is thus continuously drawn and re-drawn. (Allegories 10-11)

Woolf himself showed at least some familiarity with the continually re-drawn nature of his political policy and actions. In a 1935 letter to Kingsley Martin,[73] Woolf delineated the "determining factors in [his] political beliefs and particular opinions" to be based on the following assertions:

> A. The idea that people are politically all-white or all-black is false; the mind is mongrel
>
> B. The idea that you can choose between a course of action which is good and leads to all good and a course of action which is bad and leads to all bad is an almost universal delusion and leads to political and social disaster. In 999,999 cases out of a million, the choice is between two evils and two courses both of which will lead to evil; the wise man is he who by reason or instinct chooses the less evil course leading to the lesser evil. (E.g. Course I. Destruction of League system, destruction of Abyssinia by Italy, inevitable European war. Course II. Use of sanctions, war with Italy, possibility of degeneration into common or garden war.)
>
> C. Things happen very slowly. (Letters 401-2)

Viewed using this type of incremental analysis, Woolf's work everywhere documents, even within the confines of his Eurocentric appreciation of that society's own structural and philosophical makeup, his impatience with the colonial situation. His was a social pragmatism, and his negotiations for change went on within the framework of a larger system which he sometimes admired, and sometimes castigated, but through which he felt constrained to work at all times. Thus he defined "backwards" peoples as those who are to be "found mainly in Africa, though there are also some in the Pacific islands" for the purposes of advocating political reform which would involve these peoples in the daily workings of the governance systems currently in place over them. The vast majority of these peoples, he suggested,

> live in primitive and often tribal societies; they are uneducated and illiterate, terribly poor, and ravaged by the major tropical diseases. They are incapable in their present condition of dealing

---

[73] Martin was editor of the New Statesman and Nation after 1931 and was "a spokesman for the left at a time when the entire intellectual community was on the left. His spectacularly bad political judgment provoked [Woolf's] furious disagreement, which in turn drove Martin into frenzies of anguish" (Spotts 579).

> intelligently and efficiently with the political and economic problems which the impact of European civilization, and particularly the economic system of Europe, is imposing upon them. Ever since the partition of Africa in the last century and their incorporation within the British Empire, they have been subject to British rule and administration, and except in purely local or tribal matters, they have had no say in the determination or management of their own affairs. ("Backwards" 84)

I have already suggested that Woolf's negotiations for the end of imperialism through the politics of influence were a result of his belief that colonial discourse criticism of an immediate political nature, if it was to be effective within the system in which it was working, must react to situations and political structures already in place. Thus his political activity was often reactive in nature. Duncan Wilson suggests that the

> main political objective of the A[dvisory] C[ommittee on] Imp[erial] Q[uestions] was negative--[for instance, they were concerned] to prevent any grant of independence to Kenya [a main area of concern] which would entrench the small white settler minority in privileged positions vis-à-vis the African population and the Indian minority. (171)

Trusteeships (or Mandatories), in Woolf's conception of them, were intended to appeal to the better nature (presuming one existed) of countries asked to act in this way and to protect against "home" interests. They were originally conceived for the purpose of the "subjection of imperialism to international control" (Wilson 108). Woolf was particularly vicious in his writing against those who violated this trust. For instance, he was clearly angry in his discussion of settler appropriation of land and forced labour in Empire and Commerce in Africa. The Nation's anonymous reviewer, in "Illusions of Empire," stated that "Mr. Hobson's 'Imperialism' was hitherto from the economic side the most powerful hostile analysis. Mr. Woolf in this masterly book has carried the argument a great deal farther" (782). The New Statesman's review, "The Ethics of Imperialism," while recommending the book highly, called Woolf's "intense belief in the rights of uncivilised peoples" a "preconception" and quarrels with Woolf's conclusion that the "general effects of European policy in Africa have been almost wholly evil" (310). It should be remembered that the New Statesman was a Webb outlet.[74] Woolf was clearly arguing from a different, less totalizing,

---

[74] I am grateful to Edward Bishop for providing me with copies of these reviews.

position than that taken up by apologists of "modernization" and Social Darwinism when he suggested that the system of expropriation followed by forced labour carried out in many parts of Africa

> is essentially that of exploitation of the African for the benefit of the European...The argument is that an inferior civilisation must give way before a superior, and that it is both inevitable and right that the native who cannot exploit the riches of his own country should stand aside and allow the European to do so. The premises of this argument are proved to be false by the facts. (Economic Imperialism 71)

Of course, Woolf's argument continued, "proving" that

> the African, if he be given the chance, is perfectly competent to take his place as a free man in the world's economic system, that he is able to make an economic use of his own land and supply the world with the agricultural products needed by the industries and industrial populations of Europe and America. (72)

Woolf believed that the direct political actions necessary at the time were "to protect [the native] where he was economically most vulnerable, i.e. in his land and his labour, and on the intellectual and spiritual side to educate him so that eventually he might understand the new conditions and be able to protect himself" (Imperialism and Civilization 81). Woolf went on to advocate general education and

> Political education: this can only be achieved by training the inhabitants in local self-government wherever this is possible. Where-ever there are self-governing local organs, these should be encouraged and developed by the central government; where such do not exist they should be created. The aim should be gradually to extend the area and powers of these local self-governing organs. (394)

Woolf was, in fact, a protectionist in the sense that he wished to protect the indigenous African from any further depredations. He had, however, to make his argument to an audience who might not feel that imperialism was bad in and of itself. His purpose was to "show," as he had shown in Empire and Commerce in Africa, that imperialism was flawed as an economic force and that mercenary tactics benefited only certain already rich individuals and cartels. Attempting to sway a British public only just then being weaned from the idea, rather than the reality, of the "glories" of the Raj, Woolf addressed those arguments which had been used to justify the continuance of imperialism: moral superiority is only moral if it fulfils the contracts it has made with subject peoples, social superiority is not

innate, and material gain only benefits a few, already rich, capitalists. It is clear that "most of Labour's colonial experts had a racial-cultural typology for their frame of reference rather than one based on an empirical analysis of changes in economic organisation and patterns of social mobility" (Gupta 131). It is difficult, as the effect of Woolf's social pragmatism neatly dovetailed with the effect desired by those who wished continued imperial rule, to distinguish the different positions. That Woolf's type of argument was sometimes considered wildly revolutionary is revealed in Woolf's reply to Hugh Dakin, a Rhodesian student who objected to an article written in 1959 ("The Colour of Our Mammies"):

> My position is that you and people like you go on saying that people who are not white and English are not yet able to govern themselves but, of course, you are going to give them the right to govern themselves when they are fit to govern themselves, until they break out into savage violence. Sooner or later this has happened all over the British Empire with disastrous results. Of course I do not say that the black man's civilization or barbarism is the same as ours and I know that he will make a mess of governing himself. But would you really say that the Europeans, at any rate in Germany, Poland, Hungary, Spain and Russia have made a great success of it? I did not say in my article that the blacks were more civilized than the whites but I do think that, looking back over history, the obstinate stupidity of people like Lord Robins and Sir Roy Welensky [prominent Rhodesians and white supremacists] is staggering. (Letters 446-7)

WORKING THROUGH AND AGAINST AN INFECTED DISCOURSE:

Woolf's work was not broadly visionary or rebellious as we would today understand it, and as such writers as Fanon did understand it in 1952 (though it certainly seemed so to some readers of the day and his own Party). His words and actions seem to have ranged in the band of possibility known as the negotiated interpellation of ideology. He knew there was something dreadfully wrong with the system in place, and yet, as Raymond Williams says he was "at once against its dominant ideas and values and still willingly, in all immediate ways, part of [the existing English upper class]" (156).[75] His protest was fractional and incomplete, as are all protests, but in the end, he wished his words and

---

[75] In fact, of course, Woolf was not of the upper class (he was of the professional middle class), but the point holds.

actions to make it that much more difficult for imperialism to continue unchallenged. That Woolf saw so clearly that the depredations of imperialism would only continue were there to be no system of checks in place, but that the only system he considered politically viable as a replacement was the Mandate system, says as much about the (continuing) state of the imperialist and neo-imperialist powers and way of being in the world as it does about Woolf. As Noel Annan summed up the matter,

> If British public opinion today is vastly more sceptical than it was of the necessity of hanging all murderers, enforcing monogamous sexual relations and imprisoning homosexuals, blasting colonial people with cordite, proclaiming as offensively as possible the superiority of the white to all other races, and, therefore, its inalienable right to treat them as second-class citizens, some of the credit goes to.. Woolf and [his] friends. If in the ninth decade of their lives, they saw their own countrymen, at last accepting in principle the kind of behaviour they had urged them to adopt in the 1920s, they can hardly be said to have been lazily swimming with the tide all their lives. They were the men who helped to turn the tide. ("Leonard Woolf" 188-9)

Woolf's attempt to change the world in which he lived and interacted was thus of some political moment. And whether or not anyone listened to his protest, Woolf "went on doing his thing aware that it was ineffective yet consoling himself that it was as important as the lifework of the vast majority of men and hoping occasionally through his personal life to add to the happiness of others, and to diminish ignorance, cruelty and injustice" ("Leonard Woolf" 191). A focus on literary and artistic form as the "revolutionary" legacy of modernism writes Woolf's voice out of modernism, de-politicizing Bloomsbury. Any canonical refusal to look at the multiplicitous influences determining Woolf's entry into a fractured modernist political discourse which weaves itself between disciplines such as sociology, political science, comparative studies, and English literature (many of them created within the lifetime of Woolf and Waley) dismisses the traces of possibilities to be found within historicized readings of Bloomsbury's modernism.

CONCLUSION: STRANGE FRUIT

Edward Said's work on Orientalism has enormously influenced the fields of literary and cultural studies. In a sense, my work responds to his contention that a "huge and remarkable adjustment in perspective and understanding is required to take account of the contribution to modernism of decolonization, resistance culture, and the literature of opposition to imperialism" (Culture 293). Rather than focussing on the ways in which the "peripheries" forced change upon the "metropolis," however, I have chosen to focus on the fractures, fissures, and fault lines already developing at the "centre" at the start of the decolonization process and before the time "native uprisings were too far gone to be ignored or defeated" (291). Some of these fissures are political in nature; some are literary and cultural. All are necessarily incomplete and flawed, including the enormously promising and troubling work of Bloomsbury members Leonard Woolf and Arthur Waley. I have covered that work here in detail in terms of both their own historical background and more recent developments in literary and critical traditions, including colonial discourse and postcolonial theories. I have tried to foreground the successes, failures, and fractured sites of possibility through which their modernist political interventions interfered with and were part of the transmission of existing orientalist and imperialist systems of knowledge. In the process, I have argued that this political gesture, though not always successful, is a recognizably modernist mode of expression distinct from that of "form."

It should make a difference to readings of modernism that the modernist period is the historical origin of many of the points of reference, good and bad, from which the world now operates. The United Nations (as the successor to the League of Nations), the World Bank, US imperialism, North American relations with Japan and China, the European and North American Keynesian economic policies now breaking down almost completely in Britain and the United States (and very possibly in some Canadian provinces), decolonization, and universal suffrage (especially female suffrage) with its insistence on "democratic" equality, are all products of modernist political activities. Given these mixed places of intervention, we cannot afford to concentrate on the lonely, aesthetically driven genius (even should such a thing exist). I believe that readings of content, social context, and authorial intent have both enabling and cautionary implications for the interpretation of modernist cultural

productions. In making this suggestion, I am invoking authorial intent as Rita Felski locates it. She writes that

> it is both elitist and reductive to suggest that only certain highly specialized intellectual reading and writing practices can pierce the veil of ideological mystification...Such a position ignores the historically specific, complex, and contradictory nature of human subjects and the varying degrees of dissent, resistance, and potential for change which exist in particular social contexts. (61-2)

Given a reading of modernist literature which assumes that any protest which gestures to the equal worth of individual human beings as they are acted upon by, and act upon, other individual human beings, reverts to the pursuit of (outmoded) "goals based on economic models from the nineteenth century" (Tratner "Sex" 714) and is thus unbelievably naive, one can look at immaterial discourses and their intertextual "play" or tension as the most important aspect of any work of "art." One can also, almost paradoxically, locate political conviction and efficacy in <u>today's</u> post-modern space rather than locating the history of our current attempts at invested literary and social criticism within the context of modernism:

> Interestingly, various influential versions of American post-modernism argued that the emergence of the marginal figure - for example, the non-white, the non-Anglo, the non-male, and/or the non-middle-class - characterized the post-modern era. Put more abstractly, this version of post-modernism pictured the 'eruption of difference' or the 'flowering of the eccentric' as the predominant cultural fact or force of the times. (Leitch 167)

As Rey Chow says, if "everyone can agree with Fredric Jameson that the unity of the 'new impulse' of postmodernism 'is not given in itself but in the very modernism that it seeks to displace,' exactly how modernism is displaced still remains an issue" (55). As I have tried to suggest, the whole issue of the efficacy and purpose of displacing modernism needs more investigation.

Edward Said talks in <u>Culture and Imperialism</u> about the ease with which "many constituent parts of the West's major cultural formations...have been historically hidden in and by imperialism's consolidating vision" (288). He goes on, however, to say that it "bears repeating that no matter how apparently complete the dominance of an ideology or social system, there are always going to be parts of the social experience that it does not cover and control. From these parts very frequently comes opposition, both self-conscious and dialectical" (289). In this context, I am suggesting that we might fruitfully begin to locate some of the history

of our own (deeply institutional) "oppositional practice in the empire" (336) within modernist groups like Bloomsbury. Bloomsbury is one of the originary sites of Western postcolonial academic tradition. The Bloomsbury Group was closely and inextricably bound up with Cambridge and ideals of philanthropy and liberal humanism, which became linked to socialist ideals. Their methods of social intervention were based on a belief in the efficacy of rational argumentation, the publication of abuses of power, human interest in other humans; basically they traded on the effectiveness of unfettered communication and education. We might call such a tradition academic humanism.

I do not want to be read here as advocating an unproblematic return to liberal humanism, especially the type of philanthropic, do-unto-others, humanism suggested by Raymond Williams' reading of Annan's (1955) concept of an "intellectual aristocracy." I do, however, want to make the point that if we give up an understanding of Bloomsbury's incorporation of alternate traditions and political protest as a modernist project, we have no academic roots on which to base our own academic protests and from which to learn about the perils of historical revisionism. It would help us to construct some sort of space of "possibility" from which to work if we could locate our own foundations within the fractures already growing within liberal (socialist) humanism at the time of Bloomsbury's flourishing.

Gyan Prakash's 1995 review of the critical reception of Orientalism has suggested that Said's critical framework is considered flawed by some theorists because it "opposes humanist values to Orientalist essentialisms; it asks that we replace East-West dichotomies with intertwined histories and human experience" (206). Indeed, Said acknowledges that he keeps coming back

> simplistically and idealistically -- to the notion of opposing and alleviating coercive domination, transforming the present by trying rationally and analytically to lift some of its burdens, situating the works of various literatures with reference to one another and to their historical modes of being. What I am saying is that in the configurations and by virtue of the transfigurations taking place around us, readers and writers are now in fact secular intellectuals with the archival, expressive, elaborative, and moral responsibilites of that role. (Culture 386)

For me, the secular interpretation ("Intellectuals" 46) Said proposes in 1986 holds the whole weight of the types of interpretation and interventions which Waley and Woolf tried to perform. On that basis, I do not find Said's argument flawed so much as deeply informed by the history of academic humanism and the ways in which that practice seems so far to

have been able to exert any effect at all on the world around it. It is just possible that readings of modernism's oppositional spaces, such as those provided by Waley and Woolf, might aid in the search for something in "human history [which] can move us from the history of domination towards the actuality of liberation" (Culture 340).

WORKS CITED

Ahmad, Aijaz. "Jameson's Rhetoric of Otherness and the 'National Allegory.'" Social Text. 17 (Fall 1987): 3-25.

Alexander, Peter F. Leonard and Virginia Woolf: A Literary Partnership. Toronto: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.

Anderson, Perry. "Modernity and Revolution." Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture. Eds. Lawrence Grossberg and Cary Nelson. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1988. 317-33. (originally New Left Review. 144 [March/April 1984]: 96-113)

Annan, Noel. "The Intellectual Aristocracy." Studies in Social History: A Tribute to G.M. Trevelyan. Ed. J.H. Plumb. London: Longmans, Green, 1955. 241-87.

_____. "Leonard Woolf." in S.P. Rosenbaum's The Bloomsbury Group. 187-194. (originally "Leonard Woolf's Autobiography." The Political Quarterly. 41 (January-March 1970): 120-40.)

_____. Leslie Stephen: The Godless Victorian. NY: Random, 1984.

Apter, Ronnie. Digging for the Treasure: Translation After Pound. NY: Peter Lang, 1984.

Ardis, Ann. New Women, New Novels: Feminism and Early Modernism. New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1990.

Bayly, Christopher. Atlas of the British Empire. Oxford: Facts on File, 1989.

_____. "Knowing the Country: Empire and Information in India." Modern Asian Studies. 27 1 (1993): 3-43.

Bell, Quentin. "Introduction." The Diary of Virginia Woolf. Volume I: 1915-19. Ed. Anne Olivier Bell. NY: Penguin, 1979. xiii-xxviii.

_____. Virginia Woolf: 1882-1941. Volume I. Toronto: Triad, 1987.

Bishop, Edward. Unpublished correspondence.

Blacker, Carmen. "Intent of Courtesy." Madly Singing in the Mountains. Ed. Ivan Morris. 21-8.

Boehmer, Elleke. Colonial and Postcolonial Literature: Migrant Metaphors. Oxford: OUP, 1995.

Bradbury, Malcolm and James McFarlane. "Preface" and "The Name and Nature of Modernism." Modernism: A Guide to European Literature 1890-1930. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. Markham: Penguin, 1991. 11-56. (originally 1976)

Brooke-Rose, Christine. A ZBC of Ezra Pound. London: Faber and Faber, 1971.

Brooker, Peter. A Student's Guide to the Selected Poems of Ezra Pound. London: Faber and Faber, 1979.

Burton, Richard. "Terminal Essay." The Book of the Thousand Nights and A Night. Vol. 10. Private ed. by the Burton Club, 1886.

Casillo, Robert. "The Desert and the Swamp: Enlightenment, Orientalism, and the Jews in Ezra Pound." Modern Language Quarterly. 45 3 (September 1984): 263-86.

_____. "The Return of the Native: Ezra Pound as an American." Review. 13 (1991): 111-130.

Chang, Hsin-Hai. "The Vogue of Chinese Poetry." Edinburgh Review. (July 1922): 99-114.

Chang, Yao-Xin. "Pound's Chinese Translations." Paideuma. 17 1 (1988): 113-132.

Chow, Rey. Writing Diaspora: Tactics of Intervention in Contemporary Cultural Studies. Bloomington: IUP, 1993.

Coetzee, J.M. White Writing: On the Culture of Letters in South Africa. New Haven: Yale UP, 1988.

Coffman, Stanley K. Imagism: A Chapter for the History of Modern Poetry. NY: Octagon, 1977.

Commee, Stephen. Review of A Guide to Ezra Pound and Ernest Fenollosa's Classic Noh Theatre of Japan. Eds. Akiko Miyake, Sanehide Kodama, and Nicholas Teele. Japan Foundation. 22 6 (March 1995): 17-19.

Conant, Martha Pike. The Oriental Tale in England in the Eighteenth Century. NY: Columbia UP, 1908.

Connolly, Cyril. The Modern Movement: One Hundred Key Books From England, France and America 1880-1950. London: Grafton, 1965.

Curtis, Perry and George H. Nadel, eds. Imperialism and Colonialism. NY: Macmillan, 1964.

Dasenbrock, Reed Way. "Modernism/Modernity: A Review." Paideuma. 24 2/3 (Fall/Winter 1995): 245-9.

DeKoven, Marianne. Rich and Strange: Gender, History, Modernism. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.

de Silva, Mervyn. "Introduction: Part II - General." Diaries in Ceylon. xlviii-lx.

de Silva, Lilamani. Imperialist Discourse: Critical Limits of Liberalism in Selected Texts of Leonard Woolf and E.M. Forster. Unpublished dissertation. University of North Texas, 1991.

[de Silva, S.?] S.D.S. "Introduction: Part I - Historical." Diaries in Ceylon." vii-xlvii.

Dickinson, Goldsworthy Lowes. Letters from John Chinaman and Other Essays. London: Allen & Unwin, 1946. (reprints essays originally published beginning in 1901)

Edel, Leon. Bloomsbury: A House of Lions. London: Hogarth, 1979.

Edmonds, Michael and Leila Luedeking. Leonard Woolf: A Bibliography. Winchester: St. Paul's Bibliographies, 1992.

Eliot, T.S. "Introduction." Selected Poems. Ezra Pound. London: Faber, 1928. vii-xxxii.

Elliot, Bridget and Jo-Ann Wallace. Women Artists and Writers: Modernist (Im)positionings. NY: Routledge, 1994.

"The Ethics of Imperialism." The New Statesman. 19 June, 1920. 310-11.

Eoyang, Eugene. "Waley or Pound? The Dynamics of Genre in Translation." Tamkang Review. 19 1-4 (Autumn 1988-Summer 1989): 441-65.

Felski, Rita. Beyond Feminist Aesthetics: Feminist Literature and Social Change. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard UP, 1989.

Fenollosa, Ernest. "The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry." Investigations of Ezra Pound: Together with An Essay on the Chinese Written Character

by Ernest Fenollosa. Ezra Pound. Freeport, NY: Books for Libraries, 1967. (originally 1920)

Fernando, Shelton C. Review of Growing. An Autobiography of the Years 1904-1911. Political Quarterly. 33 (1962): 218-20.

Flanagan, Kathleen. "Ezra Pound and Amy Lowell: English Poetics in Renditions of Chinese Poetry." Paideuma. 15 2-3 (1986): 163-73.

Flood, David H. "Leonard Woolf's The Village in the Jungle: A Modern Version of Pastoral." Virginia Woolf Quarterly. 1 4 (Summer 1973): 78-86.

Fuller, Roy. "Arthur Waley in Conversation: BBC Interview (1963)." Reprinted in Ivan Morris, ed. Madly Singing in the Mountains. 138-151.

Giles, Herbert. Chinese Poetry in Verse. London: Quaritch, 1898. (Gems of Chinese Poetry published Shanghai, 1884)

_____. A History of Chinese Literature. Short Histories of the Literatures of the World Series. 10. London: Heinemann, 1901.

Gooneratne, Yasmine. Diverse Inheritance: A Personal Perspective on Commonwealth Literature. Adelaide: Centre for Research in the New Literatures in English, 1980.

_____. "Leonard Woolf's 'Waste Land': The Village in the Jungle." The Journal of Commonwealth Literature. 7 1 (June 1972): 22-34.

Goonetilleke, D.C.R.A. "Leonard Woolf's The Village in the Jungle." The Journal of Commonwealth Literature. 9 3 (April 1975): 72-5.

Guha, Ranajit. An Indian Historiography of India: A Nineteenth-Century Agenda and Its Implications. Calcutta: Bagchi, 1988.

Gupta, Partha Sarathi. Imperialism and the British Labour Movement, 1914-1964. NY: Holmes and Meier, 1975.

Gunawardana, A.J. "The Village in the Jungle." Sight and Sound. 49 1 (Winter 1979/80): 26-27.

Henig, Suzanne. "Virginia Woolf and Lady Murasaki." Literature East and West. 11 4 (December 1967): 421-3.

Holden, Philip. "An Area of Whiteness: The Empty Sign of The Painted Veil." English Studies in Canada. 20 1 (March 1994): 61-77.

"Illusions of Empire." The Nation. 6 March 1920. 782, 784.

James, C.L.R. The Case for West Indian Self-Government. London: Hogarth, 1933.

Jang, Gyung-Ryul. "Cathay Reconsidered: Pound as Inventor of Chinese Poetry." Paideuma. 14 2-3 (1985): 351-362.

Johns, F.A. "Arthur Waley and Amy Lowell: A Note." Journal of the Rutgers University Library. 44 1 (June 1982): 17-22.

_____. "A Collection of Papers of Arthur Waley and Beryl de Zoete." Journal of the Rutgers University Library. 29 2 (June 1966): 59-61.

_____. "Manifestations of Arthur Waley: Some Bibliographical and Other Notes." British Library Journal. 9 2 (Autumn 1983): 171-84.

Keene, Donald, ed. Anthology of Japanese Literature: From the Earliest Era to the Mid-Nineteenth Century. NY: Grove, 1960.

Keller, Helen Rex. The Dictionary of Dates. Volume I. NY: Macmillan, 1934.

Kenner, Hugh. "The Invention of China." Spectrum. (Spring 1967): 21-52.

_____. "The Making of the Modernist Cannon." Chicago Review. 34 (Spring 1984): 49-61.

_____. "Modernism and What Happened to It." Essays in Criticism. 37 2 (April 1987): 97-109.

_____. "Responsibilities." Donald Davie and the Responsibilities of Literature. Ed. George Dekker. Manchester: Carcanet, 1983. 95-102.

Kern, Robert. Orientalism, Modernism, and the American Poem. Cambridge: CUP, 1996.

Kishida-Ellis, Toshiko. "Love: Its Representation in Japanese Art and Literature." Japan Foundation Newsletter. 21 2 (September 1993): 22-8.

Kronick, Joseph. "Reading Pound Against Pound." The Southern Review. (Baton Rouge) 25 4 (Autumn 1989): 859-76.

Lawrence, Karen. "Cultural Politics of Canons." Decolonizing Tradition: New Views of Twentieth-Century "British" Literary Canons. Ed. Karen Lawrence. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1992.

Leitch, Vincent. "Writing Cultural History: The Case of Post-modernism." Feminism and Institutions. Ed. Linda Kauffman. London: Blackwell, 1989.

Levenson, Michael. A Genealogy of Modernism: A Study of English Literary Doctrine 1908-1922. Cambridge: CUP, 1984.

Lowell, Amy. Pictures of the Floating World. NY: Macmillan, 1919.

Luedeking, Leila. "Bibliography of Works by Leonard Sidney Woolf (1880-1969)." Virginia Woolf Quarterly. 1 1 (Fall 1972): 120-40.

Lukacs, Georg. "The Ideology of Modernism." Trans. John and Necke Mander. The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends. Ed. David H. Richter. NY: Bedford Books, St. Martin's P, 1989. 597-610. (Lukacs was working on modernism in the 1930s; translations began in the 1950s)

Manganiello, Dominic. Review of Leon Surette's The Birth of Modernism: Ezra Pound, T.S. Eliot, W.B. Yeats, and the Occult. English Studies in Canada. 20 4 (December 1994): 484-7.

Matthews, Noel and M. Doreen Wainright, compilers. A Guide to Manuscripts and Documents in the British Isles Relating to the Far East. Ed. J.D. Pearson. Oxford: OUP, 1977.

Marcus, Jane. "Liberty, Sorority, Misogyny." Virginia Woolf and the Languages of Patriarchy. Bloomington: IUP, 1987. 75-95.

Meyerowitz, Selma S. Leonard Woolf. Boston: Twayne, 1982.

Miner, Earl. The Japanese Tradition in British and American Literature. Princeton: PUP, 1958.

Mirsky, Dmitri. "The Bloomsbury Intelligentsia." in S.P. Rosenbaum's The Bloomsbury Group. 380-387. (reprinted from The Intelligensia of Great Britain. Trans. Alec

Brown. London: Gollancz, 1935.)

Montrose, Louis A. "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture." The New Historicism. Ed. H. Aram Veeser. NY: Routledge, 1989. 15-36.

Morris, Ivan. "The Genius of Arthur Waley." Madly Singing in the Mountains: An Appreciation and Anthology of Arthur Waley. Ed. Ivan Morris. New York: Walker, 1970. 67-87.

Muttukumaru, Anton. The Military History of Ceylon: An Outline. New Delhi: Navrang, 1987.

Nelson-McDermott, Catherine. "Virginia Woolf and Muraskaki Shikibu: A Question of Perception." Virginia Woolf Miscellanies: Proceedings of the First Annual Conference on Virginia Woolf. Eds. Mark Hussey and Vara Neverow-Turk. NY: Pace UP, 1992. 133-143.

Nobuko, Tsukui Keith. "Aoi no ue and Kinuta: An Examination of Ezra Pound's Translations." Paideuma. 8 (1979): 199-214.

North, Michael. The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literature. Oxford: OUP, 1994.

Parry, Benita. "Some Problems in Current Theories of Colonial Discourse." Oxford Literary Review. 9 1-2 (1987). 27-58.

Parsons, Ian and George Spater. A Marriage of True Minds: An Intimate Portrait of Leonard and Virginia Woolf. London: Cape and Hogarth, 1977.

Paxton, Nancy L. "Disembodied Subjects: English Women's Autobiography Under the Raj." De/Colonizing the Subject: The Politics of Gender in Women's Autobiography. Eds. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1992.

Perham, Margery. Colonial Sequence 1930 to 1949: A Chronological Commentary Upon British Colonial Policy Especially in Africa. London: Methuen, 1967.

Perlmutter, Ruth. Arthur Waley and His Place in the Modern Movement Between the Two Wars. Ann Arbor: UMI, 1971.

Poole, Roger. The Unknown Virginia Woolf. Cambridge: CUP, 1978.

Prakash, Gyan. "Orientalism Now." History and Theory. 34 3 (1995): 199-212.

Pratt, Mary Louise. Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation. NY: Routledge, 1992.

Qian, Zhaoming. Orientalism and Modernism: The Legacy of China in Pound and Williams. Durham: Duke UP, 1995.

Raffel, Burton. Ezra Pound: The Prime Minister of Poetry. Hamden, Conn.: Archon, 1984.

Rainey, Lawrence. "The Price of Modernism: Reconsidering the Publication of The Waste Land." Critical Quarterly. 31 4 (Winter 1989): 21-47.

Ratnatunga, Manel. Folk Tales of Sri Lanka. New Delhi: Sterling, 1979.

_____. Unpublished correspondence.

Reed, Christopher. "Bloomsbury Bashing: Homophobia and the Politics of Criticism in the Eighties." Genders. 11 (Fall 1991): 58-80.

Rimer, J. Thomas. A Reader's Guide to Japanese Literature. NY: Kodansha, 1988.

Richards, Thomas. The Imperial Archive: Knowledge and the Fantasy of Empire. London: Verso, 1993.

Robinson, Lillian S. and Lise Vogel. "Modernism and History." New Literary History. 3 1 (Autumn 1971): 177-200.

Rosenbaum, S.P. ed. The Bloomsbury Group: A Collection of Memoirs, Commentary and Criticism. Toronto: U of T, 1975.

_____. "Conversation with Julian Fry." Modernist Studies. 3 3 (1979): 127-135.

_____. Edwardian Bloomsbury. NY: St. Martin's, 1994.

Said, Edward. Culture and Imperialism. London: Chatto & Windus, 1993.

_____. "Intellectuals in the Postcolonial World." Salmagundi. 70-71 (Spring/Summer 1986): 44-64.

_____. Orientalism. NY: Pantheon, 1978.

_____. "Orientalism Reconsidered." Cultural Critique. 1 (Fall 1985): 89-107.

_____. "Representing the Colonized: Anthropology's Interlocutors." Critical Inquiry. 15 2 (Winter 1989): 205-25.

Sharpe, Jenny. Allegories of Empire: The Figure of Woman in the Colonial Text. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1993.

_____. "The Unspeakable Limits of Rape: Colonial Violence and Counter-Insurgency." Genders. 10 (Spring 1991): 25-46.

Slemon, Stephen. "Cultural Alterity and Colonial Discourse." Southern Review. 20 1 (March 1987): 102-107.

_____. "Modernism's Last Post." Ariel. 20 4 (October 1989): 3-17.

_____. "The Scramble for Post-Colonialism." De-Scribing Empire: Post-Colonialism and Textuality. Eds. Chris Tiffin and Alan Lawson. London: Routledge, 1944. 15-32.

Sontag, Susan. AIDS and Its Metaphors. NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1988.

Spotts, Frederic, intro, ed, and notes. Letters of Leonard Woolf. NY: HBJ, 1989.

Spurr, David. "Myths of Anthropology: Eliot, Joyce, Levy-Bruhl." PMLA. 109 2 (March 1994): 266-280.

Stephen, Adrian. The Dreadnought Hoax. London: Chatto/Hogarth, 1983. This version contains an introduction by Quentin Bell. (originally Hogarth, 1936)

Suleri, Sara. The Rhetoric of English India. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1992.

Tiffin, Helen. "Metaphor and Mortality: The 'Life Cycle(s)' of Malaria." Unpublished paper.

Tratner, Michael. Modernism and Mass Politics: Joyce, Woolf, Eliot, Yeats. Stanford: SUP, 1995.

_____. "Sex and Credit: Consumer Capitalism in Ulysses." James Joyce Quarterly. 30-31 4-1 (Summer-Fall 1993): 695-716.

Trotter, David. "Modernism and Empire: Reading The Waste Land." Critical Quarterly. 28 1-2 (Spring-Summer 1986): 143-53.

Venuti, Lawrence. "The Translator's Invisibility." Criticism. 28 2 (Spring 1986): 179-212.

Waley, Alison. A Half of Two Lives. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1982.

Waley, Arthur. The Analects of Confucius. London: Allen and Unwin, 1938.

_____. Ballads and Stories from Tun-Huang: An Anthology. London: Allen and Unwin, 1960.

_____. "Blake the Taoist." Madly Singing in the Mountains. 358-363.

_____. The Book of Songs. London: G. Allen, 1934.

_____. A Catalogue of Paintings Recovered from Tun-Huang by Sir Aurel Stein, K.C.I.E.: Preserved in the Sub-Department of Oriental Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, and in the Museum of Central Asian Antiquities, Delhi. London: Trustees of the British Museum and the Government of India, 1931.

_____. "Introduction" to A Hundred and Seventy Chinese Poems. (1962 edition). Reprinted in Ivan Morris, ed. Madly Singing in the Mountains. 131-137.

_____. An Introduction to the Study of Chinese Painting. London: Benn, 1923.

_____. Japanese Poetry: The 'Uta.' London: Humphries, 1959. (photo reproduction of the 1919 edition)

_____. More Translations from the Chinese. London: Allen and Unwin, 1919.

_____. "Murasaki's Affinities as a Writer." Madly Singing in the Mountains. 331-332.

_____. The Nō Plays of Japan. Rutland, Vt.: Tuttle, 1976. (originally 1921)

_____. The Opium War Through Chinese Eyes. London: Allen and Unwin, 1958.

_____. The Originality of Japanese Civilization. Tōkyō: Kokusai Bunka Shinkokai, 1941.

_____. Poems from the Chinese. Frontispiece Humbert Wolfe. The Augustan Books of English Poetry Second Series, no. 7. London: Ernest Benn, 1927

_____. "Review of Ivan Morris's The World of the Shining Prince: Court Life in Ancient Japan." (1964) Madly Singing in the Mountains. Ed. Ivan Morris. 375-8.

_____. The Secret History of the Mongols; and Other Pieces. London: Allen and Unwin, 1963.

_____. The Tale of Genji. London: Allen and Unwin, 1925-1933.

_____. The Travels of an Alchemist: The Journey of the Taoist Ch'ang Ch'un from China to the Hindukush at the Summons of Chingiz Khan Recorded by His Disciple Li Chih-Ch'ang. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1931.

_____. Yuan Mei: Eighteenth Century Chinese Poet. London: Allen and Unwin, 1956.

Waugh, Patricia. Practising Postmodernism Reading Modernism. London: Arnold, 1992.

Webb, Beatrice and Sidney Webb. Indian Diary. Ed. Niraja Gopal Jayal. Oxford: OUP, 1990. (originally 1912)

Weisberg, Gabriel P. "Introduction." Japonisme Comes to America: The Japanese Impact on the Graphic Arts 1876-1925. Julia Meech and Gabriel P. Weisberg. NY: Harry Abrams, 1990. 15-40.

Williams, Raymond. "The Bloomsbury Fraction." Problems in Materialism and Culture. London: Verso, 1980.

Wilson, Duncan. Leonard Woolf: A Political Biography. London: Hogarth, 1978.

Winters, Lee Eugene. The Relationship of Chinese Poetry to British and American Poetry of the Twentieth Century. Unpublished dissertation. University of California, 1956.

Wollen, Peter. "Fashion/Orientalism/the Body." New Formations. 1 (Spring 1987): 5-33.

Woolf, Leonard. Barbarians at the Gate. Left Book Club Edition. London: Gollancz, 1939.

_____. Beginning Again: An Autobiography of the Years 1911 to 1918. NY: HB & World, 1964.

_____. "The Beliefs of Keynes." Listener. 9 June 1949. 993.

_____. Diaries in Ceylon, 1908-1911: Records of a Colonial Administrator: Being the Official Diaries Maintained by Leonard Woolf while Assistant Government Agent of the Hambatola [sic] District, Ceylon During the Period August 1908-1911 & Stories From the East. London: Hogarth, 1963.

_____. Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919 to 1939. London: Hogarth, 1967.

_____. Economic Imperialism. London: Swarthmore, 1920.

_____. Empire and Commerce in Africa: A Study in Economic Imperialism. NY: Fertig, 1968. (originally 1920)

_____. Growing: An Autobiography of the Years 1904 to 1911. London: Hogarth, 1961.

_____. Imperialism and Civilization. London: Hogarth, 1933. (originally 1928)

_____. The Journey Not the Arrival Matters: An Autobiography of the Years 1939 to 1967. NY: HB & World, [1970].

_____. Letters of Leonard Woolf. Ed. Frederic Spotts. NY: HBJ, 1989.

_____. "The Political Advance of Backward Peoples." Fabian Colonial Essays. Ed. Rita Hinden. London: Allen & Unwin, 1945.

_____. Sowing: An Autobiography of the Years 1880 to 1904. NY: HB, 1960.

_____. Stories from the East. in Diaries in Ceylon, 1908-1911: Records of a Colonial Administrator. (originally 1924 as Stories of the East)

_____. The Village in the Jungle. London: Hogarth, 1931. (originally 1913)

_____. The Wise Virgins: A Story of Words, Opinions and a Few Emotions. London: Hogarth, 1979. (originally 1914)

Woolf, Virginia. The Common Reader: First Series. London: Hogarth, 1984. (originally 1925)

Woolmer, J. Howard. A Checklist of the Hogarth Press: 1917-1946. Revere, Pa.: Woolmer/Brotherson, 1986.

Workman, Gillian. "Leonard Woolf and Imperialism." Ariel. 6 (1975): 5-21.

Xie, Ming. "Pound, Waley, Lowell, and the Chinese 'Example' of Vers Libre." Paideuma. 22 3 (1993): 39-68.

Yu, Beongcheon. The Great Circle: American Writers and the Orient. Detroit: Wayne State UP, 1983.

Zach, Natan. "Imagism and Vorticism." Modernism. Eds. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. 228-242.

Zeylanicus [pseud]. Ceylon: Between Orient and Occident. London: Elek, 1970.