

"TO SEIZE FRAGMENTS OF TRUTH": A STUDY OF
ROSE MACAULAY'S PACIFIST NOVELS

By

SEONAE HA-BIRDSONG

Bachelor of Arts
Kyungpook National University
Taegu, South Korea
1981

Master of Arts
Kyungpook National University
Taegu, South Korea
1983

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
December, 1995

“TO SEIZE FRAGMENTS OF TRUTH”: A STUDY OF
ROSE MACAULAY’S PACIFIST NOVELS

Thesis Approved:

Elizabeth Crutgel

Thesis Advisor

Linda Small

Edward P. Wally

Fantasy Garcia

Thomas C. Collins

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Elizabeth Grubgeld for being an outstanding advisor. She not only gave me inspiration, encouragement, and guidance but also helped me to have access to a number of materials for this study. I must extend my gratitude to my other committee members, Dr. Edward Walkiewicz, Dr. Linda Leavell, and Dr. Santiago Garcia for their guidance. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Leavell for her class on feminist studies which helped me to understand women's literature.

I dedicate my dissertation to my mother, Gyl-Yun Cho, who has been supportive for all these years and for whom my completion of this degree has the greatest meaning.

My thanks also go to H. Young Kim for her friendship and tremendous help and to Dale McLaughlin, who always gave me encouraging words.

Finally, I express my special appreciation to my husband, Jeffrey Birdsong, who has been a strong supporter and best friend. I also extend my warm thanks to his parents, Art and Donna Birdsong, for their support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
I. ESSAYS	24
II. <u>POTTERISM</u>	49
Potterism.....	53
The Potterish Literature	58
Macaulay's Writings on War	78
III. <u>NON-COMBATANTS AND OTHERS</u>	92
A Distinctive Pacifist Novel	94
Alix: A Daughter	108
Daphne: A Mother	127
Rose: A Writer	138
IV. <u>AND NO MAN'S WIT</u>	148
"A Convinced Pacifist" or "A Neutral?"	153
Politics	166
Art	195
V. <u>THE WORLD MY WILDERNESS</u>	210
A Pacifist in the Time of World War II	215
Barbarism.....	219
Civilization	240
CONCLUSION.....	257
BIBLIOGRAPHY	265

INTRODUCTION

In Rose Macaulay's life time, 1881 to 1958, England was officially engaged in three wars—the Boer War and two World Wars—and informally involved in the Spanish Civil War because of its citizens' voluntary participation. The Boer War, which lasted between 1899 and 1902, does not seem to have affected the young Macaulay, for there is no writing before 1906 in which she revealed her views of the war. However, the impact of the two World Wars and the Spanish Civil War on Macaulay can be inferred from her various writings. The First World War, especially, had a crucial effect on her as a woman writer. In 1914 Rose Macaulay was thirty-two years old. She had published seven novels and one collection of poems before the outbreak of the First World War. The war disturbed Macaulay tremendously as it did a great number of writers. It also led her to an awareness of gender identity. The majority of her novels published after World War I demonstrate that Macaulay was preoccupied with issues related to war. Among those issues are the impact of war on non-combatants as well as combatants, the gender division with respect to war, the relation between war and literature, and war's effect on civilization. All the issues reflect her pacifist beliefs. Macaulay's pacifism, however, has not been fully appreciated because it is presented in a way that not many readers would comprehend. In her novels, Macaulay avoided directly voicing her opinion on peace. Moreover, she did not agree with the women pacifists of the early twentieth century who argued that men were warlike, while women were peace-oriented. Thus her writings led

the readers of the time to question her pacifist views. The misunderstanding of Macaulay's pacifist stand, to a certain degree, still continues.

My study explores Macaulay's pacifism as embodied in the novels that particularly concentrate on the First World War, the Spanish Civil War, and the Second World War. The novels are Non-Combatants and Others (1916), And No Man's Wit (1940), and The World My Wilderness (1950). I shall examine how Macaulay's ideas of war literature shape the way in which pacifism is presented in her novels. I shall also consider how those ideas are connected with the gender identity which Macaulay, as a woman writer, has to face in dealing with the issue of war. Before discussing characteristics of Macaulay's pacifist writings, this study goes over her political activities as a pacifist, which partly explain why Macaulay has been neglected as a pacifist writer.

In general, Macaulay is considered to be a strong advocate of peace in the 1930s before the Second World War. Because of her active role as a pacifist and her numerous anti-war comments and essays, such as "Aping the Barbarians" in Let Us Honor Peace (1937) and An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist (1937) for the Peace Pledge Union, her pacifist stance of the late 1930s was unquestionable. During this time Macaulay, as a co-compiler with Daniel George Bunting, also worked on an anthology of anti-war literature, All in a Maze (1938). Macaulay's pacifist activities of the 1930s were mainly in support of the Peace Pledge Union, which was founded in 1936 by Dick Sheppard, an Anglican clergyman. Macaulay was one of its thirty-six sponsors—alongside other writers such as Aldous Huxley, Siegfried Sassoon, Bertrand Russell, and Vera Brittain—from June 1936 to March 1938, the time when she resigned her sponsorship. In the opinion of Martin Ceadel, despite her distinctive activities, Macaulay did not adhere to her pacifist beliefs long at all. In his 1980 study of pacifism in England between the two World Wars, Ceadel

says that Macaulay, after resigning from the Peace Pledge Union, “remained a pacifist until the summer of 1940,” the time of the Nazis’ breakthrough (215). Macaulay may have changed her strong opposition to war in general after witnessing the impact of Nazism. In a letter to her sister on 6 June 1940, she expressed her concern about many friends of hers who were on the Nazi black-list and described a dreadful situation which was generated by the Nazis: “Some people have schemes for taking the identity cards from corpses after raids and assuming new names, but I fear the Gestapo will be up to that.”¹ By this time Macaulay was very much afraid that the Nazis would invade London. Nevertheless, her abomination of the Nazis did not in any way make her give up her opposition to war. Her novel of World War II, The World My Wilderness, and her letters demonstrate that her belief in pacifism never died out. Ceadel’s argument about Macaulay’s short-term pacifism is solely based on her political activities. It does not consider those writings of Macaulay’s which embody her pacifist views after the Second World War. Thus it comes short of understanding Macaulay’s pacifism, which is carried through in her various writings.

While Ceadel denies that Macaulay remained a pacifist after World War II, Mary Agnes Hamilton, who was Macaulay’s contemporary and a well-known peace activist and writer, disputes that she was a pacifist before 1930s. Hamilton confirms that Macaulay was a pacifist in the 1930s. In her memoir, Remembering My Good Friends (1944), Hamilton states: “Rose was not a pacifist, but she became an ardent follower of Dick Sheppard’s in the 30’s, and was stirred to the soul, like so many, by the war in Spain” (139). According to Hamilton, Macaulay was one of the crowd who became interested in anti-war efforts only in the period just before the Second World War. Making a point that there were great differences between their attitudes in 1914 and 1939, Hamilton writes:

“For the so-called pacifists, of whom I was one, resistance, primarily emotional, to this glorification of war was the main-spring of resistance to the majority view The experience was wholly unlike 1939. In a sense everybody . . . is the sort of pacifist I was in 1914-18; very few were that sort of pacifist at the time” (71). Like Ceadel, Hamilton only sees Macaulay’s opposition to war in the 1930s when she became politically active. The interpretation of Macaulay’s pacifism by both Ceadel and Hamilton shows that Macaulay in the 1930s expressed her pacifist views in a manner which allowed many pacifists of the time to recognize her as one of them, although the nature of her views toward war before and after that decade remain a subject of contention.

Considering only Macaulay’s political activities, it is in fact hard to say that Macaulay was a pacifist in the 1910s or after World War II. Not only was she not involved in the peace movement but also she seemed to support the government’s war effort. Macaulay was never a member of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, which emerged during the First World War. She did not participate in any peace movements, including male-dominated ones. Instead, she volunteered to be a V.A.D. (Voluntary Aid Detachment) nurse in 1915, although she could not keep the job very long because of her high sensitivity to the pain and injuries of patients. She also worked in the War Office until the war was over. During the Second World War Macaulay, in her late 50s, drove an ambulance at night. Such activities were far from many women’s peace efforts.

Macaulay’s voluntary service as a V.A.D. nurse and her active participation in the British government’s war effort during the First World War especially seem to support Hamilton’s assertion that Macaulay was not a pacifist at the time of World War I. Nevertheless, Macaulay’s war activities were not grounded on patriotism. Regarding the

motivation Macaulay might have had when she joined V.A.D., Jane Emery speculates that Macaulay's affection for Rupert Brooke² and his death "jolted her out of her attempted retreat from the sight of khaki" (150). Emery also implies that Macaulay was not pro-war because she "did not in the first ten months volunteer for any war work" (150). Whatever the motivation was, Macaulay certainly was not enthusiastic about the war while being active in war work, for the majority of her novels can be regarded as anti-war literature. Even her work in the War Office was definitely not impelled by her support of the war. If such participation indicates that she might have believed the righteousness of the government's involvement in the war, how could she, while working in the War Office, write What Not: A Prophetic Comedy (1919), which satirizes the government's propaganda in the name of future peace? The novel clearly illustrates that the government vainly attempts to control every individual's emotions and every individual's marriage as if the war which precedes the story was caused by the people's uncontrolled emotions and mismatched marriages. The novel ridicules the War Office, which is named the Ministry of Brains, whose object is "to avert another Great War" (23). It describes: "The Ministry of Brains . . . had many sections. There was the Propaganda Section . . . the Men's Education Section, the Women's, and the Children's; the Section which dealt with brain-tests, examinations, certificates and tribunals, and the Section which was concerned with the direction of the intellects of the Great Unborn" (23). Because of its mockery of wartime bureaucracy, the publication of the novel was delayed until the war was over. Macaulay's literary responses to the war demonstrate that she did not support the war effort.

Despite Macaulay's life-long beliefs against war and the novels that reflect her beliefs, there have been to date only a few studies of her pacifism. Even those studies that

take a serious view of her pacifism tend to focus on one novel, Non-Combatants and Others. There is little doubt that Non-Combatants and Others presents a pacifist message. In Rose Macaulay: A Writer's Life (1991), Jane Emery points out that the novel was not very successful with the readers of the time who were exalted with the war mood. She asserts that "the novel's ruling ideas about peace were ahead of their time" (155). Emery also notes an unsigned review of the novel, which appeared in Englishwoman on May 22, 1916: the indignant reviewer described the pacifist character Daphne Sandomir "as one of those 'who act from a nervous desire to be doing something different from the common task . . . without any clear idea of the result of their activities'" (155). Nevertheless, the novel has been noticed as a pacifist novel only in recent years. Clair M. Tylee's The Great War and Women's Consciousness (1990) deals with Non-Combatants and Others as one of a few pacifist novels that were published during World War I. She compares Macaulay's novel with Mary Hamilton's Dead Yesterday (1916) and Rose Allatini's Despised and Rejected (1918). Similarly, Sharon Ouditt in Fighting Forces, Writing Women (1994) studies Non-Combatants and Others along with other pacifist novels, such as Mary Hamilton's Dead Yesterday and Vera Brittain's Honorable Estate (1936). D. A. Boxwell also discusses the pacifist theme of Macaulay's First World War novel in "The (M)other Battle of World War One: The Maternal Politics of Pacifism in Rose Macaulay's Non-Combatants and Others" (1993).

Of course Macaulay did not stop writing about war after Non-Combatants and Others. Pacifism is manifested in her other novels than Non-Combatants and Others as well as in her essays. Tylee briefly mentions Macaulay's What Not: A Prophetic Comedy as another novel that reflects the writer's pacifist beliefs at the time of World War I. A recent collection of women writers' works The Gender of Modernism: A Critical

Anthology (1990) contains excerpts from Macaulay's Non-Combatants and Others, Told by an Idiot (1923), and a collection of essays Personal Pleasures (1935), and it notes the pacifist ideas in the two novels. The anthology presents the two novels as Macaulay's challenge to the canon of war literature on the grounds that the pacifist themes contradict those of the popular war literature. In the introduction to the anthology, Bonnie Kime Scott points out that Macaulay was one of the women writers whose writings on war have been neglected because of a traditional definition of modernism which "was unconsciously gendered masculine" (2). According to Scott, modernism has been shaped by a small number of male writers and the men's literary experience, and it does not represent "modernism as caught in the mesh of gender" (4). By the same token, the literature by "the canonized authors on the war"—Rupert Brooke, Siegfried Sassoon, Ernest Hemingway, and Ford Madox Ford—does not display women's war experience. Women's writings on war are in contrast to the dominant canon of war literature which focuses on men's experiences on the battlefield. The dominant war literature tends to emphasize the gulf between men and women in their experiences of war. In the introduction to the chapter on "Rose Macaulay" in the anthology, Susan Squier argues that Macaulay's Non-Combatants and Others challenges "the critical canon that continues to favor war literature even in the wake of the Great War" (254). The novel, says Squier, underlines "the linking—and consequent challenge—of the conventions of gender and war" (254). Squier also views "Macaulay's multiple positions and her weary, even cynically indifferent stance toward war and peace in Told by an Idiot . . . as attempts to escape the self-perpetuating binary construction of the war text" (256). Squier's introduction does not give detailed analyses of Macaulay's writings on war. However, it provides a significant step to investigate the pacifism that Macaulay presents in various

writings other than Non-Combatants and Others. It also notes those characteristics of Macaulay's novels which have contributed to the misreading of her pacifist views.

My study focuses on two characteristics of Macaulay's pacifist novels. First, Macaulay's pacifist novels do not present explicit pacifist views; they deal with diverse voices of and responses to war. Second, they do not present peace as a women's issue; although they tend to focus on women's war experience, they do not polarize men and women in their attitudes toward war. These characteristics are grounded in Macaulay's effort to write realistic novels from a woman writer's perspective and thus reflect her opposition to the clichés in the war literature of her time. The tradition of war literature generated propaganda that drove men to fight war and women to support it. As Janet Montefiore points out, it was also "deeply imbricated with patriotic ideology and overwhelmingly masculine in its assumption" (55). Such war literature may reflect the writing of Rupert Brooke rather than that of Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon, for the latter do not demonstrate patriotic ideology. However, the masculine assumption still exists in the latter, for the idea that war is "a wholly masculine way of life uncomplicated by Woman"³ prevails. Sassoon's poem "Glory of Women" suggests that women are devoured by the idea of soldiers' holy sacrifices for the nation. The soldiers as war-heroes may no longer have patriotic views regarding warfare, yet women, if depicted at all in the soldiers' writings, appear as non-combatants still cheering the government to victory. The soldiers' literature shows that the clichés of war propaganda had a lasting impact on the portrayal of women. By devaluing the trite expressions of patriotism and the dichotomy between men and women in the tradition of war literature, Macaulay defies the canon of the masculine war literature.

The first characteristic of Macaulay's pacifist novels is that they do not directly expound the author's political commitment to an anti-war stance. Neither do they undertake to move the readers to assume pacifist views. Such a characteristic is most directly opposite to the mannerisms of propaganda. It also explains why, despite Macaulay's depiction of the strong pacifist character Daphne Sandomir, Hamilton did not believe Macaulay to be a pacifist in 1916 when Non-Combatants and Others was published. Hamilton discredited Macaulay's early pacifist stance by not counting, for example, Macaulay's Non-Combatants and Others, which was published only a few months later than her own pacifist novel Dead Yesterday (1916). In her memoir, Hamilton said that her Dead Yesterday was "inspired by intense feeling against war."⁴ It is possible that Hamilton had not read Macaulay's Non-Combatants and Others or had forgotten about it when she wrote her memoir in the late 1930s. However, it is more likely that Hamilton made such an assertion based on her own interpretation of what a pacifist novel should be. Hamilton did read Macaulay's Told By An Idiot, published in 1923, because, in her memoir, she argued that the novel more directly represented Macaulay's "superb and unfaltering courage" than did most of her novels (138). Yet Hamilton could not grasp Macaulay's deep concern with peace and war in the novel. Hamilton's inability to recognize the anti-war mood in Told By An Idiot results from the manner in which Macaulay presented pacifism in her novels.

Macaulay's presentation of pacifism in novels is not direct. As Claire Tylee points out, Macaulay refuses "to dictate a position" or to give any "moral/ religious authority to glamorize," while Hamilton falls into the "emotive techniques" of "authoritative moral didacticism" (114; 110). Because Macaulay does not employ the emotive techniques upon which Hamilton heavily relies in order to express her pacifist views, Macaulay's work

“was not congenial to reviewers” of the time.⁵ Tylee notes one review in the Times Literary Supplement, which typified general reactions to the novel: Macaulay’s “careful elimination of sentimentality actually achieved the ‘impossible’ effect of *exaggerating* the ‘misery and horror of these times’” (108). Tylee contends that Macaulay’s ironic and detached presentation of war makes the novel more appealing to later readers than other pacifist novels, such as Mary Hamilton’s Dead Yesterday. In contrast to Macaulay’s work, Hamilton’s novel could easily reach the readers of its time. As a typical sentimental novel, Dead Yesterday emphasizes the distress of a virtuous character Mrs. Leonard. Mrs. Leonard, who stands firm in her pacifist commitment throughout the novel, represents the voice of Hamilton and preaches her beliefs to the readers. As Tylee pertinently says, Hamilton’s novel “is cast in the same mould of spiritual uplift as the propaganda writing she [Hamilton] was explicitly opposing” (111). Compared with Hamilton’s novel, Macaulay’s anti-war novels do not show such didacticism. Macaulay’s ambition to write good literature prevents her from writing novels that present the didactic message of pacifism.

For Macaulay, writing good literature takes precedence over delivering an anti-war message. Macaulay believes that a writer should enjoy writing. Without enjoyment, the writer would not produce good literature. According to Hamilton, Macaulay had the right aptitude to be a writer. Macaulay, said Hamilton, “is an artist” who “has, for perpetual refreshment, an endless, unfatigued and unfatigable passion for her craft—for words.”⁶ Hamilton continues: “With words, she [Macaulay] could for ever go on playing; to find new ones, right ones, fresh uses for old ones: to make them dance: to make them shout and sing—here is a game, arduous and absorbing, of which she never tires.”⁷ Macaulay’s love of writing seems to emphasize an aesthetic preoccupation.

Nonetheless, the majority of Macaulay's novels after World War I take on political and social views related to war. Macaulay did not just focus on cultivating high artifice. The immediacy of her literary response to the First World War, as represented in Non-Combatant and Others, demonstrates that she was indeed "inspired by intense feeling against war" in a time when not many writers wrote about it. Her contemporary Virginia Woolf, who is generally considered to be a pacifist, did not deal with the war at all when she wrote Night and Day (1919). Because Woolf's novel did not include the issue of war, Katharine Mansfield expressed disappointment in a letter to John Middleton Murry: "My private opinion is that it is a lie in the soul. The war never has been: that is what its message is . . . the novel can't just leave the war out It is really fearful to see the 'settling down' of human beings. I feel in the *profoundest* sense that nothing can ever be the same—that, as artists, we are traitors if we feel otherwise: we have to take it into account and find new expressions, new moulds for our new thoughts and feelings We have to face our war."⁸ Mansfield's account of the relationship between war and literature accords with Macaulay's view of literature. Macaulay valued aesthetics, yet she could not leave out the First World War and could not but write about it. As manifested in her novels, she believed literature should deal with war and war-related issues. She continued to present her pacifist beliefs in novels without giving overt messages of peace.

The second characteristic of Macaulay's pacifist novels is that there is no polarization between the sexes in their responses to war. Macaulay believes that most human beings, men and women, are against war. She does not think that all men want to make war, while all women want to make peace. She does not agree that women as mother and nurturer deplore war by nature. Such a view was prevalent among a number of female pacifists of the early twentieth century. In her Woman and Labor (1911), Olive

Schreiner argues that women's biological traits make women hate war: "There is, perhaps, no woman, whether she have borne children, or be merely potentially a child-bearer, who could look down upon a battlefield covered with slain, but the thought would rise in her, 'So many mothers' sons! . . . ' And we cry, 'Without an inexorable cause, this must not be!' No woman who is a woman says of a human body, 'It is nothing!'" (175-176). The argument that women's pacifism was grounded in their biological function was developed in the industrial age of the nineteenth century. Ruth Pierson explains the ideological development of women's association with peace and men's association with war: "the sexual division of labor between male bread winner and dependent home-bound wife became the ideological norm At the same time theories of sex differences emanating from exponents of the new discipline of sociology gave scientific validation to the equation of women with passivity and non-aggression, and motherhood with self-sacrifice and tender nurturance" (211). Pierson also points out that in the time of World War I "the equation of female nature with the pacific virtues became a commonplace" (212). Macaulay's pacifist novels denounce such an equation. Although the main characters of the novels are all women, they never suggest that women innately oppose war. All the novels imply that men's and women's attitudes toward war cannot be generalized based on their sex identities.

Throughout her life, Macaulay questioned women's gender roles and refused to conform to them. Macaulay's challenge to them has contributed to the misunderstanding of her pacifism, which is not based on sex division. In her biography Rose Macaulay (1972), Constance Smith says that Macaulay at the age of twelve wished to be a man and to join the Navy (36). Referring to the young Macaulay's wish, Smith argues that Macaulay's "superficial" pacifism of the 1930s contradicts itself: "it [Macaulay's

pacifism] stemmed from a revulsion against violence and cruelty, and from her acute sensitivity to pain. Yet even here there was a contradiction, for in spite of the horror that physical suffering kindled in her she was not altogether anti-military; there was still in her something of the young hero-worshipper who had relished tales of daring, and had herself longed to be a man" (141). Smith's contention is based on the assumptions that pacifism is synonymous with anti-military sentiment and that one's wish to aid others reflects hero-worship. Smith comes to this conclusion by referring to Macaulay's An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist, in which Macaulay stresses the significance of peace efforts against organized violence. In the essay, Macaulay professes her duty to help someone being physically attacked, which makes Smith criticize Macaulay's pacifist views as self-contradictory. However, Smith's criticism of Macaulay's pacifism reveals that she understands pacifism only in a narrow sense, for in this very essay Macaulay disputes such an idea that pacifism means the absolute abolition of all types of physical force. For Macaulay, pacifism means opposition to war in the international conflict and efforts to eliminate the causes of war. Macaulay does not confine pacifism to completely passive resistance to violence on the personal level. By discussing the necessity of proper punishment of criminals, for example, she explains that pacifism does not signify the abolition of all types of violence. Instead of making an attempt to read Macaulay's argument, Smith applies her limited understanding to analyzing Macaulay's pacifism. She even contends that Macaulay, who was well over fifty when writing An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist, still had a wish to be a hero as she did when she was a teenager. It is not surprising that Smith disregards Macaulay's novels, such as Non-Combatants and Others and Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract (1920), which describe the hollowness of hero-worship. Smith's interest lies in Macaulay's refusal to conform to women's conventional

roles. Thus she argues that Macaulay's boyish act confirmed her envy of a fighting hero. Macaulay's non-traditional manner was well-known, and Jane Emery points out that Macaulay consciously "avoided calling attention to her sex" when she associated with people in literary society (142-43). Emery also notes that Macaulay's contemporaries remarked on her appearance and manner as displaying "boyish traits" and "a combination of tomboy and perfect lady" (143). To her contemporaries, Macaulay did not behave like a woman. She believed no more in the validity of the roles that a society imposed on women than in the general perception that women's opposition to war is based on biology. Yet Macaulay's nonacceptance of feminine roles certainly does not indicate that she wished to be a war hero. It indeed underlines her challenge to the gulf between the sexes which was deepened in war time.

Macaulay consciously refused to recognize differences between the sexes. Nevertheless, facing wars, she acknowledged her gender identity. Wars "have a way of revealing with special clarity how men as well as women are both intensely and uneasily gendered" (Schweik 3). The gender gap between men and women was very deep during the time of the two World Wars, compared to the present time when women also have opportunities to be combatants. Men were compelled to join the battle, while women had to stay home and indirectly experience the horror of war; men were combatants, while women were non-combatants. Of course not all men became combatants, but all women were non-combatants. A character in Macaulay's Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract (1920) aptly describes women's position: "The war was damnable, but it was worse to be out of it. One was such an utter outsider. It wasn't fair" (24). In Testament of Youth (1938), Vera Brittain expresses similar feelings after reading a letter from her fiancé, Roland Leighton. In the early stages of the First World War, Roland wrote: "I don't think

in the circumstances I could easily bring myself to endure a secluded life of scholastic vegetation. It would seem a somewhat cowardly shirking of my obvious duty I feel that I am meant to take an active part in this War. It is to me a very fascinating thing You will call me a militarist. You may be right.”⁹ Roland could not think of his life without being involved in the war. As a young woman who could not participate in the war, Brittain felt left out: “‘Scholastic vegetation,’ hurt just a little; it seemed so definitely to put me outside everything that now counted in life I felt it altogether contrary to his professed feminism—but then, so was the War; its effect on the women’s cause was quite dismaying.”¹⁰ Brittain analyzes her emotions at the time: “obviously I was suffering, like so many women in 1914, from an inferiority complex.”¹¹ That inferiority complex was grounded in the inability of women to serve active duty on the battlefield, which kept women writers out of the realm of the dominant literary experience in war time.

Like Brittain, Macaulay had high literary ambitions and acknowledged the significance of war experience to a woman who wanted to write about war. Women’s war experience was completely different from men’s, which became the center of literary responses to war, as manifested in Paul Fussell’s The Great War and Modern Memory (1975). As a woman writer, Macaulay was keenly aware of the boundary that she could not enter when writing about war. Macaulay did not want to be “seen as ‘a writer *for* women’” (Emery 150). However, her writing of Non-Combatants and Others a year after the outbreak of World War I demonstrates her awareness of the nature of female gender identity in war time. The novel was the first of Macaulay’s novels in which the central figure was a woman. Despite her attempt to discredit the differences between the sexes, Macaulay realized the inevitable gulf between men and women in writing about war. Thus she did not emulate her male counterparts. Unlike soldier writers’ works,

Macaulay's novels on war do not deal with soldiers and their experiences in battlefield as main subjects. When soldiers are depicted in her novels, they are not glorified.

Macaulay's novels present grim realities about soldiers: they are not only killed but also kill on the front. The main subjects of her novels are non-combatants and their experiences and perspectives in war time. Her novels are "gender-inflected"¹² texts because they concentrate on women's war experience. Her novels typify women's literature that has created a literary tradition separate from the literature of soldier writers.

Since Macaulay's writings on war are "gender-inflected" texts, my study of her works attempts to contribute to establishing a canon of women's war literature, a canon whose formation is still in process. The definition of women's war literature is still under debate, and not every scholar agrees that a tradition of women's war literature differs from that of men's. As Elaine Showalter says, "a double-voiced discourse" in women's literature "always embodies the social, literary, and cultural heritages of both the muted and the dominant" (263). Depending on which heritage, muted or dominant, scholars reach different conclusions concerning women's war literature. Some scholars, such as Tylee, read women's war literature as falling within the circle of the dominant war literature. Applying Showalter's analysis of women's literature to women's writing of World War I, Tylee argues: "Women were not . . . so concerned to express that imaginary area of their experience which was literally 'no-man's-land,' off-limits to men and so outside the dominant culture. Rather, their literature is concerned with women's entry into that exclusive part of the national culture which had previously been forbidden to women, all that area of public privilege and power to which men had access, and women did not Above all, it concerns their access to military institutions and the martial zone" (14). Tylee believes that women's war literature mostly shares the dominant

cultural memory as embodied in masculine war literature. In contrast, some other scholars, such as Lynne Hanley, argue that women's war literature reflects a muted literary tradition. Hanley sees women's war literature, unlike masculine literature, as lacking pugnacity and considers the study of women's literature to be "an antidote to the bellicosity of patriarchal literature and literary studies" (35).

Like Hanley, I view Macaulay's pacifist novels as representative of a muted tradition because they concentrate on women's war experience, which is different from men's. However, I disagree with Hanley's polarization between bellicose men's literature and peaceable women's literature, for such a polarization is liable to criticism considering that soldier writers of the First World War—Wilfred Owen and Siegfried Sassoon—expressed anti-war feelings in their writings. Furthermore, I find that the polarization clashes with Macaulay's own idea of war literature as manifested in Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, which denounces the antagonism between men and women in war time. Macaulay's novels are typical of women's war literature in that they deal with subjects, such as women's responses to war, which have not been presented in masculine literature.

My study of Macaulay's pacifist writings is in keeping with current studies of women's position on war. Dorothy Goldman divides studies of women's responses to the First World War since 1970s into four categories according to the subjects: the first concentrates on women's war work; the second on women's politics such as the suffrage and pacifist movements; the third on "women's place within a culture," which explains women's concern with their social roles; the fourth on women's literary responses to the war (4). Adopting Goldman's division, this study belongs to the fourth category. Yet I believe that a study of Macaulay's writings has key elements of each category. A premise

of my study is that Macaulay's war work, her political pacifist efforts of the 1930s, and her interest in women's social roles must all be discussed in the context of her writings on war and are integral to them.

Macaulay's literary responses to war were intense. After the First World War, Macaulay wrote sixteen novels. Most of them either explicitly or implicitly deal with the issues related to war. She also produced essays that clearly represent her views of war and peace. This study starts with analysis of pacifism in her essays, An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist, "Aping the Barbarians," and the introduction to All in a Maze. Although her arguments on peace are not logically simple, compared with her novels, these writings present her pacifism in a straightforward manner. By examining her essays, I shall show the principal ideas in Macaulay's pacifism as a necessary preparation for a better understanding of her novels. I shall then concentrate on Macaulay's four novels—Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, Non-Combatants and Others, And No Man's Wit, and The World My Wilderness.¹³ The subjects of the novels are almost exclusively connected with wars—World War I, the Spanish Civil War, and World War II. The first novel, Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, does not directly manifest Macaulay's pacifism. Yet I see the significance of the novel because it lays the basis of Macaulay's writings on war. My chapter on Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract demonstrates that Macaulay challenges the dominant, popular tradition of war literature after World War I, which can be interpreted as, to use Charlotte Gilman's words, "androcentric literature."¹⁴ Thus I shall start with a crucial argument on war and literature in Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, although the novel was published later than Non-Combatants and Others.

After the second chapter on Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, I arrange three following chapters on Macaulay's war novels chronologically. The sequence does not

indicate the progression of Macaulay's pacifism. Rather, it reveals her long-term interest in various issues in relation to the two World Wars and the Spanish Civil War. It also shows that her fundamental beliefs hardly changed over three decades, although the idea of the fruitlessness of peace efforts seemed to prevail in the later years. I shall devote the third chapter to Non-combatants and Others, which deals with the impact of the First World War on non-combatants as well as combatants during the war. The novel represents the deep gulf between combatants and non-combatants—the gap between men and women. The focus on the gender gap does not suggest that all men are warlike, while all women are peace-oriented. Each individual's response to war is different depending on how he or she reacts to the gender role. A main focus of the novel is on a young female artist who feels pain at a loss in war time and who eventually searches for her gender identity. In contrast to the young artist, her mother is a convinced pacifist and puts her beliefs into action. The novel concentrates on the daughter's development into a peace activist.

The next novel I shall consider is And No Man's Wit. The subject of the novel is the Spanish Civil War. Depicting a strong British mother and her journey to find her son in post-war Spain, the novel illustrates regional and ideological conflicts that continue after the civil war was officially over. A young British man's dream to defeat fascism never becomes a reality. It is not just because his side lost the war but because the war was an embodiment of strife which occurs throughout history. A crucial idea of the novel is that it seems almost impossible to keep peace in Spain as well as in this world. Nevertheless, by dealing with the ideological and regional struggles which underlay the civil war, the novel implies that a writer should be concerned with the politics which affect humanity. Such an idea is tied to Macaulay's portrayal of the mother who sees the

futility of pacifist efforts yet who stresses the necessity of being involved with human affairs. Near the final part of the story, the Second World War breaks out, and the mother is determined to be active in the efforts to end it.

The last chapter concerns The World My Wilderness, which is about the impact of World War II on civilians, especially children. Unlike adults, children do not easily adjust to a post-war society. A young girl, who was a juvenile maquis in France under the German occupation, has difficulty living in the post-war London as a civilized being. During the war her activities, such as stealing for the Resistance, were justified in the name of patriotism, but now they become crimes. The characterization of the young girl demonstrates war's impact on humanity. The major theme of the novel is that war, a reflection of barbarism, imperils civilization and lurks in it. The post-war barbarism is embodied in the ruined site of London as well as in the young girl's mind. The civilization after the war seems to continue prospering, yet it indeed has been affected by the war and has potentials to make war.

My purpose is to establish Macaulay as a pacifist writer by showing that her war novels manifest her distinctive views on peace. Macaulay was never an idealistic pacifist. Her recognition of the diversity of human nature and the history of human civilization drove her to disbelieve that peace efforts would suppress the violence and eventually abolish war. Because of her doubts about the complete abolition of war in human history, her pacifist views seem to be pessimistic. Furthermore, unlike some feminist pacifists whose views were founded on a hypothesis of women's peaceable nature, Macaulay did not believe that women's participation in the policy-making process would change the world so that nations no longer would fight. Thus Macaulay's pacifism has been misread by pacifists who have focused upon the total conviction of peace as well as by feminist

pacifists who have pursued women's political power in order to end war. Nevertheless, her writings demonstrate that she was an ardent pacifist in the time when several powerful nations engaged in wars. Stressing her pacifism in her writings, I do not contend that Macaulay never vacillated in her conviction of peace efforts. Instead, I attempt to show that her essays and novels reflect Macaulay's very realistic view of pacifism: the pacifist's work may never be completed, yet it is worth striving for even "if only to keep the idea alive"¹⁵ when warmongerism pervades the world. I hope that this study will contribute to establishing women's distinctive perspectives on war.

Notes

¹ Rose Macaulay, Letters to a Sister, ed. Constance Babington Smith (New York: Atheneum, 1964) 99. The fear of the Nazis at the time was intense. One day after Macaulay wrote this letter, Virginia Woolf wrote that she and three others (one of them was Rose Macaulay) debated suicide "in the gradually darkening room" with "at last no light at all," which she described as "symbolic." See The Diary of Virginia Woolf, ed. Anne Olivier Bell, vol. 5 (San Diego: Harcourt, 1984) 292.

² Regarding the relationship between Rose Macaulay and Rupert Brooke, see Constance Babington Smith, Rose Macaulay (London: Collins, 1972) 61-65.

³ As quoted by Paul Fussell, The Great War and Modern Memory (London: Oxford, 1975) 273-74. By citing J. B. Priestly's statement, Fussell stresses the male bonding which developed into a "homoerotic" relation during World War I.

⁴ Mary Agnes Hamilton, Remembering My Good Friends (London: Jonathan Cape, 1944) 72-73.

⁵ Claire M. Tylee, The Great War and Women's Consciousness: Images of Militarism and Womanhood in Women's Writings, 1914-64 (Iowa: U of Iowa P, 1990) 108.

⁶ Hamilton, Remembering My Good Friends 139.

⁷ Hamilton, Remembering My Good Friends 139.

⁸ As quoted by Nichola Beauman, A Very Great Profession: The Woman's Novel, 1914-39 (London: Virago, 1983) 28.

⁹ Vera Brittain, Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years, 1900-1925 (New York: Macmillan, 1938) 104.

¹⁰ Brittain, Testament of Youth 104.

¹¹ Brittain, Testament of Youth 104.

¹² I use the term "gender-inflected" as defined in Bonnie Scott's introduction to Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology (Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990). Scott distinguishes gender from sex: "Gender is a category constructed through cultural and social systems. Unlike sex, it is not a biological fact determined at conception" (2). Based on the distinction, Scott argues that many women's texts have been omitted from the canon of masculine modernism. Concerning masculine modernism in war literature, she contends that women's war literature, such as Rose Macaulay's pacifist writings, gives "gender-inflected" views of war.

¹³ Since each chapter focuses on Macaulay's one novel, citations of each novel appear only with page references.

¹⁴ See Charlotte Perkins Gilman, The Man-Made World or Our Androcentric Culture (New York: Charton, 1911). Gilman asserts that history "was made and written by men" as manifested in "an Androcentric Culture" (17). She defines "androcentric

literature” as stories of warfare and conquest, yet does not view it as a product of men’s warlike nature. Her main argument is that women writers must contribute to creating their own literary tradition since “fiction, under our androcentric culture, has not given any true picture of woman’s life . . . and a disproportioned section of man’s life” (102).

¹⁵ Rose Macaulay, “Aping the Barbarians” in Let Us Honor Peace (London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1937) 17.

CHAPTER I

ESSAYS: "TO KEEP THE IDEA ALIVE"

In a letter to her sister on 9 December 1934, Rose Macaulay expresses her belief in people's fundamental preference for peace despite their different approaches to it: "people don't at all agree about the answers. Quite a lot of people don't see any point in abolishing private arms manufacture What we all *are* agreed on, of course, is in wanting peace; the rest is just a question of ways of obtaining it."¹ Although Macaulay makes it sound simple by saying that everybody is for peace, she is very much aware of the complexity of obtaining peace. As she observes, even after experiencing the ravages of the First World War, many people approved of another war under the pretext of ending wars. In another letter, written about five years later when the Second World War was imminent, she describes this paradox: "Sir W. B. said I couldn't really hate war as much as he does, because I want to stop this one, and he feels sure that would only lead to others, and he wants to stop the others by having this. Who hates war most is unimportant: I think we all hate it."² These letters reveal the basis of Macaulay's pacifism. Macaulay does not polarize pacifists and warmongers; even warmongers want peace. In addition, as the pronoun "we" connotes, her argument does not accept any division between men and women or between combatants and non-combatants. Macaulay's beliefs are not founded in such conventional binary divisions. The lack of such divisions in her letters points toward two crucial attributes of her pacifism as expressed in her essays.

While her pacifist novels do not directly expound her beliefs, Macaulay's essays represent her opposition to war in a straightforward manner. Compared to her novels, her essays elucidate her position on the issue of war so that the readers cannot question her stand. Yet readers of her essays can be perplexed at the details of her arguments. Although these writings certainly do not articulate diverse opinions as much as her novels do, they tend to consider ideas opposite to her own. In addition, they tend to re-examine and re-define general ideas about pacifism, civilization,³ and human nature in relation to war. Because of the oppositions and the re-definitions, her arguments can be seen as ambiguous rather than clear. Constance Smith sees "the vacillating nature" of her pacifism in Macaulay's An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist (140). Smith does not believe that Macaulay ever took a firm stand against war, as shown in her assertion that while joining the Peace Pledge Movement, Macaulay "was unconvinced, for she doubted whether pacifism would work" (140). Smith assumes that a pacifist should be absolutely optimistic about the success of peace efforts. Since Macaulay did not have such an attitude, Smith believes that Macaulay was never a convinced pacifist. In contrast to Smith, Jane Emery thinks that Macaulay's conviction as revealed in An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist is unquestionable, yet argues that Macaulay "undercuts her own argument" because the essay, "as always," manifests her "spirit of fairness" (250). Such conflicting views of Macaulay's arguments result from her own realistic view of human nature and from her challenge to the simplified, general conception of it. Macaulay overemphasizes neither a peace-oriented nature nor a bellicose nature, although she believes that a civilized person should be free from any type of barbaric behavior. Macaulay's argument implies that the differences among people as to how to approach peace may be resolved if everyone focuses on achieving civilized humanity and the process of civilization.

However, her tone is not forceful. Macaulay acknowledges that war has repeatedly broken out in history and that peace efforts have not been successful in preventing war, yet she suggests that an attempt to establish a lasting peace is worth while.

Second, Macaulay's essays do not contain any suggestion that men and women are different in their approaches to war. As in her novels, Macaulay never makes a division between peaceable women and bellicose men. Her novels are gendered texts because they predominantly represent women's war experience, but her essays are not. Unlike Virginia Woolf, who in her essay Three Guineas (1938) distinguishes between men and women with respect to war, Macaulay, even in her essays, does not define her views as a woman's perspective on war. Macaulay assumes her voice to be representative of a pacifism which has engaged both men's and women's interests. Woolf's argument, even if relying on the binary division between men and women, is not based on the concept of sex but that of gender, for it does not contend that the division is biologically determined. Compared with Woolf's, Macaulay's argument refuses to acknowledge the difference between men and women not only in terms of sex but also of gender. Some may say that such an argument results from her involvement with the male-dominated Peace Pledge Movement, which was started by Dick Sheppard as he appealed to men to pledge themselves against war. However, it also reflects her own beliefs. If Macaulay had been interested in peace as a women's issue, as Vera Brittain was, she would have presented it from a woman's distinctive perspective, despite her work with male pacifists in the Peace Pledge Union. Brittain, another sponsor of the Peace Pledge Union, shows her own overtly gendered pacifism in an essay "Why I Stand for Peace," which was published with Macaulay's "Aping the Barbarians" in the collection of essays Let Us Honor Peace (1937). Brittain's essay concentrates on women's responsibilities and

activities for peace. Brittain writes: “Will the women who had no political rights in 1914 but are now voting citizens, really do nothing to prevent this sorry repetition of mortal folly? . . . I should like to see every mother in this country write a letter to some responsible member of the Government refusing the protection of a gas-mask which offers nothing but a false sense of security, and demanding . . . alternatives to rearmament” (62). Brittain’s focus on women’s peace efforts, however, does not intend to prove women’s particular interest in peace. It does not at all embrace conventional divisions between men and women. Brittain believes that women’s efforts for peace, along with men’s, will contribute to saving civilization from war. Brittain and Macaulay have the same goal, although their approaches are different.

It is not surprising that Macaulay’s essays embody many ideas similar to those of Aldous Huxley’s *An Encyclopedia of Pacifism* (1937). In the encyclopedia, Huxley, another sponsor of the Peace Pledge Union, alphabetically lists subjects related to peace and war—armaments, biology and war, the church’s attitude toward war, education and peace, non-violence, pacifism, the Peace Pledge Union, and propaganda. Unlike Huxley’s book, Macaulay’s essays do not deal with such diverse subjects. Nevertheless, they share many ideas with Huxley’s encyclopedia, such as views about armament, pacifism, propaganda, civilization, and education. One significant difference between the two is that Macaulay is not as forceful as Huxley in presenting pacifist beliefs. Another significant difference pertains to Huxley’s comment in the last entry of the encyclopedia, “Women in Modern War, Position of.” Therein Huxley points out that many women were involved in various war activities during World War I. He ends the entry: “War is no longer an affair conducted by a small body of professionals; it has become totalitarian. Women are as intimately concerned in it as men” (122). Huxley’s implication is that war

became a women's issue after World War I. By comparison, Macaulay believes that women have always been as concerned about war as men, although she does not specifically discuss women's distinctive interest in war. For Macaulay, war is just a human issue. As revealed in All in a Maze, the majority of literary works on war were written by men until the early twentieth century. Nevertheless, a small number of women's texts reflect their earlier views of war. Writings of both sexes compose a history of war literature and represent human response to war and peace.

In this chapter, I shall explore three essays that represent the attributes of Macaulay's pacifism. All three of them—An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist, "Aping the Barbarians," and an introduction to All in a Maze—were written in late 1930s and were closely related to her involvement with the Peace Pledge Union, which she joined in 1936. The selection of her writings for this chapter does not suggest that her pacifist writings were confined to that period, although it seemingly supports her friend Mary Hamilton's contention that Macaulay became an ardent pacifist in 1930s. They are selected because they represent the clear voice of the author on the matter of pacifism. In other non-fictional pieces, such as journal articles and letters, Macaulay also expresses anti-war feelings and makes some suggestions to prevent future wars. Even those texts show the attributes of her pacifism. For example, in a journal article "What I Believe" (1931), Macaulay discusses three aspects of human nature—"ignorance, vulgarity, and cruelty"—from which all social problems of the world, such as war, have originated. The article demonstrates that Macaulay's argument is not grounded in a binary division between the sexes. Macaulay briefly discusses the difference between men and women in intelligence, yet implies that such difference is caused by inequality in education. She never implies that ignorance, vulgarity, and cruelty are characteristics of one sex.

The only significant difference between the essays on which this chapter concentrates and the other non-fictional pieces is that the latter do not directly consider pacifism. In An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist, Macaulay defines pacifism and its significance. Her “Aping the Barbarians” deals with the pacifist’s belief in saving civilization in contrast to the non-pacifist’s views of civilization. In the introduction to All in a Maze, Macaulay reviews war literature in a historical context and explains the complexity of approaches to war and peace.

An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist was published in 1937 as a pamphlet of the Peace Pledge Union. Although it was addressed to a non-pacifist, a large number of its readers were probably members of the Peace Pledge Union. Macaulay’s effort to reach non-pacifists did not have good results, as exemplified in her relation with Victor Gollancz, a publisher who held a strong belief in an international military defence against Fascism. Macaulay sent a copy of the essay to Gollancz, marked “Victor, please read.” Gollancz rejected her request.⁴ Macaulay’s arguments in this essay show that her pacifism specifically aims at mass violence, such as international conflicts. It also reveals that her belief in pacifism is not idealistic. Macaulay starts her arguments by discussing three types of pacifism according to general definitions: “the conviction that all taking of life, human or other, is sinful,” “the conviction that passive resistance is the only right way to oppose oppression,” and “the conviction that fighting is never worth while” (3). Among the three Macaulay least agrees with the first type; she clearly states that she does not advocate the absolute abolition of violence on the personal level. Macaulay acknowledges diverse opinions among pacifists about violence in general. Capital punishment is one example. Macaulay does not give her opinion. She simply implies that pacifism does not address the issue of capital punishment. According to Macaulay, pacifism is opposed to

mass violence: it “is, on its negative side, opposition to organized warfare, and, on its positive side, the attempt to remove war’s causes and to build up the conditions of peace” (3). The key word in her definition of pacifism is “attempt,” which explains her ambiguous yet realistic approach to peace by resisting and trying to abolish international conflict.

As to the second type of pacifism, Macaulay distinguishes an individual’s passive resistance to certain types of violence from mass passive resistance to war. Although she realizes that some accept absolute passive resistance to violence as the only guiding principle, she believes that some use of physical force, as a means to defend oneself or to help someone from being attacked, is justifiable. By recognizing the necessity of force in some cases, Macaulay anticipates the possible criticism from the non-pacifist’s perspective: “You say that this is inconsistent, because, as violence would be, it is an attempt to coerce” (4). Macaulay describes as “grotesque” the common conception of pacifism as passive resistance to all types of violence. She contends that some use of force is inevitable and accepted by the majority of pacifists. For Macaulay, there is a great difference between fighting against an attacker and making a war against the enemy with destructive weapons, and the difference should be clarified. In addition, unlike what some believe, pacifism does not mean to “object to the forcible arrest of criminals by the police” (4). Anyone who advocates absolute passive resistance on every occasion has no realistic view of organized war. Macaulay’s argument is similar to Huxley’s comment in An Encyclopedia of Pacifism, where Huxley divides violence into individual disputes and national disputes. By separating a policeman’s arrest of a criminal from a nation’s use of force to kill masses of people, Huxley argues: “To draw analogies between an army and a policeman, between war (however ‘righteous’ its aims) and the prevention of crime, is

utterly misleading” (59). What Macaulay opposes is the mass violence which has been often declared in the name of protecting a country from others.

After separating war from the force which is used against criminals in a civilized society, Macaulay discusses the third type of pacifism—the belief in mass non-violent resistance—with respect to civilization. This belief extends one country’s interests. However, Macaulay shows a keen sense of the difficulty in the manifestation of this belief despite its being the core of pacifism: it is an “attempt” or an “experiment, scarcely tried as yet in Europe” (5). Since it has not been carried out, she does not guarantee that it will abolish mass violence. She admits that it is hard to put into practice because of the easy means to which people have resorted, such as arming themselves on the basis of barbaric competition yet, paradoxically, in the name of civilization. As manifested in armament, “our civilization, our barbarism, is built on that age-old, bloody, trampled ground” (4). Macaulay implies that this civilization tied to armament is not the true civilization because armament only leads “civilized” people to “descend to the barbarian’s level” (5). Armament is indeed a menace to the true civilization, so the idea of disarmament “is worth a throw”: “it is an experiment which no nation or individual who claims and pretends civilization can afford not to try” (6). Macaulay’s focus on the idea of the experiment seems to weaken her argument, but it demonstrates that she is by no means naive.

Macaulay’s challenge to the justification of mass violence and her appeal for civilization lead to the questioning of patriotism. Macaulay is aware that many arguments for mass violence are related to the idea that people should support and defend their country. She gives examples in which the patriotism has justified barbarous laws and conventions of the government, such as laws against treason. Macaulay argues that the

laws allowed anyone who was convicted of treason to be “tortured, disemboweled and hanged” (7), and she goes on to mention the old practices of the church against heretics and witches, such as torturing and burning. She is convinced that such laws and practices cannot be supported by modern civilized people, although they were exercised for the sake of the country and humanity. Bringing up those conventions and laws, Macaulay suggests that organized war should not be accepted by civilized people because of its savage characteristics. Despite the apparent differences of modern warfare from the old practices, it also stimulates a barbaric human nature: “we break to pieces and burn out the eyes of the innocent citizens of the States with whom we are ‘at war.’ We mutilate, torture, and destroy; in doing so we engender hate, lies, meanness, narrow and cruel and silly nationalisms and party bigotries on all sides” (8). Referring to the “serviceable euphemisms which Mr. Aldous Huxley has deplored,” Macaulay points out that all the barbarous means are inoffensively described as ‘resisting the enemy’ or ‘self-defence’ (8). She gives another example: “We ‘christen’ bombing aeroplanes in champagne” (8). People should understand the underlying meanings of euphemistic words that are often used under the pretext of patriotism.

Macaulay repudiates the claim that the nation has engaged in war as a necessity. For her, no war can benefit a nation. In addition, since any war provokes the savage side of human nature, it seriously harms human civilization. From this point, Macaulay reviews the non-pacifist’s argument that the ending of war will not eliminate the barbarous side of human nature. Her response to the argument is that even if war is only one of the practices that reflect human barbarity, the effort to end it is not a waste. An example of such barbaric practices that are finally suppressed by the resisting effort is slavery. Likewise, the human race should try to end war. The peace effort keeps the

process of human civilization, for a war will create an environment full of human barbarity: “All will be hate, fury, tyranny, dictatorship, brutality, fear Culture will be gone, barbarism will reign, the clock will have swung back through the centuries to a darker age” (8).

An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist demonstrates the two attributes of Macaulay’s pacifism. First, Macaulay makes her points by presenting herself as a pacifist. Yet her approach to the issue does not meet the reader’s expectation, for it does not adopt the common division between pacifists and non-pacifists. It never suggests that the non-pacifist is the opposite of the pacifist. Macaulay truly believes that even the non-pacifist is fundamentally for peace because he is aware that a barbarous human nature underlies war: “You . . . point out that war is . . . a symptom of the whole horrid business of human behavior” (8). This view does not contradict her stand. It shows her perception that the contrast between the non-pacifist and the pacifist is more complicated than commonly accepted because even the former desires peace. Secondly, Macaulay does not give any indication that women have distinctive interests in peace. She presents her pacifism as a general doctrine with no allusion to a distinction between men and women. Only at one point, Macaulay states in parentheses her opinion on women in order to argue that war’s effect on them cannot be more disastrous than men. After explaining its tragic impact on children, Macaulay writes that “still less will I say women, for I can never see that it is worse to kill these than men” (7). Such a point echoes what she says about clichés in Catchwords and Claptrap (1926). Therein, Macaulay refers to a misleading, yet frequently employed statement during the First World War, “Go and fight for the women and children.” The statement, says Macaulay, indicates that the deaths of non-combatants somehow weighed heavy upon the general public’s mind despite the fact that much more

combatants were killed by the enemy. Macaulay asserts that the use of the word “children” is understandable, but not the word “woman”: “I do not profess to understand the full aura of associations . . . which surround the name *woman*.”⁵ Despite physical differences between the sexes, Macaulay does not take for granted the statement which implies that during a war the losses of women’s lives are more appalling than those of soldiers. Her idea is similar to a main point of George Orwell’s essay on a World War II pamphlet. In the essay, Orwell criticizes the phrases used in the pamphlet in order to oppose bombing attacks on non-combatants, such as “killing civilians” or “massacre of women and children.” Orwell asks: “Why is it worse to kill civilians than soldiers?”⁶ Long before civilian bombing during the Second World War, Macaulay already pointed out that “woman” was used as a catchword to justify war effort. Disputing the division between the sexes, Macaulay in this essay clearly expresses her opinions: pacifism means the opposition to organized warfare, which is distinguished from the justifiable force that is used to defend the individual; pacifism has to be attempted in order to make the process of human civilization continue, although it seems almost impossible to actualize such a plan.

“Aping the Barbarians” was published in the book Let Us Honor Peace (1937) along with other pacifists’ essays. One of them was Vera Brittain’s “Why I Stand for Peace.” In the introduction, Dick Sheppard, the founder of the Peace Pledge Union, writes that the essays show the diversity of pacifist views among members of the Union. One predominant idea underlying all the essays is that “pacifism is indeed more than a negative renunciation of war . . . the renunciation and elimination of war is but the first step in the construction of peace, the construction of peace but a step in the construction of a wiser, saner and more humane social order” (8). Macaulay’s essay focuses on the

meaning of civilization. It represents war as opposed to the process of civilization. Most of the arguments in the essay, such as the ideas that pacifism is worth trying to realize and that war provokes human barbarity, overlap with those in An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist. However, this essay provides more detailed arguments on the antagonism between war and civilization.

While in An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist Macaulay contemplates different definitions of pacifists before expressing her own opinions, in “Aping the Barbarians” she starts by recognizing people’s diverse perspectives on civilization. The concept of civilization varies from one nation to another and from one era to another. Alluding to remnants of uncivilized human life which continue despite all the process of civilization, Macaulay states: “everyone has his own ideas about this or that pest and the best way of getting rid of it That is to say . . . that part of the human race which is considered more civilized than some other parts. I suppose that even the less civilized have also rid themselves of certain pests but probably different pests” (9). However, the different ideas of civilization among individuals do not exclusively rely on the developmental differences among nations. Macaulay points out that there are three different opinions on one stage of civilization: “There is one stage in the advance towards that insubstantial, undefined condition that we call civilization when society sets about to rid itself of heretics and witches, another when half of it perceives that it must rid itself of the custom of destroying heretics and witches; yet another when so much opinion is united on this point that the persecution of heretics and witches actually ceases” (9). Macaulay’s argument is that the first idea of civilization, although it seemed reasonable at the time, cannot be accepted by civilized people of the present. The last two embody the meaning of civilization, yet only the third facilitates the process of civilization.

From this point, in connection with the three distinctive ideas of civilization, Macaulay makes the analogy between war and the barbaric practices against heretics and witches: “War, the settling or attempting to settle disputes between governments and sections of people by arming one section against another with destructive weapons, is, like heretic-burning and ordeal by torture, one of the primitive, age-old barbaric pests, which humanity is, it is hoped, slowly outgrowing as it staggers on its erratic and extremely dilatory way towards some form of adult civilization” (10). Macaulay believes that the majority of civilized people are against war as much as they are against the barbaric punishment inflicted upon those outcasts. Thus she argues that the civilized people must join the anti-war effort because war diminishes civilization, which advances at a very slow and inconsistent pace. Nevertheless, she is aware that people, despite their comparatively civilized environment, have shown ambiguous attitudes toward war. Based on civilized people’s attitudes toward war, Macaulay distinguishes them into three groups. Some of them, like the people who believed the cruel execution against heretics and witches to be part of civilization, see war as “unfortunate but unavoidable.” Macaulay considers these people as the “very little civilized” masses. They are easily manipulated by their government, which has no interest in the process of civilization; they are infatuated with patriotism and nationalism. They encourage the younger generation to prepare for war even in peace time. Macaulay points out that although the armaments of the nations do not seem to endanger civilization in peace time, they lead to mass conflict because other nations are likely to start arming themselves. Thus the argument to equip a nation with weapons for a future war generates a peril to civilization.

Unlike the “very little civilized” masses, some people are civilized enough to object to war in general, yet they favor war for certain causes. These people do see the

barbarity, not just regretfulness, in war, but they accept war because they either believe that a war is the only means to save civilization or proclaim that a war will end all wars. They also consent to armament in the belief that “they will . . . fight if necessary, fight if attacked, fight for liberty, democracy, civilization, culture, peace, nationality, empire, survival: in brief, for their country” (12). Despite their noble beliefs, they, says Macaulay, seem to dismiss the fact that once a nation engages in war, the people of the nation “join the barbarian game” (12). Furthermore, even if the nation ends up winning the war, it scarcely guarantees the people liberty, democracy, civilization, and culture, which its citizens expect to enjoy after the war. Therefore, the civilized people who realize the barbarity in warfare should join the pacifists, whom Macaulay describes as “more civilized,” if they are sincere in their desire to save civilization.

Pacifists are the people who not only denounce war as barbaric but also attempt to stop exercising such means. They believe that a nation which has been prepared for war can not be permanently at peace with others. In order to establish the pacifist’s contention, Macaulay notes the self-contradicting arguments of the people who justify a certain war despite their abhorrence of it. Disputing their argument that a nation has to go to war in order to protect its own democracy and liberty, she asserts that a nation at war does not fully appreciate democracy and liberty because it becomes “a nation dragooned into acceptance of the Fascist state” (14). She also quotes a statement of Max Plowman, the General Secretary of the Peace Pledge Union: “In order to meet it with equal force you must adopt its ethic . . . just as in 1914 those of us who dreamed of ‘a war to end war’ had to become as completely militaristic as our enemies . . . Fighting Fascism by armed means implies becoming Fascist in order to fight Fascism” (14). All nations at war use the same tactics. Macaulay describes the tactics in disgust: “propaganda, hate, lies,

intolerance, xenophobia, and all other stupid phobias, the fevered excitement of the third-rate mind, silly nationalisms, fear, selfishness, shocking cruelties on all sides which before long cease to shock, savage determination to give as good or as bad as is received, the loss of all standards of civility, culture and intelligence, terrified animal concentration on survival" (14). All these repugnant tactics, accompanied by weapons, aim at mass killing of another nation's population. Thus the argument that war is a justifiable means for the noble cause leads to a paradox: "if you kill enough people at once, it is no longer murder, it is patriotism, or class war, or the saving of civilization" (16). Weapons used for mass destruction endanger civilization. For the sake of civilization, every nation must stop arming itself. Even if other nations are in favor of warfare and armament, civilized people should not let their nation join those others. If they do, they make the same mistake that all savages have made, which results in a block to the process of civilization.

Macaulay makes a strong point that war is incompatible with a civilized society. Nevertheless, she is not optimistic about the practicability of her argument. About the effort for disarmament, which she calls a "gamble," Macaulay comments: "It might lose on the throw Or it might not; though I should not care to put much money on that hope myself. But it seems worth while that some power should try it" (16). She suggests that the effort might lack realities of the time in which many civilized people view armament as necessary despite their abhorrence of war. She stresses her point by describing the pacifist's effort for disarmament as a worthwhile experiment. The alternative to the experiment is, Macaulay argues, "war and more war, stupid and cruel destruction . . . until the jungle swallows him [the savage] up and the world as we know it crashes in ruins" (16). Because she acknowledges both the necessity and the impracticability of the pacifist's effort for disarmament, Macaulay sets up the meaning of

such an effort: “it is worth while . . . to keep on talking about disarmament, if only to keep the idea alive . . . it seems worth while that all those who feel strongly on the matter should continue to protest against the present intemperate and nerve-ridden unreason which impels civilized and humane persons to ape the distasteful ferocity of the barbarians” (17).

As she focuses on the issue of civilization, Macaulay again does not suggest any difference between men and women. Only at one point does she differentiate men from women by employing the term “boys”: she argues that non-pacifists who condone war “bring up the boys of the nation in military formation, making them march to militant songs, making them chant in chorus” (11). Macaulay merely describes the exclusive gender roles which boys are driven to play. Her connection between boys’ militancy and their training is similar to Huxley’s comment on boys’ education in a totalitarian nation. Huxley quotes a paragraph from Bertrand Russell’s *Which Way to Peace?*, which stresses “the connection between discipline in schools and a love of war in later life” (47-48). Similarly, Macaulay believes that boys are trained to be warlike. Her argument about boy’s manipulated militancy reveals that her pacifism is grounded on gender division, not sex division.

Considering her view of civilized people, Macaulay seems to be an idealist. However, she always acknowledges the diversity among people in society. She is very much aware that not everybody exhibits that civility which typifies human nature. She indeed states that human nature is Janus-faced, savage and civilized, regardless of the process of civilization. In her article “What I Believe,” she expresses her opinion on this bivalent nature of civilized human beings: “Strange enough it is that, in the same race of mammal bipeds, this stupid, barbarous vulgarity should thrive side by side with learning,

wit, civilization, philosophy, beauty, poetry, art, science, genius, generosity, nobility, courage, elegance, and the highest dreams of the imagination. Strange indeed, but so it is” (665). Her words “stupid barbarous vulgarity” reveal her disgust at the savage nature of people. Nonetheless, Macaulay does not disregard the undesirable nature of civilized people. Neither does she overlook the savage nature’s prevalence, although intermittent, over the civilized nature all through human history. Therefore, she cannot but emphasize the significance of the pacifist’s attempt. Her belief in pacifism does not sound firm, but it deals with realities. This realism is tied to her knowledge of literature of war and peace, which has displayed the conflict between the savage nature and the civilized nature, as displayed in All in a Maze (1938).

All in a Maze is an anthology of literature on peace and war since the era of Euripides to the years immediately preceding World War II. It was a project of the International Peace Campaign. Daniel George Bunting compiled the anthology, and Macaulay supposedly rendered “some assistance” to him, as noted on the title page of the book. She “read, commented on, checked translations and variants, and edited page after page of excerpts.”⁷ In addition, she wrote an introduction, in which she gave an overview of the history of war literature. The introduction embodies Macaulay’s idea that throughout history the civilized side of human nature has coexisted with its savage side, while echoing the other themes that have been evident so far in her essays. The anthology contains excerpts of Macaulay’s “Aping the Barbarians,” entitled “Acting like Savages,” and her poem “Peace Treaty,” written on June 28, 1919. The poem deals with the peace treaty, yet the narrator is not free from war anxiety: “Our peace . . . your peace . . . I see neither:/ They are a dream, and a dream.” A peace treaty does not guarantee permanent

peace. The main idea of the poem is similar to the predominant theme of Macaulay's introduction to the anthology.

The purpose of the anthology, according to Macaulay, is "to illustrate . . . the continual clash between man's sense of the horror, the folly, and the barbarous waste of this insistent doom, and the recurrent fits of madness in which he plunges into it with noble, savage, and often pious cries; between his impassioned praises of peace and his angry kickings of the gentle goddess downstairs; between, in brief, man's civility and his barbarity" (7-8). Macaulay calls the conflict between two sides of human nature a "paradox." Since ancient Greece, writers have depicted this paradox in civilization. Euripides stated that "fools rush on war" and "mankind are fools" (7). Not all Greeks shared his disapproval of war. Pericles gave a speech on "the sacrifice of the glorious dead and their happy parents" (8). Macaulay describes Pericles' idea of war as "the self-flattering age-old error" which reflects "the confusion that has obsessed all those who glorify war by speaking as if its essence were self-sacrifice and dying, instead of sacrificing others and killing" (8). By contrasting the two contemporaries' conflicting views of war, Macaulay shows the existence of the paradox in the same period.

Such a paradox continues in later times, and it becomes very complicated as the human race not simply supports war but rationalizes it. Macaulay notes the paradox which has appeared among Christians. The tie among Christianity and patriotism and war was solidified by the time Thomas Aquinas exhorted the clergy's duty in righteous wars. In contrast, Wycliffe questioned the rationale of the killing in war time, which could not be justified in the time of peace: "many men with right of law withstand their enemies, and yet they kill them not . . . Lord! what honor falls to a knight that he kills many men?—the hangman killeth more, and with a better title" (9). As Christianity became

blended with humanism during the Renaissance, such denunciation of war continued. However, here Macaulay notes that voices of Christian pacifists were by no means unanimous. Reginald Pecock took a grave view of “the absolute pacifist position” for Christians. Looking at human perspectives on war, Martin Luther reached to “a kind of dual-personality theory”: a Christian is a spiritual and, at the same time, a temporal person. Macaulay summarizes his theory: “in the case of an assault on his wife ‘I would lay aside the spiritual person and make use of the temporal’” (9). Luther did not take the absolute pacifist stand⁸ that Pecock held, yet he was vehemently against firearms. Despite the diversity in them, all these anti-war views, from the absolute pacifist position to the opposition to fire-arms, are opposed to militarism. If simply divided into pacifist Christians and non-pacifist Christians, Lollards, Anabaptists, Socinians, and Quakers could be grouped into anti-war sects; on the other hand, many preachers of the main denominations shared the positive view of war. Cardinal Bellarmine’s praise of military leaders sums up the strong tie between Christianity and patriotism: “those religious generals and commanders who teach their men by word and example how to shed the blood of the enemy without offence to God” (10).

Macaulay also calls attention to diverse definitions of such terms as peacemongers and conscientious objectors. Captain Pill in Barnaby Rich’s The Fruites of Long Experience (1604) describes “peacemongers” as people who do “not hear of keeping up national defences till they have news that the beacons be on fire about their ears” (10). He uses the term in order to throw contempt on pacifists. Macaulay notes that the Oxford English Dictionary cited the derogatory definition of the word two centuries earlier. Such a definition is not completely wrong because peacemongers in general do not accept the argument for national defense, as shown in Émeric Crucé’s advocacy for the League of

Nations in the twentieth century. Nevertheless, as if denouncing the derogatory implication of the very definition, Macaulay calls Émeric Crucé “that great peacemonger” and comments on his idea as a “delightful thought” (10). Likewise, definitions of another term “conscientious objectors” are not unanimous. Hugo Grotius views conscientious objectors as people who oppose war. By comparison, Francisco de Vitoria defines them as the people who are not convinced of the justice of a war and argued that they should not be forced to fight the war they do not believe in. According to Francisco, conscientious objectors are not fundamentally against war.

Macaulay further discusses the complexity of approaches to war by displaying the diversity among people whom Macaulay calls “isolationists” or “escapists” and who are capable of living “in easeful detachment from the fray” (10). These people are distinguished from “bewildered civilized thinkers up against barbarism” whom she discusses later in this essay. Starting with a “recluse poet” and an “embittered scholar,” Macaulay lists thirty diverse types of people, from a “bluff Christian general” to a cynic. Approximately two thirds of the people approve of war either because they accede to clichés about war, such as patriotism or some leaders’ justification of war in the name of God, or because they are concerned about the finance with respect to warfare. Among the rest of the people, some have just negative feelings about barbarity; others made unrealistic suggestions, such as one who wants to buy enemies instead of making war on them; and some poor people disapprove of war by asking “why should a man die for his country when he hasn’t got any of it and won’t be given any” (12). Thus, despite their resentment of war, they are different from people who not only oppose war but also look into human nature and the meaning of civilization. Macaulay seems to suggest that even if a person, like a “kindly female author,” has compassion upon a suffering enemy, she

cannot be regarded as a “civilized thinker.” For Macaulay, “the urbane eighteenth century man of the world, with his humane and civilized disgust for all such barbarous nonsense” was not one of the civilized thinkers, either (11). She considers that civilized thinkers recognize both human barbarity and civility.

Macaulay describes civilized thinkers: “the horrific describer of battle-field anguish, blood and stench, of men writhing away their last moments in ditches; the writer ‘would fain asunder the veil from the sore places of war . . . does it become us to let others endure what we cannot bear even to think of?’”; “the hopeful and rational thinker, who ‘firmly believes that war . . . will one day be reckoned more absurd than if people were to settle an argument over the dinner-table with their knives’” (13). Distaste for war underlies the beliefs of the civilized thinkers. Yet not all civilized thinkers can be regarded as pacifists. Some of them revealed that distaste also “grows for the half mystical exalted exultation which has always made some men and women drunk at the thought of war” (13). The combination between distaste and exultation not only parallels the paradox which Macaulay earlier discussed but also explains a different angle on it. For example, De Quincey’s view of war implies his dislike of war, yet it certainly manifests his exultation in it. He wrote about “war’s ‘ineffable relation to hidden grandeurs in man . . . the idea of mixed crusade and martyrdom, doing and suffering, that finds its realization in a battle such as that of Waterloo . . . so that the tutelary angel of man, when he traverses such a dreadful field’” (13). Macaulay views De Quincey’s exalted ardor as more distasteful than “the hearty manly contempt” which simply contrasts with denunciation of war. Similar to De Quincey, Ruskin described joy in looking at “war-bereaved parents sobbing ‘the old Seyton war-cry, Set on’” (14). From Ruskin’s expression, Macaulay sees the exploitation of the press. She mentions a

civilized thinker Reverend George Beaumont's The Warrior's Looking Glass (1808), which reveals his "distaste for 'a set of men who . . . ought to rank among the vilest of the vile, I mean News-printers,' whom . . . he blamed for most recent wars" (14). Reverend Beaumont's statement sets a precedent for civilized thinkers' dislike of the press which has emphasized the exultation that paradoxically arises from human barbarity.

Macaulay finally reaches diverse voices of war expressed in the twentieth century. The people's various responses at the time are depicted as "the oddest utterances, degraded, sublime, agonized, complacent, odious, perplexed" (14). Macaulay uses a metaphor to describe the intricacy of all the opinions: a maze, which "has thickened to an intolerable sad mess" (14). And she points out that even in post-war era, the maze does not disappear. In a time of peace, the prevailing opinion is for peace. Nonetheless, the conflict between people who attempt to keep peace and people who desire to make war remains to be solved: "flocks of vigilant and somewhat nervous doves cooing in the chimneys of munition factories, while 'the melancholic eye sees fleets and armies in the sky'" (15). The diverse ideas, which may be simply divided into two main principles, warmongerism and peacemongerism, have been written throughout history. Macaulay outlines the history: "four-and twenty centuries of peace dreams and plans, of war fears and facts, of pacifism, militarism, conscientious objection, martial ardor and odes, propaganda, protests, Christianity up against a dire dilemma, the rational voice of intelligence lifted in vain, war preparations, wars to end war, war as medicine, the excellent spirit of the troops, all our old familiar friends" (15).

By providing a brief history of war literature, this essay manifests not only Macaulay's firm pacifist stand but also, as one who could not "live in easeful detachment," her understanding of the intricacies of approaching war and peace. She

perceives the clash between human civility and human barbarity in war literature. However, she can not simplify the clash between the two sides of human nature into a conflict between the nature of the peacemonger and the nature of the warmonger. Not all warmongers disdain to note barbarity; some warmongers appear to be for peace by employing the same rhetoric as peacemongers do.⁹ Moreover, Macaulay distinguishes one's exclusively personal reaction from the pacifist's belief. The latter focuses on human civility. She does not consider a person who only expresses his or her strong distaste for war as a pacifist. Constance Smith argues that Macaulay's pacifism has "strong emotional roots" and that it is grounded in nothing more than "a revulsion against violence and cruelty" (141). However, Macaulay's fundamental belief is that one's personal emotional reaction to war should not be identified with the pacifist principle. As discussed earlier in her definition of pacifism, a person's conviction to oppose war, which is mass violence, should be accompanied by his or her effort to prevent it. In addition, the person's pacifist conviction should be rooted in his or her understanding of human nature with the purpose of saving civilization.

Because Macaulay's pacifism focuses on the impact of war on humanity and the prevention of it, it is not specifically presented from a woman's perspective. However, this essay reveals Macaulay's awareness of the difference between men and women in producing war literature. Among over thirty warmongers and peacemongers, Macaulay mentions only one woman: "the kindly female author, with her right-minded and impartial compassion for the suffering foe" (12). The proportion of women to men indicates that men's voices have dominated in a history of war literature, although Macaulay never suggests that women would approach war from a distinctive perspective. When referring to the war literature of the World War I period, she admits that the

anthology All in a Maze gave priority to soldiers' poems. About writings of non-combatants she says that "most civilian verse at this time is better left [out]" (14). The domination of men's writings on war and peace, mainly based on their experiences on the battlefield, cannot be overlooked. In this introduction to the anthology, Macaulay does not express her opinions on the soldiers' poems. However, as she always examines the underlying meanings of general ideas in relation to war, pacifism, civilization, the dichotomy between "the peacemonger" and "the warmonger", and the struggle between civility and barbarity, she explores the tradition of soldiers' poetry in her novel Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract. Macaulay probably never wished to discuss the difference between men and women in her novels. Nevertheless, considering that writers' direct experiences in the front were of great value, Macaulay as a female writer could not but challenge the canon of war literature, which has excluded women's writings on war.

Notes

¹ Rose Macaulay, Letters to a Sister 62.

² Macaulay, Letters to a Sister 89.

³ Macaulay does not directly give her definition of civilization, although she frequently uses the term, especially in "Aping the Barbarians" and The World My Wilderness. Her writings imply that civilization fundamentally contrasts with barbarism and that civilized beings are opposite to barbarians. Macaulay believes in the progress of civilization. Nevertheless, in her writings, Macaulay also points out that the civilization we know is far from true civilization which is antithetical with barbarism, because this civilized world has not succeeded in abolishing war. Macaulay's idea of civilization corresponds to her belief in peace efforts.

⁴ See Jane Emery, Rose Macaulay: A Writer's Life (London: Murray, 1991) 249-50.

⁵ Macaulay, Catchwords and Claptrap (London: Hogarth, 1926) 25-26.

⁶ George Orwell, The Collected Essays, Journals and Letters of George Orwell: As I Please, 1943-1945, ed. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus, vol. 3 (New York: Harcourt, 1968) 151. In response to Vera Brittain's pamphlet, Seed of Chaos, Orwell criticizes Brittain's appeal for restriction of the bombing. His main point is that a pacifist Brittain should accept the fact that war is not avoidable and that war affects both civilians and combatants.

⁷ Emery 254.

⁸ Luther in fact believed that killing could be justifiable because he completed the sentence by saying that "I would slay him in the act or call for help." See All in a Maze, ed. Daniel George (London: Collins, 1938) 73.

⁹ In the introduction, Macaulay does not mention the absurdity of some warmongers' arguments, such as Hitler's speeches which seemingly oppose war. All in a Maze contains four excerpts from Hitler's speeches in 1938. His speeches typify some warmongers' misleading arguments. Referring to his order to strengthen armed forces on the front, Hitler says, "these most gigantic efforts of all times have been made at my request in the interest of peace." See All in a Maze 466.

CHAPTER II

POTTERISM: A TRAGI-FARCICAL TRACT: "WE NEVER
KNOW THE 'THING SEEN'"

Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, Macaulay's first best-seller, is a satire on the powerful newspaper of a fictional publisher Percy Potter, who later becomes Lord Pinkerton. The novel deals with the period of time from 1912 through World War I to 1920, but its focus is on the post-war era. Through the novel Macaulay satirizes the tendencies of the British press during the early twentieth century. Alice Bensen accurately points out that Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract is "a fictional attack on an actual contemporary form of harmful gigantism, the sensational press. During the war, the press as a whole had undergone such unprecedented development under the leadership of Lord Northcliffe and Mr. Aitken (later Lord Beaverbrook) in conjunction with the political maneuvering of Lloyd George" (68). The tendencies of the press, such as commercialization of news, degeneration into the public's vulgar tastes, and sensationalism, were observable in the daily newspapers developed at the end of the nineteenth century. During the First World War the press reached its highest point of influencing the public as it contributed to creating a great surge of patriotic enthusiasm. Part of its contribution resulted from its fabrication of facts in the name of patriotism, as demonstrated in a statement distributed by the press bureau during the war: "Essential not literal truth and correctness are necessary. Inherent probability being respected, the thing imagined may be as serviceable as the thing seen."¹

Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, however, exposes more than vulgar, irresponsible journalism that distorts facts. The novel shows that the trend which the Potter press represents—sensationalism, melodrama, sentimentalism, and commercialism—infiltrate every circle of human life. Macaulay’s dedication of the novel implies the extent that the trend saturates human life. The novel is dedicated “to the unsentimental precisians in thought, who have, on this confused, inaccurate, and emotional planet, no fit habitation” (v). The place is not even confined to England. The description of the planet as “confused, inaccurate, and emotional” indicates that the world itself is imbued with the trend toward vulgarity. Journalism is the main target of the criticism, yet the novel also deals with similar tendencies of the Potter press in literature, religion, and politics.

Among several subjects, this chapter explores the way literature is affected by the popular press. In so doing, it examines Macaulay’s opinion of the popular literature of the First World War. This popular literature is far from the kind of literature produced by artists who could be defined as “unsentimental precisians” who always seek truth. An epigraph of the novel reveals Macaulay’s idea of artists:

We see the narrow world our windows show us not in itself, but in relation to our own needs, moods, and preferences Unless we happen to be artists—and then but rarely—we never know the “thing seen” in its purity It is disinterestedness, the saint’s and poet’s love of things for their own sakes When . . . the verb “to have” is ejected from the center of your consciousness . . . your attitude to life will cease to be commercial and become artistic. Then the guardian at the gate, scrutinizing and sorting the incoming impressions, will no longer ask,

“What use is this to *me*?” . . . You see things at last as the artist does, for their sake, not for your own. (vi)

Artists convey the “thing seen” in their works and help viewers to see it. They are certainly different from writers who distort facts or truth in order to heighten sensation. In this novel, Macaulay does not present an artist whose war literature enables the reader to grasp the “thing seen.” She seems to be mainly concerned with aspects of the popular war literature produced by pseudo-artists. I shall show that Macaulay’s critical view of this literature is grounded in her pacifism, which is very much tied to her challenge to traditional gender divisions. In order to explore her beliefs, I shall also examine a few poems that Macaulay wrote before she chose the novel as the proper form for the presentation of her ideas.

As it criticizes war literature, Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract considers a soldier poet’s poetry and a woman writer’s fiction. In the novel, the first depicts the combatant’s experience at the front and presents his negative view of war. It is similar to the poetry of Siegfried Sassoon in that it not only conveys the author’s anti-war voice but also portrays women as a group of people who take advantage of men’s sacrifices during wartime. In contrast, the second represents the woman writer’s blind acceptance of heroism and patriotism. Thematically, the woman writer’s fiction is close to the poetry of Rupert Brooke, which encompasses conventional, traditional concepts of war. It romanticizes soldiers as heroes and advocates the noble cause of war. However, the jingoism in the woman writer’s novels contradicts itself when the author considers common soldiers as expendable. For her, common soldiers are not heroes, who cannot be sacrificed. Thus the poetry of Rupert Brooke and her writing are not really similar after all. In addition, the woman writer’s choice of a literary form is the novel, not poetry. Ironically, the images of

women that the soldier poet laid out in his poetry are confirmed by the woman novelist's messages of honor and glory as well as by her idea that soldiers only exist to sacrifice their lives for their country.

With emphasis on these two kinds of war literature, this chapter intends to reveal Macaulay's awareness of her position as a woman writer who has been generally considered to have no authoritative voice in writing about war. In Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, there is no woman writer whose literary work contrasts with the war literature of soldier poets or patriotic women writers. However, Macaulay challenges the canon of such war literature by questioning its value as good literature. Furthermore, Macaulay's depiction of war literature explains the basis of her own war literature, which carries pacifist themes and dismisses sex division between men and women. Her anti-war ideas may be close to those of soldier poets who express disillusionment about war. Yet, unlike the combatants' literature, her anti-war writings do not focus on soldiers on a battlefield. As manifested in her article "The Return to Horridness in Literature" (1933), Macaulay believes that description of a battlefield in detail does not serve as "a legitimate or a desirable element in art." Therein Macaulay contends that a terrible battlefield should not be the center of literary experience in war literature:

. . . since war is a horrid business, war books must be horrid or else liars.

Our war novelists and diarists have not flinched; brave warriors trained in a tough school, how seldom do they write as I should feel inclined to write did I feel it my duty to recall such intolerable memories, "I then saw some corpses," or "Near me a man was blown to bits"; they describe the corpses and the dismembered man with merciless detail, till the reader, trained in

no such bitter school, falls sick Art must not be tested by the
 revulsions of stomach or nerves. (329)

Macaulay is critical of the war literature that only describes the horror of a battlefield. She also recognizes that men in combat can be killers as well as victims, and she dismisses the idea that combatants are heroes. Men's gender roles as soldiers have led them to a horrific experience of killing, and their mind affected by their war experience is sometimes revealed even when they conduct civilian lives once a war is over. Because of her unromanticized view of combatants, Macaulay's position is decidedly opposite to that of jingoistic women novelists. By presenting the perspectives of a combatant and a non-combatant on war literature, Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract demonstrates Macaulay's efforts to establish a kind of war literature different not only from that of soldier poets but also that of women writers who naively believed in patriotism and heroism.

Potterism

Throughout the novel, the reader is constantly reminded of Potterism by five narrators—three anti-Potters, one Potter, and the authorial narrator, R. M. Because of their almost unanimous opinions on Potterism, the novel gave Virginia Woolf the impression that it had an “atmosphere of [a] lecture room.”² Even the Potterite narrator, Leila Yorke, the wife of the newspaper Lord Percy Potter, is aware that the term “Potterism” was coined by the Anti-Potter League and has been used in a derogatory sense, although she disdains to consider it. Her scorn at the term, however, does not carry strength, for her narrative ironically underlines the negative aspects of Potterism, which are repeatedly discussed by the anti-Potterites. The three anti-Potter narrators—Arthur Gideon, Katherine Varick, and Laurence Juke—stress certain fields in which Potterism

prevails, according to their main interests. Gideon focuses on Potterism in journalism and literature; Katherine approaches it from her scientific viewpoint; Juke is mainly concerned about it in religion. The differences among them indicate the prevalence of Potterism in human life. In addition, although the three anti-Potter narrators agree with overall meanings of Potterism, each of them has slightly variant opinions on it.

First, for Gideon every aspect of Potterism is repugnant to his beliefs. As the leader of the Anti-Potter League before the war, Gideon never forgets a sense of mission as an anti-Potter. After coming home from the front, he starts the editorship of the Weekly Fact in the belief that he opposes the Potter press with the weekly publication. His interpretation of Potterism represents how much he dislikes it: "Potterism has, for one of its surest bases, fear. The other bases are ignorance, vulgarity, mental laziness, sentimentality, and greed" (75). He also describes several aspects of Potterism: "The ignorance which does not know facts; the vulgarity which cannot appreciate values; the laziness which will not try to learn either of these things; the sentimentality which, knowing neither, is stirred by the valueless and the untrue; the greed which grabs and exploits. But fear is worst; the fear of public opinion, the fear of scandal, the fear of independent thought, of loss of position, of discomfort, of consequences, of truth" (75). Gideon always tries to be completely opposite to anything that he believes is Potterish. He is an idealist who fights against the gigantic force of Potterism and aims to eliminate Potterism of the people whose habitual acts contribute to creating Potterite surroundings. Gideon defines Potterish people as "every artist directly he thinks of his art as something marketable, something to bring him fame; every scientist or scholar (if there are any) who fakes a fact in the interest of his theory; every fool who talks through his hat without knowing; every sentimentalist who plays up to the sentimentalism in himself and other

people; every second-hand ignoramus who takes over a view or a prejudice wholesale, without investigating the facts it's based on for himself" (246). Eventually Gideon becomes overwhelmed by the prevailing practices of the Potterites. Gideon's idealism collapses as he realizes defeat in his fight against Potterism.

Compared with Gideon's antagonism against Potterism, Katherine, a chemist, approaches it in an objective manner. Although she clearly sees negative effects the Potter press creates, she is not annoyed by them. She views Potterism as a subject of study and feels joy in studying it. Katherine's definition of Potterism is similar to Gideon's in that she regards Potterism as "humbug, sentimentality, commercialism, and genuine feeling" (143). However, studying such elements of Potterism gives her pleasure. Thus Katherine thinks that "Potterism is a wonderful thing" (143). Unlike Gideon, she does not fight against Potterism. She simply accepts Potterish facts. When talking about the writings of the Potter press on the war, she points out that the popular Potter press, which she believes has "the unthinking rightness of the fool," appears to be right because it speaks for the public. She states: "intellectual people are always thinking above the heads of the people who make movements, so they're nearly always out. The Pinkerton press *is* the people, so it gets there every time. Potterism will outlive all the reformers and idealists. If Potterism says we're going to have a war, we have it" (36). Since Gideon agreed with the Potter press at the beginning of the war, he may not be one of the idealists whom Katherine discusses here. Nevertheless, her statement foretells Gideon's downfall from his idealism in opposition to Potterism. It also manifests her insight into the connection between jingoism and Potterism and explains a crucial aspect of Leila Yorke's writing that espouses jingoism. Katherine remains anti-Potterite all along because of her detachment from not only the initial enthusiasm for the war but also from her own

sentiment. Such a trait is confirmed by Juke: “we can’t all be clear and steely unsentimentalists like Katherine Varick” (193).

As a parson, Juke’s main concern about Potterism lies in religion. He states that “Potterism has no room for Christianity . . . the Potterites have taken Christianity and watered it down to suit themselves” (19). Nevertheless, he does not have the same degree of antagonism against Potterism as Gideon does. As Katherine describes, he tends to be optimistic, despite the fact that his beliefs do not materialize: he is “still touchingly full of faith, even after all that has and hasn’t happened, in a new heaven and a new earth. He believed at that time that the League of Nations was going to kill war . . . that the Christian Church was going to kill selfishness . . . and that we were all going to kill Potterism” (156). Juke does not struggle with realities, although he always wishes to change them. This approach is also shown in his opinion of the two sides of Potterism. Pointing out the differences between two Potter sisters, Juke divides Potterism into “the intellectual and moral,” which can be rephrased into exploitation and sentimentalism respectively. He says: “Clare, the ignorant, muddle-headed sentimentalist; Jane, reacting against this, but on her part grabbing and exploiting. Their attitude towards truth was typical; Clare couldn’t see it; Jane saw it perfectly clearly, and would reject it without hesitation if it suited her book. Clare was like her mother, only with better, simpler stuff in her; Jane was rather like her father in her shrewd native wit, only, while he was vulgar in his mind, she was only vulgar in her soul” (198). Juke’s analysis of the Potters reflects the general definitions of Potterism which Gideon and Katherine share. His description of the Potterites indicates that he finds them disagreeable. Nonetheless, Juke eventually accepts the realities created by the Potterites. He is very much disturbed by Clare’s sentimentalism, but contends that “one has to learn to bear sentimentalism. In parishes

(which are the world) one has to endure it, accept it. It is part of the general muddle and mess” (193). Concerning the exploiting side of Potterism, he expresses his initial inclination to believe that “the only unforgivable sin is exploitation” (177). However, as his thought progresses, his view changes: “Exploitation of human needs and human weaknesses and human tragedies, for one’s own profit And, as we very nearly all do it . . . let us hope that even that isn’t quite unforgivable. Yes, we nearly all do it We all exploit other people” (177). Juke realizes that in a strict sense everyone is a Potterite one way or the other. A Potterite is distinguished from a non-Potterite only by the extent that a person exercises Potterism. In his view, there is a great difference between Gideon, whose emotion is slightly tainted because of his love for Jane, and Clare, whose sentiment is overwhelming.

The definitions of all three anti-Potterite narrators overlap one another. They are also expanded from the original meaning of Potterism. As the name connotes, Potterism is typified by the Potters, although it is not bounded to them. The authorial narrator explains: “Potterism had very certainly not been created by the Potters, and was indeed no better represented by the goods with which they supplied the market than by those of many others; but it was a handy name, and it had taken the public fancy that here you had two Potters linked together, two souls nobly yoked, one supplying Potterism in fictional, the other in newspaper, form” (13). The two Potters are Percy Potter and his wife, Leila Yorke. The narrator sees that Potterism, which directly signifies the trend of journalism toward giving priority to immediacy of interest and easy readability, offers a framework for literature. Literature that adopts the journalistic principle focuses on appeals to public sentiment. In addition, it is characterized by exploitation. As defined in the novel,

Potterism in relation to literature means “the antithesis of the artist’s spirit, which lived beauty for what it was, and did not want to exploit it” (18).

The Potterish Literature

The main characteristics of the Potterish literature are sentimentalism and exploitation, as summarized by Juke in reference to the Potter family. The Potterish literature represents the writings of Leila Yorke, Johnny, and Jane. Among the three Potter writers, Leila Yorke and Johnny produce literary works about the war, which typify the Potterish literature on war. In the two writers’ works, both aspects of Potterism—sentimentalism and exploitation—are intermingled, although the first suits Leila Yorke’s writing, whereas the second does Johnny’s. Leila Yorke’s writing seemingly lacks the second aspect. Making a comparison between her work and Percy Potter’s, Jane points out, “If you do that sort of thing at all, you might as well make a job of it, and sell a million copies Mother’s merely commonplace; she’s not even a by-word—quite. I admire dad more. Dad anyhow gets there. His stuff sells” (6). As Clare is described more than one time as a type of heroine in her fiction, sentimentalism rather than exploitation typifies Leila Yorke’s literature. Nevertheless, most of her publications are popular enough to be profitable. Only her Socialist Cecily did not sell very well because of the outbreak of World War I. Although Leila pretends not to be interested in making profit, her decision to stop writing for a short period during the war indicates her profit-oriented mind. As the authorial narrator remarks, “Mrs. Potter put away the writing of fiction, as unsuitable in these dark days. (It may be remembered that there was a period at the beginning of the war when it was erroneously supposed that fiction would not sell until peace returned)” (27).

In comparison, Johnny writes for the purpose of being successful and making profit, and he openly admits it. He is a kind of Potterish writer who, in Gideon's words, "directly thinks of his art as something marketable, something to bring him fame" (246). After coming back from the front, Johnny writes war poetry based on his war experience. Before the war, he harbored an ambition for writing somewhat different from his mother's. He opposes not the exploitative nature but the sentimentalism of his mother's fiction as well as of his father's press. After all, he is a Potterite with a strong tendency to pursue profit. As Jane says, such disposition is "in the blood" (37). Johnny produces literary works which indisputably fit in the exploiting side of Potterism. Nonetheless, his literature is not completely free from sentimentalism because it has a tendency to invoke sentiment by following the conventions of war poetry. "An appeal to sentiment over the head" characterizes one key aspect of Potterism (19). Johnny's writing on war turns out to be somewhat tainted with the key element of his mother's fiction.

As evidenced by Percy Potter's title, *Lord Pinkerton*, which he obtained in the middle of the war, Potterism prospered during the war, and its prosperity continues. So does the Potterish literature. Although the term Potterism is not employed, such trend is well summarized in Macaulay's novel *Told By an Idiot* (1923): "Never, perhaps, was thinking, writing and talking looser, vaguer, and more sentimental than in the years following the European war. It was as if that disaster had torn great holes in the human intelligence, which it could ill afford. There was much writing, both of verse and prose" (306). Johnny and Leila Yorke go with the stream. Throughout *Potterism*, both of them produce writings on various topics. Certainly the war is not the only issue that they write about. Yet a focus on the two Potters' writings on the war demonstrates that they exemplify two types of war literature. Johnny's poetry represents the kind of war

literature written by soldier writers who had experience of the front, while Leila Yorke's fiction typifies a woman writer's war literature which emulates men's war experience by focusing on her war activities on the home front. The first has been believed to be the authentic voice about the war because of its author's direct war experience. On the other hand, the second is considered to be a product of a non-combatant's image of men's war experience. Such productions are ridiculed by men who believe in the authority of war literature, as manifested in Ernest Hemingway's remark about Willa Cather's depiction of a battle scene: "Poor woman she has to get her war experience somewhere."³ Making connections between Potterism and the writings on World War I, Macaulay questions a value of the popular war literature by combatants as well as of non-combatants' writings about the war.

Johnny's poetry delivers the horror of war and combatants' alienation from non-combatants, especially from women. On this ground, his poetry is similar to that of Siegfried Sassoon. In order to discuss the combatant's poems, Macaulay gives voice to Gideon, who went to fight in the belief that his country was going to win the war. Gideon has had firsthand observation of the battle, which becomes the center of soldiers' literary experience. After his co-editor, Peacock, decided to publish Johnny's poems, Gideon expresses his opinion of them:

Peacock . . . accepts poetry; poetry about the war, by people like Johnny Potter. Every one knows that school of poetry by heart now; of course it was particularly fashionable immediately after the war. Johnny Potter did it much like other men. Any one can do it. One takes some dirty, horrible incident or sight of the battle-front and describes it in [a] loathsome detail, and then, by way of contrast, describes some fat and incredibly

bloodthirsty woman or middle-aged clubman at home, gloating over the glorious war. I always thought it a great bore, and sentimental at that. But it was the thing for a time, and people seemed to be impressed by it, and Peacock, who encouraged young men, often to their detriment, would take it for the *Fact*, though that sort of cheap and popular appeal to sentiment was the last thing the *Fact* was out for. (57)

Gideon mentions not only the popularity but also the main ideas of the war poetry which was written by soldiers immediately after World War I. The poetry may embody anti-war themes because it depicts the horror of the battlefield, yet it suggests the antagonism between combatants and non-combatants, which Gideon emphatically objects to.

Although Gideon does not argue that non-combatants are synonymous with women, the words “incredibly bloodthirsty,” which modify “woman,” imply the combatants’ antagonism against women in general. Gideon’s analysis of the war poetry can be applied to Siegfried Sassoon’s “Glory of Women,” which says of the female non-combatant, “you believe/ That chivalry redeems the war’s disgrace You listen with delight,/ By tales of dirt and danger fondly thrilled You can’t believe that British troops ‘retire’/ When hell’s last horror breaks them, and they run,/ Trampling the terrible corpses—blind with blood.” The combatant’s view of women in Sassoon’s poem is representative of many combatants’ feelings about non-combatants, who appear to enjoy life with no knowledge of the front. In The Great War and Modern Memory Paul Fussell discusses the adverse relationship between combatants and non-combatants by quoting a number of combatants’ writings. One of the excerpts is from Philip Gibbs’ Now It Can Be Told (1920): “They [soldiers returning from leave] hated the smiling women in the streets. They loathed the old men They desired that profiteers should die by poison-gas.

They prayed God to get the Germans to send Zeppelins to England—to make the people know what war meant.”⁴ Explaining combatants’ emotional turmoil, Fussell, a World War II veteran, argues that non-combatants were understandably ignorant of war: “even if those at home had wanted to know the realities of the war, they couldn’t have without experiencing them: its conditions were too novel The war would have been simply unbelievable” (87). Fussell explains that the gulf between combatants and non-combatants was partly due to rigid censorship by the British government. The gulf became deeper because combatants found war indescribable, as expressed in an interview of Robert Graves: “The funny thing was you went home on leave for six weeks, or six days, but the idea of being and staying at home was awful because you were with people who didn’t understand what this was all about.”⁵

All the seemingly unanimous opinions of combatants indicate that Gideon’s view of non-combatants is rather exceptional. How many soldiers could share his view? His opinion indeed represents that of Macaulay, who questioned the commonly accepted view of non-combatants among soldiers. Gideon indeed “serves as the author’s mouthpiece” on intellectual subjects.⁶ Ironically, Macaulay’s creation of Gideon aims to fulfill the theory which Gideon believes to lie at the root of writing: all writing should be based on firsthand observation. It explains why Gideon is reticent about his experience as a combatant. He seems almost callous to his own combat experiences; he is by no means an anguished, shell-shocked veteran. The characterization of Gideon suggests that Macaulay does not emulate men’s war experience. Nevertheless, through her combatant character Gideon, Macaulay makes a point that one’s direct experience does not always extend to one’s firsthand observation which lays the basis of good literature, as shown in Johnny’s poetry. Johnny has not opened his eyes to certain facts that he should have perceived from

firsthand observations. By using Gideon to criticize soldier poets' fixed ideas of combatants and non-combatants, Macaulay probably was aware of the irony that her creation of Gideon might engender. Macaulay's wounded veteran Gideon is certainly different from soldiers depicted by male writers. He does not have any flashbacks of the incident in which he lost his leg. He only mentions the pain in his leg by describing "my leg shooting like a gathered tooth" when Leila Yorke makes a conventional remark that she hopes he would be "quite all right again" (63). Instead of talking about combat experiences, he focuses on the absurdity of the traditional division between soldiers and civilians.

For Gideon, the dichotomy between combatants and non-combatants in war poetry is grounded in "popular convention" which does not render reality. According to convention, combatants are against war because they have witnessed the front, whereas non-combatants are for war because they have no direct knowledge of the battle. Gideon contends that the polarization between anti-war combatants and jingoistic non-combatants is preposterous. Referring to his own observation, he says: "some of the most bloodthirsty fire-eaters I met during the war were among the fighting men. Of course there were plenty of them at home too, and plenty of peaceable and civilized people at the front, but it's the most absurd perversion of facts to make out that all our combatants were full of sweet reasonableness (any one who knows anything about the psychological effects of fighting will know that this is improbable), and all our non-combatants bloody-minded savages" (58). Gideon disputes the dichotomy between the sexes as described in soldiers' war literature. Nevertheless, he notes "the psychological effects of fighting" on combatants and implies the male gender role during war time has generated to a certain

extent a division between the sexes. After their war experiences, men simply cannot be “full of sweet reasonableness.”

Macaulay characterizes Gideon as a combatant who himself is not immune from “the psychological effects of fighting.” Before the war, Gideon and other anti-Potterite men—Johnny and Jake—were not bellicose. Each of them just felt that he was obliged to join the war despite his dislike of it. Unlike young men in war literature, they knew that war would be horrible. Their unfavorable views of war reflect Macaulay’s belief that no one is in favor of war. Nonetheless, each of them was determined to play the gender role which had been conventionally and culturally set for him. A conversation between the Potter twins illustrates the different gender roles that man and woman play:

Johnny said to Jane, “War is beastly, but one’s got to be in it.” He took that line, as so many others did Every one ought to go.”

“Every one can’t,” said Jane morosely.

But to Johnny every one meant all young men, and he took no heed. (25-26)

The men’s gender role as soldier during war eventually creates the gulf between men and women. War provokes barbaric nature of many young men, and its effect continues in post-war time. Under the eye of Katherine, Gideon reveals himself as a veteran whose mind has been scarred by his experience of killing. Having lunch with him, Katherine observes: Gideon “murdered a wasp with his knife—a horrible habit at meals, but one practised by many returned soldiers, who kill all too readily. I suppose after killing all those Germans . . . a wasp seems nothing” (162). Katherine’s viewpoint supports the earlier statement made by Gideon: the idea that combatants are “full of sweet reasonableness” is improbable. By providing Katherine’s perspective, Macaulay

strengthens Gideon's contention that war poetry fails to portray the realities of combatants.

According to Gideon, the crucial reason why war poetry presents such fixed ideas of soldiers and civilians is that the poet ignores his own "firsthand observation." The poetry is a product of exploitation, which, along with sentimentalism, composes Potterism. Johnny's acceptance of such conventional conception of combatants and non-combatants reflects his desire to be successful and to make profit. Johnny's poetry typifies the Potterite literature, as expressed by Gideon: "Johnny Potter, like other people, was merely exploiting his experience John would never write the particular kind of stuff he does for the love of writing it; he'll only do it because it's the stunt of the moment In his calm, unexcited way, he worships success, and he'll get it" (57-58). Gideon views Johnny's poetry as typical of Potterish literature. His idea of Johnny's writing is different from that of his co-editor, Peacock, who does not see Potterism in it despite his claim that the Weekly Fact "ought to hammer at Potterite fiction as well as at Potterite journalism and politics" (86). For Peacock, the term "Potterite literature" directly refers to the writings of Leila Yorke, whom he considers as "a public nuisance" (86). Gideon, nevertheless, thinks that Johnny's poetry is also a product of Potterism. He implies that any writer whose main concern is making profit is a Potterite. A writer's love for writing has to underlie his or her literary works. However, the love of writing alone does not confirm a writer's quality. As manifested in Leila Yorke's writing, if a literary work imposes war propaganda on the readers, it cannot be a good piece of literature. Her love of writing is outweighed by other factors.

Concerning the exploiting aspect, Gideon switches his attention from the war poetry of the soldiers to speeches and articles, which use conventional diction in

describing combatants' deaths and also define justifications for their sacrifices. He resents the language of civilians who exploit combatants. He gives a specific example: men who were killed would "be called 'the fallen,' instead of 'the killed' (it's a queer thing how 'fallen,' in the masculine means killed in the war, and the feminine given over to a particular kind of vice), and then the audience, or the readers, would be told that they died for democracy, or a cleaner world" (59). Interestingly, despite his resentment about all sorts of exploitation, Gideon does not note that combatants also frequently employed such language that conveyed heroism and patriotism. In fact, as Paul Fussell has demonstrated, at the beginning of the World War many British soldiers wrote about the war in "high diction" with which they were very familiar from reading literary works such as romances, and some soldiers still utilized such language in their writings as late as 1918.⁷ By stressing the civilians' high diction, Macaulay implies that the war poetry at issue does not include the poetry of a soldier like Rupert Brooke, with whom she had some personal contact before he died in 1915. As a soldier poet of the early stage of World War I, Rupert Brooke wrote poems which hit heroic and patriotic tones. Gideon's focus on civilians' exploitation of soldiers' deaths, not on the poetry of soldiers killed later, seems to reflect Macaulay's resentment of the jingoist's exploitation of death. Although Macaulay did not give such an example, she probably recalled Winston Churchill's well-publicized obituary for Brooke in *The Times*: "Joyous, fearless, versatile, deeply instructed, with classic symmetry of mind and body, ruled by high undoubting purpose, he was all that one would wish England's noblest sons to be."⁸ From the viewpoint of the combatant Gideon, Macaulay refutes non-combatants' use of such grandiloquent language to justify young men's deaths.

As Gideon repudiates the conventional dichotomy between combatants and non-combatants in their attitudes toward war, he does not insinuate that all non-combatants are self-deceiving in the belief that the war is for a good cause. Not all of them take advantage of the sacrifices of young men. Yet his argument about non-combatants', especially women's, naive beliefs in war may perplex the reader because he seems to overgeneralize their attitudes toward the war. Gideon derides justifications of war which were formulated "by the people at home—the politicians, the clergy, the writers, the women, and the men with 'A' certificates in Government offices" (60). Gideon's reference to the various groups of civilians seems to suggest that non-combatants are profiteers. Moreover, his categorization of women as a profiteering group seemingly suggests the same kind of binary distinction between men and women seen in the poetry of soldiers, although Gideon views the majority of non-combatants, especially women, as profiteers, he also recognizes exceptions to the generalization.

Gideon's definition of profiteers is implicitly given when he expresses his feelings about Jane during the war: "All through the war I had seen her at intervals, enjoying life, finding the war a sort of lark, and I had hated her because she didn't care for the death and torture of men, for the possible defeat of her country, or the already achieved economic, moral, and intellectual degradation of the whole of Europe. She had merely profiteered out of it all, and had a good time" (94). Here, Gideon seems to join with the soldier poets in viewing women as free from the horror of war. However, he specifically points to Jane, not women in general. Jane's attitude toward the war indeed supports Gideon's idea of her. As a profiteer, Jane believed that the war gave her an opportunity to be successful in journalism, literature, or politics. The authorial narrator explains Jane's exploitative mind: "With so many men going, there would be empty places to fill

That thought came, perhaps, as soon to Jane as to any one in the country” (31). The word “any one” connotes women. Through Jane’s ambition, Macaulay reveals that women have the advantage over men in times of war. She does not deny the popular idea of the time, as described by Sandra Gilbert in “Soldier’s Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women, and the Great War” that women would be “triumphant survivors and destined inheritors” (209). Gilbert asserts that “as young men became increasingly alienated from their prewar selves, increasingly immured in the muck and blood of No Man’s Land, women seemed to become . . . ever more powerful” (200). By making such a point, she ironically confirms not only the kind of rhetoric the British government employed in its propaganda during World War I but also combatants’ perception of women as profiteers.

Macaulay attempts to refute the prevailing view of women by presenting a woman character who does not exploit the war for her own advancement. A conversation between Jane and Katherine confirms the profiteering position of women, yet also shows an exception:

“How Arthur does hate us all, in these days.”

Katherine said, “True. He finds us profiteers.”

“So we are,” said Jane. “Not you, but most of us. I am. (37)

As Jane accurately points out, Katherine is not a profiteer, regardless of her gendered role as non-combatant. Although she includes herself among profiteers, Katherine is to a profiteer what Gideon is to a sentimentalist. She is one of the women who are able to see through deception in propagandistic rhetoric. She criticizes the conventional idea that men fight in order to protect women and children, saying, “Why is it worse that women should suffer than men? . . . they[women] are always classed with children, as sort of helpless imbeciles who must be kept from danger and discomfort. I got sick of it during

the war” (152). Katherine’s remark on the misleading argument about women in relation to war is similar to that of Macaulay in Catchwords and Claptrap and An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist. Among non-combatants, including women, not many think the way Katherine does. She is the one who proves to Gideon that a generalized view of women does not suit all women. Gideon states: “I went to see Katherine Varick . . . I often do when I have been meeting women like Lady Pinkerton, because there is a danger that that kind of woman, so common and in a sense so typical, may get to bulk too large in one’s view of women, and lead one into the sin of generalization” (64). Only the small number of women like Katherine contribute to denouncing the fixed image of women that has been portrayed in the poetry of soldiers. Gideon’s comparison of Katherine and Leila Yorke reveals Macaulay’s recognition that the majority of women took advantage of the war in many different areas, including literature. Concerning this idea, Gilbert argues that “a number of women writers . . . felt that not only their society but also their art had been subtly strengthened, or at least strangely inspired, by the deaths and defeats of male contemporaries” (222). However, Macaulay’s characterization of Leila Yorke implicitly indicates her objection not only to those women writers who were exhilarated by the opportunities that the war provided for them but also to women like Jane, who experienced vicarious thrills.

Leila Yorke is representative of profiteering women writers. However, the negative aspect of her writing, especially on the First World War, is not directly commented upon by Gideon. Macaulay consciously avoids giving Gideon an authoritarian voice. Although Gideon is critical of all of Leila Yorke’s fiction throughout Potterism, he does not analyze any of her novels. When Peacock asks him to write a review of Leila Yorke’s A Cabinet Minister’s Wife, which is presumably “full of psycho-

analysis,” Gideon declines to do so. His reason is that he does not know the subject well enough to review it. Macaulay makes Gideon hold to his principle that any writing should be based on firsthand knowledge. For that reason, after referring to “a suppressed Freudian complex” that may explain “the natural war rage” of some non-combatants, Gideon abruptly cuts off his argument by saying that “I don’t know” (59). Leila Yorke’s war fiction is written from a non-combatant’s perspective, so Gideon should not make any comment on it. Instead, through the voice of the authorial narrator and Leila Yorke’s own narrative, Macaulay presents Leila Yorke as a mother and a writer who fits the generalized description of women in the poetry of soldiers. Unlike her approach to Johnny’s poetry, Macaulay does not use Gideon to analyze Leila Yorke’s writing on the war. Nevertheless, she creates Leila Yorke so that her writing on the war and her ideas of the war are open to Gideon’s earlier criticism which only concentrates on Johnny’s war poetry.

The narrator briefly explains Leila Yorke’s war activities and her war fiction: “Mrs. Potter . . . took up Y.M.C.A. canteen work, and went for a time to France. There she wrote Out There, an account of the work of herself and her colleagues in Rouen, full of the inimitable courages of soldiers, the untiring activities of canteen workers, and the affectionate good-fellowship which existed between these two classes. The world was thus shown that Leila Yorke was no mere *flâneuse* of letters, but an Englishwoman who rose to her country’s call and was worthy of her men-folk” (27). Leila Yorke’s war work was a reflection of the war propaganda proclaimed by the Potter press concerning the role of women. The propaganda says that “the women of England must now prove that they are worthy of their men” (25). Leila Yorke’s writing is based on her canteen work for a short period of time and thus typifies her literature, which deals with subjects she does

not really know much about. Leila Yorke is always in great haste to write about a subject of the moment. Early on she expresses ambition to write an Oxford novel after staying on campus during the college's boat-race week. With no firsthand observation, she is willing to try any subject, including Potterism, by saying that "it would help me in my work" (12). For Leila Yorke, war is no more than a popular subject she can write about. Her principle is exactly opposite to that of Gideon, who believes that one should write about a certain subject only with a high degree of knowledge. In order to write a literary work about the war, Leila Yorke simply exploits her experience of the canteen work. It is similar to what Johnny does with his experience of the battle. However, because of the patriotic theme, her writing differs from Johnny's.

The characteristics of Leila Yorke's war fiction can be inferred mostly from her own analysis of her writing and from her description of her son-in-law's death. Leila Yorke states that her fiction is a product of her love for writing and that it delivers certain messages (105). Seemingly, she has a quality that Johnny does not have; her love for writing has priority over making profit. However, because of the message that her fiction conveys, especially in relation to war, she cannot be above the criticism Gideon has made of the propagandistic works that euphemize soldiers' deaths and justify war. Leila Yorke's narrative exhibits a dramatic irony in which her description of her son-in-law's death and her choice of words indeed underline Gideon's earlier argument against non-combatants' language of heroism and patriotism. Her belief in a soldier's glorious, noble death is not grounded in "the firsthand observation" but in a conventional idea of warlike, patriotic soldiers. It contradicts the convention regarding combatants' attitudes toward war on which Johnny's poetry relies. Leila Yorke cannot think of any soldier, except Gideon, who did not like going to fight. She is certain that soldiers went to fight for the

love of their country. For her, their love of the country is as natural as maternal love for her children (101). Leila Yorke does not see any difference between the love which young men are expected to have through culture and education and the love which many women feel naturally. Macaulay implicitly presents a great difference between the two kinds of love by describing young women's attitudes toward Jane's baby. No soldier expressed his love for his country, whereas Jane has become maternal since the baby was born, and even Katherine likes handling the baby. Macaulay's questioning of soldiers' patriotism suggests that their role is culturally, socially constructed. In contrast, Macaulay believes that a mother's role is biologically determined.

The idea of a parallel between soldiers and mothers indeed represents non-combatants' jingoism that ignores realities of war. As earlier discussed, Johnny's binary vision of peaceable soldiers and warlike civilians does not properly portray the two groups of people. Neither does Leila Yorke's parallel between them. For any combatant who comes to have negative views of war after witnessing the front, such an idea is preposterous. In Good-Bye to All That: An Autobiography (1931), Robert Graves expresses his sarcasm concerning a "Little Mother's" letter, which was initially printed in the Morning Post. The letter was titled "A Mother's Answer to 'A Common Soldier'" and subtitled "A Message to the Pacifists. A Message to the Bereaved. A Message to the Trenches." Reprinted in a pamphlet to serve a propagandistic purpose, it emphasized mothers' love for their sons who fought for their country: "We women pass on the human ammunition of 'only sons' to fill up the gaps, so that when the 'common soldier' looks back before going 'over the top' he may see the women of the British race on his heels, reliable, dependent, uncomplaining Women are created for the purpose of giving life, and men to take it. Now we are giving it in a double sense."⁹ According to the letter,

a mother made a sacrifice for the country as her son became a common soldier. Apparently its emphasis on sacrifice appealed to not only other mothers but also soldiers in combat. Among responses to the letter, one was from “A Bereaved Mother”: “I have lost my two dear boys, but since I was shown the ‘Little Mother’s’ beautiful letter a resignation too perfect to describe has calmed all my aching sorrow, and I would now gladly give my sons twice over.” One soldier who had “Fought and Bled” wrote: “no woman has done more than the ‘Little Mother,’ whose now famous letter . . . has spread like wild-fire from trench to trench. I hope to God it will be handed down in history, for nothing like it has ever made such an impression on our fighting men. I defy any man to feel weak-hearted after reading it My God! she makes us die happy.”¹⁰ Since the press often fabricated facts during the war, it is difficult to believe that the “Little Mother’s” letter and those responses were genuine. Nevertheless, as Graves implied, the letter represented civilians’ “war-madness that ran about everywhere looking for a pseudo-military outlet” (283). Graves views the rhetoric of the little mother’s letter as “a foreign language” which he identifies with “newspaper language.” It is the same kind of language that pacifist Helena Swanwick mentions in her pamphlet “Women and War” (1915). Swanwick is fully aware of the charge made by jingoists against women’s pacifist nature, and she admits that some women may “be more violent in speech than the men, because they can only relieve their feelings by words, whereas the men can go and fight” (10). She goes on to discuss civilians’ use of such language: “Professors and journalists and other sedentary men are notoriously more bloodthirsty in their language than the fighting men” (10). This is exactly what Macaulay satirizes through depicting Leila Yorke’s own opinions.

Leila Yorke's depiction of Oliver's death further reveals that heroism and jingoism permeate her writing. After Leila Yorke is informed that Oliver fell down the stairs and died, she compares Jane with war widows. She even envisions her as "Tennyson's young war widow" with a child and feels disappointed that Jane's baby is not born yet to complete the image of the young war widow. Although initially she acknowledges that, unlike soldiers' deaths, Oliver's death was not for "a noble cause," she makes a hero of him anyway. Oliver did not go to war. Along with all the other staff of the Potter press, he was one of the "men with 'A' certificates in Government Office" who Gideon says contrived justifications of the war. Leila Yorke thinks that those staffs' work at home was more important than soldiers' combat at the front. According to her, Oliver was involuntarily exempted from military service; he did not avoid it: "I have a horror of the men who *evaded* service during the war, but men like Oliver Hobart, who would have preferred to be fighting but stayed to do invaluable work for their country, one must respect" (107). And then Leila Yorke expresses an irony of fate: "it seemed very bitter that Oliver, who hadn't fallen in the war, should have fallen now down his own stairs" (107). Here she uses the word "fallen," which Gideon gave as an example of words that civilians used to euphemize soldiers' deaths. Such diction reveals that Leila's writings are far from reality.

Leila Yorke's heroic and sentimental view of war is manifested in her use of euphemism in reference to death. Leila Yorke utilizes words, such as "peace" and "sleep," for the death of Oliver:

"Peace, peace, he is not dead," I repeated to myself. "He sleeps whom men call dead The soul of Adonais [sic], like a star, beckons from the abode where the eternal are." (117)

Leila takes lines from Shelley's "Adonais," without identifying them. Her reference to Adonis and a star illustrates the language that Gideon resented earlier. Even when using the supposedly blunt, yet truthful word "death," Leila Yorke defines it in a romantic way: "Death is wonderful to me; not a horrible thing, but holy and high. Here was the lovely mortal shell, for which 'arrangements' had to be made" (117). Leila Yorke's language is very abstract. It is the kind of language on which many writers of World War I relied in their futile efforts to describe the realities of the war. In the chapter "Oh What a Literary War" of *The Great War and Modern Memory*, Fussell points out that writers who had personal experiences of the front felt keenly their inability to present accurate pictures of the war in the language that they had known from earlier literature. To find proper language was to break off with the tradition of the nineteenth century: "what was needed was exactly the clinical—or even obscene—language It would take still another war, and an even worse one, before such language would force itself up from below and propose itself for use. It was a matter of leaving, finally, the nineteenth century" (Fussell 174). Fussell's contention implies that non-combatants could not perceive the awkwardness of the conventional language because they did not have firsthand experience of the war. Macaulay creates Leila Yorke as one such non-combatant writer whose views on war are grounded in the literary tradition of the earlier century.

Leila Yorke certainly plays a naive narrator who does not share the author's insight into language. Macaulay's ironic intention culminates when Leila Yorke is irritated by her son Frank, who makes an effort to console Clare with religious sentiment. Frank, a clergyman, remarks that "one must not grieve for the dead as if one would recall them. We know . . . that they are happier where they are. And we know too, that it is God's will, and that He decides everything for the best" (117). Leila Yorke sarcastically

calls Frank's talk "conventional phraseology," yet she does not realize that her own language is the same. While talking to Jane, she says: "we must let bygones be bygones, and not grieve over much. Grief . . . is such a big, strong, beautiful thing. If we let it, it will take us by the hands and lead us gently along by the waters of comfort. We mustn't rebel or fight; we must look straight ahead with welcoming eyes. For whatever life brings us we can *use*" (121-22). What Leila Yorke recognizes is a difference in the superficial meaning between Frank's statement and hers: she believes in the communication between the dead and the living through a psychic medium, while Frank does not. Considering her fiction *A Cabinet Minister's Wife*, which is supposedly based on psychoanalysis, Leila Yorke's belief in psychic forces manifests an irony that undercuts her own knowledge of both subjects. Her lack of such knowledge corresponds to her inability to grasp the hollowness of her own language.

Another "conventional phraseology" that Leila Yorke exploits is shown in her statements which contain forced analogies between her situations and soldiers'. The moment she becomes suspicious that Gideon killed Oliver, Leila Yorke says, "one wakes suddenly in the night with an extraordinary access of clearness of vision, so that a dozen small things which have occurred during the day and passed without making much apparent impression on one's mind stand out sharp and defined in a row, like a troop of soldiers with fixed bayonets all pointing in one direction" (127). The phrase "a troop of soldiers with fixed bayonets" represents the diction of war. However, her comparison between "a dozen small things" that supposedly lead to her speculation and "a troop of soldiers with fixed bayonets" reveals how Leila Yorke views soldiers. Interestingly, she does not compare the "dozen small things" with soldiers' bayonets. Instead, she presents the soldiers as inanimate instruments, each of which is of little significance. For her, they

are not heroes. They are not like Oliver, whose beauty supplied a model for a hero in her novel Sidney, a Man. Only Oliver deserves the glory that is usually given to a “fallen” hero. Thus, as a believer in the tie between mother and soldier, Leila Yorke, in fact as a mother-in-law, feels like a combatant who fights for the glory of her “fallen” hero. When Juke charges her with spreading the rumor that Gideon killed Oliver, Leila Yorke expresses her position: “I stood to my guns” (138). She also describes as “a parting shot” her final suggestion that Gideon would bring an action of libel against his accuser. In addition, when talking to her husband about keeping the rumor running, she acts as a combatant who lost her comrade: “I feel it is our duty not to let the affair drop. We owe it to poor dear Oliver. Even now he may be looking down on us, unable to rest in perfect peace till he is avenged” (139). Leila Yorke’s language is reflective of the diction developed during World War I. As Fussell points out, “nobody alive during the war, whether a combatant or not, ever got over its special diction and system of metaphor” (187). However, Macaulay’s characterization of Leila Yorke as a non-combatant who utilizes such diction aims at a satirical effect. Like her conventional words of heroism and patriotism, her combat metaphors are only used for embellishing facts.

As expressed in Gideon’s criticism of both Johnny’s war poetry and Leila Yorke’s fiction, Macaulay questions the value of many writings that were published right after World War I. She certainly suggests that the war provided great opportunities for exploitation. Many writers, regardless of their gender, seized the opportunity to write and publish literary works only for the purpose of making profit. Gideon diagnoses such writers: “All but a few verse-makers are shallow, muddled, or sentimental, and most novelists are commercial as well. They haven’t the means; they aren’t adequately equipped; they’ve nothing in them worth the saying. Why say it, then? A little cleverness

isn't worth while" (226). Gideon's statement reflects his creator's view of literature in general, not just post-war literature. In other novels as well, Macaulay openly asks about the purpose of writing. In *Told By an Idiot*, a character wonders: "Why write? Why this craze for transmitting ideas by means of marks on paper? . . . why not retain the ideas for one's own private edification, untransmitted? Writing. There was this about writing—or rather about publishing it—it showed that some one had thought it worth while to pay for having one's ideas printed" (67). The question of "why write" leads to a theory that good literature should carry worthy ideas. If so, how can the theory apply to Macaulay's own writings on war? What ideas can vindicate her war literature?

Macaulay's Writings on War

In response to World War I, Macaulay herself wrote poems and novels. Studies of her poems have not recognized their pacifist themes. In particular, Macaulay's poem "Many Sisters to Many Brothers" (1915) has been interpreted as representative of a woman's unrealistic conception of the front. Sandra Gilbert asserts that Macaulay expressed women's "envy of the soldier's liberation from the dreariness of the home and the homefront" (214). The poem reads:

Oh it's you that have the luck, out there in blood and muck

You were born beneath a kindly star:

All we dreamt, I and you, you can really go and do,

And I can't, the way things are.

In a trench you are sitting, while I am knitting

A hopeless sock that never gets done.

Well, here's luck, my dear—and you've got it, no fear;

But for me . . . a war is poor fun.

In envy of her brother, the narrator ostensibly resents her knitting, which has been imposed on her in accordance with gender division. However, the narrator's attitude toward war does not reflect Macaulay's. As Catherine Reilly properly says, "Rose Macaulay was much vilified for . . . seemingly naive sentiments."¹¹ The narrator of the poem indeed sounds very much like Jane in Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, who says that "who wanted to do things like that [knitting socks and packing stores and learning first aid], when their brothers had a chance to go and fight in France? . . . Why should women always get the dull jobs?" (25). About Jane's disappointment at being prevented from active service at the front, the authorial narrator, R. M., notes that such perception of the war disappeared after "the first winter and the development of trench warfare" (25). Since Jane was created five years later than the narrator of "Many Sisters to Many Brothers," it is possible that Macaulay might be presenting rather an objective view of the war or make a mockery of her former self when writing the later work Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract. However, even in "Many Sisters to Many Brothers," Macaulay conveys the ironical situation in which many women and many men found themselves at the beginning of the war. How could anyone call sitting in "blood and muck" "luck"? Rupert Brooke's letter in 1914 described his excitement about the war: "It's all great fun."¹² The narrator's words "poor fun" seem to respond to that. Yet could every young man have fun in a battle? As manifested in soldiers' poems, most young men, including soldiers who initially felt excited, did not have fun once they saw action. Before long the word "fun" was ironically used by combatants in order to describe non-combatants' situations, especially women's status, far from the front. And then it was combatants who had "poor fun" during the war time. The "naive sentiments" are the speaker's, not the

poet's. For Macaulay, men's role at the front, which is conventionally described in words such as "luck" and "fun," could be perceived in a completely different manner, thanks to "verbal acrobatics" which she discusses in Catchwords and Claptrap (1926). She is too well aware that every catchword was "liable . . . to somersaults" and by no means "stable in its firmament."¹³ Her "Many Sisters to Many Brothers" is a parody of soldiers' war poems. By using the exact words that describe the state of combatants at the beginning of the war and by adopting the dichotomy between men and women as presented in soldiers' poetry (in Siegfried Sassoon's "Glory of Women" a mother's knitting is in contrast to her son's death in the mud), Macaulay challenges not only a tradition of popular war literature but also conventional gender roles each sex had to play in war time.

Macaulay's question about the legitimacy of gender roles even before the outbreak of World War I demonstrates that she was neither naive about warfare nor envious of her male counterparts. Her novel The Valley Captives, published in 1911, portrays a brother and a sister whose gender roles are unconventional. Tudor Vallon is always in fear of his stepbrother, Philip Bodger. In contrast, Joanna Vallon is full of fight against him. Macaulay certainly reverses the roles of the Vallon brother and sister. Joanna, often shortened to John, is a fighter who believes in getting even with the violent Bodgers. Although there is no war in the sense of mass violence, the word "war" is employed in order to describe the struggle between the Vallon siblings and the Bodger siblings. On a daily basis, both step-siblings combat with one another. As the story develops, Tudor's fear and hatred of the Bodgers make him a man of violence. Despite the change in Tudor, his effort to fight is a mockery to Philip: "Teddy fightin'! That's just what's so awfully funny; it always was" (235). Like his father, Oliver Vallon, who has no taste for violence, Tudor was not born to fight, regardless of his male identity. He has been forced to fight

against the dominant Bodgers. The best description of Tudor's situation is given by his friend Laurie Rennel: "It's pretty poor fun trying to fight the impossible, for an indefinite time" (233). In contrast to the traditional conception of the war-like man, Tudor represents a young man who has no fun fighting. With respect to combat, to be born as a male is by no means to be lucky. Macaulay clearly rejects the gender role that every young man has been driven to play. Considering her challenge to the general conception of male roles, even in a pre-war situation, it is not too much to say that earlier analyses of "Many Sisters to Many Brothers" have failed to recognize that Macaulay was skeptical of men's make-believe luck. It may be of some significance that Macaulay's own brother Aulay was killed in 1909 while serving on the North West Frontier. According to Constance Smith, Macaulay was "thrilled to have a soldier brother" when Aulay as a Royal Engineer showed up in army uniform (48). Yet even had she been excited about her brother's role at the time, his sudden death must have awakened the young Macaulay to the truth of a man's luck as a soldier.

The conception of men's luck is grounded in a traditional belief in the glory of war. In the popular war literature published after World War I, this belief is espoused only by civilians who have not had combat experiences. In *Told By an Idiot*, Macaulay presents a conversation between a mother and her son, who has won fame as a soldier poet. The mother asks her son what he intends to achieve by writing poems which are "terribly beastly and nasty and corpse" (292). When the son defends his poetry by claiming that his "object is to destroy the false glamour of war," the mother disputes his argument:

Glamour, indeed! There you go again with that terrible nonsense. I don't meet any of these people you talk about who think there's glamour in war.

I'm sure *I* never saw any glamour in it, with all you boys in the trenches and all of us at home slaving ourselves to death and starving on a slice of bread and margarine a day. Glamour, indeed. I'll tell you what it is, a set of you young men have invented that glamour theory, just so as to have an excuse for what you call destroying it, with your nasty talk. (293)

In the opinion of the mother, Macaulay illustrates that, despite its anti-war sentiments, the poetry of soldiers assumes that war has been unanimously glorified by non-combatants who have not shared direct experience of the trench. She even implies that soldiers, not civilians, were inculcated with the idea of glory, even though they became disillusioned after real battle experience.

During the time when the poetry of soldiers prevailed, Macaulay was very conscious of her position as a woman writer who had been excluded from the front, which had become the center of literary experience in the post-war era. Nonetheless, she did not try to emulate her male counterparts by writing about the front or the domain near it. Moreover, as if challenging the dominant literary form of soldiers' war literature, she focused on writing fiction rather than poetry. As Nosheen Khan's Women's Poetry of the First World War (1988) discusses, a number of women poets either expressed heroic and jingoistic views of the war or depicted horror and misery at the front. Regardless of the contrasting themes, the majority of their writings extensively dealt with soldiers in battle. According to Khan, while many of the women poets employed the heroic, romantic style of writing, only a few women poets succeeded in capturing "realistically the feelings of men at the front," because women "were dependent solely on newspaper reports and on heresay for any knowledge about life in the trenches" (21). Unlike many of her contemporary women writers, Macaulay did not focus on portraying lives of combatants

in battle. As revealed in Gideon's statement, Macaulay firmly believed that she must avoid writing on a subject, such as the trench warfare, of which she did not have firsthand experience. In addition, she acknowledged that once it was published, soldiers' poetry began to dominate the literary world because of its ostensible authenticity about the battlefield. While writing Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, she probably could not forget soldiers' poems, such as Siegfried Sassoon's, which appeared in the Cambridge Magazine and were later collected in The Old Huntsman and Other Poems (1917).

Despite her earlier writing of poems, the Macaulay of the post-war era focused on novels.

On the grounds that she was a woman of letters when World War I broke out and that she aimed to deliver messages in the form of fiction, Macaulay was closer to Leila Yorke than Johnny Potter. However, Macaulay certainly was not a woman writer who adopted the conventional, traditional ideas of war. If Charlotte Gilman's call for women writers who would defy the masculine canon of literature in The Man-Made World or Our Androcentric Culture (1911) had been answered, Macaulay would have been counted one. Gilman's idea that women's literature should confront the dominant literature, which she called "androcentric literature," predated Macaulay's recognition of her own gender identity in terms of war literature. By defying jingoism and patriotism as well as binary divisions between the sexes, Macaulay produced writings that were different from masculine war literature, which exclusively reflected men's war experience. She perceived a gulf between women's writings and the androcentric literature. Although she always questioned the validity of differences between men and women, Macaulay could not but acknowledge that women's literary experiences in relation to the war were not the same as men's. Yet she did not attempt to denounce the gap by drawing a parallel between women's war work and men's combat.

Macaulay did not approve of women's writings which focused on their war services. Her character Leila Yorke's war fiction Out There, which is supposedly based on her canteen work, exemplified such a writing. For Macaulay, those writings, although presumably showing women's perspectives, conveyed the same kind of misleading conception of war: men had luck to fight and women could have some luck by actively participating in war work. As a woman who was not able to go to the front, the young Vera Brittain believed her work as V.A.D. nurse to be "the next best thing" to do.¹⁴ In addition, Vera Brittain, who became an ardent pacifist after World War I, used her experience as a V.A.D. nurse in the portrayal of main characters in her fiction, such as Ruth Alleyndene in Honorable Estate (1936). Thus Vera Brittain's writings on the war are apt to deliver somewhat ambiguous message. As Lynne Hanley points out, Vera Brittain's "reservations about war's enthusiasts are undercut by her nostalgia for the intensities of wartime and by her loyalty to the memory of her dead lover, brother, and friends" (137). By contrast, despite her experience as V.A.D. nurse, Macaulay never viewed nursing as a heroic act. Neither did she employ a V.A.D. nurse for her main character, although in various novels she presented a number of minor characters who participated in nursing. Clare in Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract was one of them. Macaulay recognized that nursing was to women what combat was to men during the First World War. She did not consider those activities as glorious, courageous services. For Macaulay, they were carried out in accordance with gender roles that were imposed on both sexes in war time.

Macaulay's writings on war aim to present a woman's perspective which is unmilitant. By so doing, Macaulay challenges soldiers' generalized view of jingoism in women, who represent non-combatants. Her key idea is that no one but exploiters has fun in the time of war. Many civilians' lives are as miserable as those the soldiers endure. As

Macaulay's poem "The Shadow" depicts, in contrast to the general conception among combatants, civilians are not completely free from the impact of war because they sometimes had to face the terror, fear, and death, generated by zeppelin air raids.

Macaulay's poem "Picnic" expresses the pains non-combatants felt as they imagined "Flanders mud,/ And the pain of Picardy;/ And the blood that runs there runs beyond/ The wide waste sea."¹⁵ According to Joan Montgomery Byles, pain was indeed one "image which women writers of World War One mention[ed] more often than the men" (479). Byles asserts that "Picnic" typifies women's poems which render the idea that "in some respects it was no doubt easier for the men bravely to suffer pain than for their womenfolk to endure helplessly the thought of their suffering" (479). Apparently, Macaulay's poems contradict the conventional idea that men play the role of protector, while women play the role of being protected. Nevertheless, the emphasis on women's pain in her poetry is not a sign of Macaulay's pacifism, which is greater than personal distaste for war. Macaulay is more interested in women's active roles which would stop the present war and would prevent any future war than women's reactive roles as sufferers or mourners at home. Despite the fact that her brother Willie, a World War I veteran, lost a lung and could not use one arm as a result from the injuries he received in battle, she did not focus on agonies that women felt from the injury or the death of their loved ones. She instead sought solutions to the mass violence, which had recurred in human history. In order to render her ideas of war and peace from a non-combatant's point of view, which were distinctly in contrast to those of soldier poets, Macaulay's choice of a literary form became the novel.

Although Macaulay never gave up writing poetry, she almost exclusively wrote novels after World War I. Because she created a number of poet characters, such as in

They Were Defeated (1932), poems sometimes partially appear in the texts of her novels. Even as late as February 1954, in a letter to her sister Jean, Macaulay expressed her pleasure in writing poetry.¹⁶ Nevertheless, she stopped composing poems in enough numbers to make a collection after her second and last collection of poems, Three Days, was published in 1919. She seemed to affirm that poetry became the literary form of soldiers. Interestingly, her soldier poet Johnny Potter writes fiction when dealing with subjects other than war in the later part of Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract. In contrast, Leila Yorke remains only a novelist. Macaulay did not draw the line between the two literary forms based on gender, yet she could not deny that poetry became pivotal to soldiers' writings. Since soldiers' poetry was in a state of flux after World War I, she concentrated on writing novels. In addition, she might find that the novel served her purpose of presenting ideas from a woman's perspectives. Nevertheless, unlike her poems, Macaulay's novels of war do not convey only women's pains. They present multiple viewpoints regarding war issues. In a discussion of Macaulay's novels, Alice Bensen accurately states that "fiction gave her [Macaulay] more scope for the play of her varied powers than did poetry or journalism" (165-66). Bensen goes on to say that Macaulay's "fiction deals primarily with ideas, preferences, and attitudes rather than with actions, decisions, and emotions; the characters are almost always of the social class traditionally most concerned with the play of ideas—her own" (166). Macaulay considered "herself as a novelist of ideas" (Emery 157). Like her character Leila Yorke, Macaulay as a novelist of ideas aimed to deliver messages in fiction. However, as manifested in her depiction of Leila Yorke's writings, she believed that not all the ideas of a novelist were worthy to be translated into fiction. Neither did they justify the novelist's desire to publish.

In her life as a writer, Macaulay frequently asked herself why she wrote. On the one hand, Macaulay was aware that literary works had been in general produced by individuals, including herself, who had fun writing them. Expressing her ambition to write a novel, Jane Potter asserts: "I write because it amuses me. And because I like to be a novelist It's all fun" (227). In an essay, Macaulay herself states that writing "has always been to me, if a rather shame-making, yet an insidious amusement" (Personal Pleasures 267). On the other hand, she believed that every writer should have important things to say, although, as her character Gideon sarcastically states, there were "few things that wouldn't be better unsaid" (226). The way Macaulay undertook issues relevant to war in fiction vindicates her conviction that war was worth talking. Nevertheless, Macaulay did not believe that delivering pacifist messages was the only reason for her to write about war.

Unlike Mary Hamilton, who was only interested in delivering pacifist messages in her novel, Macaulay believed that creating art would give delight. As expressed in a letter to her sister, Macaulay thought that writing "makes the worries and anxieties of actual life slip into the background, except when they are very acute and absorbing, when writing rather deserts one unfortunately" (219). Advising her sister to try writing, Macaulay clearly explains that writing helps her mind, although there are times when writing can not take place at all. Thus, as long as she produces literary works, writing itself becomes her escape even when the idea of war permeates everywhere. As illustrated in her characterization of Alix Sandomir in Non-Combatants and Others, which was published in 1916, an artist cannot but recognize a reality of life, such as war. After all, Macaulay, who questioned the convention of gender roles from her own observation, was too realistic to naively believe that art would deal with the realities of an unpleasant, violent

world. In addition, she was well aware that jingoists always outnumbered pacifists in history. Presenting anti-war messages in fiction was indeed “pretty poor fun” because it was an effort “to fight the impossible, for an indefinite time.”

Macaulay’s writings on war are certainly in accordance with her principle that pacifism should be expressed in order “to keep the idea alive” in a world where the majority of people believed warfare to be a necessary means. They are products of her fight against heroism and jingoism or against conventional war literature by soldiers. Her fight is very much like Gideon’s, which is against Potterism. However, Macaulay is not fully represented by Gideon, whose emotional approach to Potterism eventually leads him to give up fighting. After all Gideon is not a novelist. In response to Jane’s question about Johnny’s novel, Gideon explodes with sarcasm: “I’m afraid I’m hopeless about novels just now I’m sick of the form—slices of life served up cold in three hundred pages. Oh, it’s very nice; it makes nice reading for people. But what’s the use? . . . I couldn’t write one [novel], good or bad, to save my life, I know that. And I’ve got to the stage when I wish other people wouldn’t” (225-26). Unlike Gideon, Macaulay never stopped writing. Her strenuous efforts to write, however, do not mean that Macaulay was never entangled by emotion. There were moments when Macaulay felt frustration in her fight against jingoism. Jane Emery notes that while working on *All in a Maze*, Macaulay “suddenly bewailed the futility of crying out against violence” (254). Macaulay wrote to her co-editor: “It’s like trying to shout above the storm, or stem Niagara with bare hands, or like frail human voices among a jungle of wild beasts.”¹⁷ No matter how futile her efforts seemed to be, Macaulay kept expressing her pacifism. Despite the outbreaks of wars, she repeatedly undertook issues of war and peace in her novels.

Although Macaulay felt that she had a mission to deliver pacifist ideas, she never overtly conveyed anti-war messages in her novels. The key aspects of propaganda literature haunted her, and she acknowledged the possibility that she could be entrapped by her own ideology as much as the jingoist writers were. She intended to represent realities of life which, she believed, could be rendered only by artists. As implied in Gideon's argument against the writings of soldiers and jingoist women, Macaulay aimed to produce a literature that presented facts of war as they were based on her firsthand observation and knowledge. She was not optimistic about realizing pacifism in the real world. The Spanish Civil War and the Second World War confirmed her realistic views on war and peace. Nevertheless, beginning with Non-Combatants and Others, Macaulay wrote pacifist novels the way she believed they should be presented in order to help readers to "know the 'thing seen' in its purity."

Notes

¹ See Aldous Huxley, ed, An Encyclopedia of Pacifism (New York: Garland, 1972) 104.

² Virginia Woolf, The Diary of Virginia Woolf, ed. Anne Olivier Bell, vol. 2 (New York: Harcourt, 1978) 57.

³ As quoted by Sharon O'Brien, "Combat Envy and Survivor Guilt: Willa Cather's 'Manly Battle Yarn' in Arms and the Woman: War, Gender, and Literary Representation, eds. Helen M. Cooper, Adrienne Auslander Munich, and Susan Merrill Squier (Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1989) 186. Hemingway specifically made the comment on a battle scene in Willa Cather's One of Ours (1922). Nevertheless, as

O'Brien implies, his comment reflected the general conception of women's war literature among male writers who belittled women's authority to write about war.

⁴ Paul Fussell, The Great War and Modern Memory (London: Oxford UP, 1975) 86.

⁵ Fussell 170.

⁶ Alice R. Bensen, Rose Macaulay (New York: Twayne, 1969) 73.

⁷ Fussell 21-23.

⁸ Cited in Michael Hastings, The Handsomest Young Man in England (London: Joseph, 1967) 182.

⁹ As quoted by Robert Graves, Good-Bye to All That: An Autobiography (London: Cape, 1931) 283-86.

¹⁰ Responses to the "Little Mother's" letter were reprinted in Graves, 286-88.

¹¹ Catherine W. Reilly, introduction, Scars Upon My Heart: Women's Poetry and Verse of the First World War (London: Virago, 1981) xxxv.

¹² As quoted by Fussell 25.

¹³ Macaulay, Catchwords and Claptrap 32.

¹⁴ Vera Brittain, Testament of Youth 214.

¹⁵ Rose Macaulay, Three Days (London: Constable, 1919) 12. In the collection of poems, three poems are titled "Picnic, July 1917," and all of them describe non-combatants' imaginary experience of the front. One of them was copied by Vera Brittain in Testament of Youth 366. Brittain refers to the unbearable sound of the "guns of France" and stresses her war experience in the area near the front.

¹⁶ Macaulay, Letters to a Sister 159.

¹⁷ As quoted by Jane Emery, Rose Macaulay: A Writer's Life (London: John Murray, 1991) 254.

CHAPTER III

NON-COMBATANTS AND OTHERS: "TO SEIZE
FRAGMENTS OF TRUTH"

This chapter intends to show that as early as 1916 when Rose Macaulay published Non-Combatants and Others, she not only perceived women's distinctive experience of war but also developed her pacifism, which was explicitly expressed later in her essays. As examined in the earlier chapter on her essays, Macaulay's pacifism was not grounded on the concept of binary division between the sexes. During World War I, Macaulay was keenly aware of her female identity, yet her pacifism did not coincide with that of many feminist pacifists of the 1910s. The majority of them, such as Olive Schreiner, Rosika Schwimmer, and Ellen Key, took the concept of motherhood as a principle of their beliefs.¹ They believed that women as childbearers had a particular interest in peace; their approach to peace focused on biological differences between men and women. In contrast, Macaulay did not agree that women, because of their sex role as mother or nurturer, were naturally inclined toward peace. For her, most people in a civilized society, combatants or civilians, or men or women, abhor war. War, in her words, haunts "all rational and sensitive people . . . as an obscene nightmare."² Even people who may be strong supporters of the government's war effort can not fail to see the miseries caused by war. Thus, to talk about war's detrimental impact on human civilization or about personal pain, distress, or discomfort in war time is one thing; to be a pacifist is another. Macaulay's main point is that a pacifist should make efforts to prevent future wars for the

sake of humanity, instead of merely expressing personal anti-war feelings. In Non-Combatants and Others Macaulay focuses on a young daughter and her pacifist mother and their views of the First World War. Yet the novel is not designed to expound only pacifist ideas. It presents various conflicting views of the war through its other characters. In addition, although the central characters are women, the novel does not polarize women's and men's attitudes toward war.

A close reading of the daughter's growing pacifism and the mother's firm pacifist position reveals that Non-Combatants and Others was a product of a woman writer who tried to establish her own literary response to the First World War at the time when writings based on combat experience were considered to be authoritative war literature. Non-Combatants and Others concurred with soldiers' war poetry in that it repudiated the jingoism and patriotism which occupied the public's minds during the war. Like soldiers' literature, it contains realistic pictures of soldiers who suffer from shell shock, although it does not cover them extensively. As Macaulay always questioned the validity of attributing certain characteristics to individuals solely based on their sex, she did not believe that all young men would be "happy warriors"³ as expected by many people at the beginning of the war. Her characterization of a few combatants in this novel demonstrates that Macaulay recognized the damaging effects of warfare on combatants at the very early stage of the war. However, her focus is not on the soldier but on a young artist, a daughter of a pacifist mother. Because Non-Combatants and Others concentrates on the daughter's perspectives on the war, it is not too much to say that this novel prefigured the women's war literature of the 1930s, which has been generally considered to represent mostly women's experience of the First World War. Moreover, the novel depicts, although briefly, the V.A.D. nurses' difficult task, a major subject of war literature by many

women in the 1930s. However, there is a great difference between women's war literature of the 1930s and Non-Combatants and Others. While main characters in the former try to emulate combatant experience by actively participating in the war and then becoming disillusioned by it, the daughter in the latter simply feels annoyed by the war before she finally decides to join the peace movement. Macaulay's characterization of the daughter implies that one could legitimately become a pacifist solely based on the experience of an observer. The novel does not articulate the prevalent assumption in the canonical anti-war literature of World War I that one must have firsthand experience to understand the realities of the war and to break with the traditions of military heroism and patriotism. I shall discuss traits of Non-Combatants and Others as a pacifist novel in its historical context before exploring the daughter's growing interest in peace efforts and the mother's pacifism. I shall also examine the connection between Macaulay's activities during the First World War and her pacifism as embodied in this novel.

A Distinctive Pacifist Novel

It is undisputable that Non-Combatants and Others is a pacifist novel. Because of its apparent message, Robert Kuehn in "The Pleasures of Rose Macaulay: An Introduction to Her Novels" (1962) states that to a certain extent Non-Combatants and Others "is a propaganda novel" (97). However, the novel does not really fit a general definition of the propaganda novel, according to which a novel is didactic and designed to move the reader to assume a certain point of view or to take direct action on a moral or political issue. Most critics agree that Macaulay's pacifist ideas presented in Non-Combatants and Others are rather ambiguous. Sharon Ouditt in Fighting Forces, Writing Women: Identity and Ideology in the First World War (1994) defines Non-Combatants

and Others as “a novel *about* uncertainty” (165). Ouditt points out the uncertainty in the voice of the narrator as well as the lack of resolution at the end of the novel. Similarly, in her article “‘It Is Not the Place of Women to Talk of Mud’: Some Responses by British Women Novelists to World War I” (1993), Nicola Beauman remarks the “generally dispassionate attitudes” which Non-Combatants and Others displays. She goes on to say that the novel is one of “the nearest we have in women’s fiction contemporary with the War to pacifist novels” (146). Beauman’s argument is grounded in the idea that women’s pacifist novels, not “the nearest” to them, came out in the 1930s, which she calls the era of the “second wave” of war literature (146). Claire Tylee also notes Macaulay’s detached attitude toward how to act to stop war. In The Great War and Women’s Consciousness (1990), Tylee asserts: “Macaulay never clearly confronts the arguments about the political grounds of the War or the possibility of political solutions to it. In fact she obfuscates the matter by linking ‘all the heterogeneous crowd of humanity’ in one desire for peace, as if all the groups she lists, such as the Anti-German League and conscientious objectors, had no conflict of interest in the way in which peace was to be achieved or what that peace would consist of” (117). Although she underestimates Macaulay’s recognition of the diverse, conflicting voices of peace, Tylee points out one of Macaulay’s fundamental beliefs concerning the issue of peace: despite the diversity of approaches, all people long for peace.

Regardless of differences in details, Ouditt, Beauman, and Tylee all explain crucial aspects of Macaulay’s pacifism in Non-Combatants and Others, which are manifested in the viewpoints of two main characters, Alix and Daphne Sandomir. First, Macaulay always believes that the pacifist movement is an attempt to establish peace regardless of its slim chance of success. Her pacifism is far from optimistic. Macaulay’s

doubts are displayed in the thoughts of the daughter, Alix, whose final commitment to peace efforts probably does not fulfill the reader's expectations of a pacifist propaganda novel. Alix does not have confidence that the peace effort will abolish the causes of war. The lack of conviction in Alix even at the final stage is plausible considering the development of her pacifism throughout the novel. She is a character of uncertainty, and she is not the only one who represents the author's ambiguous attitude toward peace movements. Surprisingly, this attitude is reflected in Alix's mother, Daphne, who is an ardent advocate for peace. Jill Liddington aptly points out that Daphne is "a gentle and affectionate fictional parody of a WIL (Women's International League) woman" (106). Nevertheless, Daphne's zeal for the peace movement is tainted with uncertainty. Daphne says to Alix: "there's no fighting with whole truths in this life, and all we can do is to seize fragments of truth where we can find them, and use them as best we can. Poor weapons, perhaps, but all we've got . . . at least it can't do any *harm* to try" (172). Daphne's words represent Macaulay's view that any attempt to establish lasting peace is itself of value.

Second, Macaulay believes in the human desire for peace. Thus she does not make any distinctions between men and women, old and young, or combatants and civilians. Unlike a number of pacifists, Macaulay does not even polarize pacifists and non-pacifists. During the First World War, she recognized the fact that the vast majority of British people viewed the war as "a war to end war." They believed they hated war so much that they took part in this war effort in order to eliminate all wars. Of course, other wars followed the First World War, yet such a justification reappeared during the Second World War. Macaulay perceived how subtle it could be to distinguish people who genuinely desire peace from people who believe in war in the name of peace. In keeping

with Macaulay's sense of subtle distinctions and her refusal to polarize perspectives, Alix does not adopt any pacifist ideas based on sex division, such as the idea that peace is a women's issue or the idea that women are peaceable, while men are warlike. That explains how Alix develops her pacifism from various viewpoints of others, especially those of a clergyman, C.M.V. West, and of her mother. Additionally, although Daphne has been involved in a peace organization and is called a feminist pacifist, she does not agree with the concept of inherently pacifist motherhood, which was popular among feminist pacifists. The pacifist women's 1915 Hague conference was dominated by the motherhood argument, which "claims that because women give birth they are *naturally* more humanitarian, more nurturing."⁴ However, pacifists were not the only group of people that emphasized women's role as mother during the war. As manifested in a "Little Mother's" letter and many recruitment posters, jingoists also used the image of the mother for propaganda. Daphne also disagrees that people's attitudes toward war are dependent upon their age. This latter idea was generally accepted by the younger generation, especially by combatants during the war. The younger generation believed that their combat experience drove them to be anti-war, while the older generation remained jingoistic. Moreover, Daphne stresses the significance of educating the public to understand the problems of international conflicts, and, unlike other pacifists at meetings in the novel, she opposes the polarization between pacifists and non-pacifists. Her implication is that everybody can be a pacifist.

In 1915, the year in which Non-Combatants and Others is set, Macaulay was 34 years old. She was not the age of "mother," the older generation of women who largely cherished glory of war for the younger generation. Neither was she the age of "daughter." Although Macaulay served briefly as a V.A.D. nurse and worked at the War Office, she

was not one of the young women, like Vera Brittain, who answered the call of their government and expressed their disillusionment about the war in the post-war era. At the outbreak of World War I, Macaulay was already “past the conventional clichés of the earlier twenties” as defined in Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract: “In extreme youth one has to be second-hand; one doesn’t know enough, one hasn’t lived or learnt enough, to be first-hand; and one lacks self-confidence” (84). In her biography of Macaulay, Jane Emery identifies her with a “daughter,” her character Alix Sandomir, a 25 year old artist, who evades the realities of war but eventually comes to a resolution to act against war. Emery points out that Macaulay did not respond to the First World War until she suffered the death of Rupert Brooke in April, 1915 (150). Nevertheless, it is questionable whether Macaulay’s characterization of Alix is entirely autobiographical. Emery does not consider that Macaulay was nearly 10 years older than Alix. Interestingly, Alix is at the age where she should have conviction. As Macaulay writes, “by five or six-and-twenty one should know what one thinks and what one means, and be able to state it in clear terms” (Potterism 84). Alix’s mother implies that Alix at her age should overcome anxiety about war: “Nerves. Yes. You oughtn’t to have any at your age, of course” (150). Referring to Alix’s introversion as selfishness, Daphne also states that Alix is “old enough now to leave it off” (162). Alix’s age also becomes an issue when Eleanor Orme, Daphne’s sister, disapproves of Alix’s intention to live alone in London. As a woman who believes in the traditional, proper behavior of young women, Mrs. Orme thinks that Alix is still “not old enough” (22). Depending on how one perceives woman’s social and cultural roles, a woman in her mid-twenties can be either mature or still young. Macaulay might have been vague about what to do with the outbreak of World War I, yet she consciously distanced herself from Alix by focusing on Alix’s age.

Questioning the identification of Macaulay with Alix does not suggest, however, that Macaulay was like Alix's mother, who is firm in her convictions, even though not many people share her views. Compared with her strong mother figure, Daphne, Macaulay was not politically active in any peace movement during the war. After all, Daphne is older than the author by thirteen years. As if pointing out a gap between her generation and her children's generation, Daphne repeatedly stresses her age, making a comparison between herself and young people in their twenties—Nicholas, West, and Alix. However, Daphne's consciousness of age does not lead her to draw a distinction between the old and the young with respect to war. Her argument reveals that Daphne is a creation of a woman writer whose ideas were not in accord with popular conceptions of either generation.

Macaulay's age lay almost halfway between Alix's and Daphne's, and she was about the same age as Mary Hamilton, who published a pacifist novel Dead Yesterday in 1916, and Virginia Woolf, who expressed her anti-war views in her novels of the early 1920s, such as Jacob's Room (1922) and Mrs. Dalloway (1925). None of the three was the age of the mothers who mostly approved of war works in which their sons and daughters participated; none of them were the age of young women who were largely led by war propaganda. Interestingly, they were of much the same age as "peacettes" in the war years who, as Caroline Moorehead points out, were "nearly all . . . in their thirties and early forties" (24). The novels of the women writers in their mid-thirties during the war years interposed between women's war literature of the 1910s, which tends to display patriotic sentiments, and those of the 1930s, which revolted against the earlier sentiments. A brief description of these two generations of women's war literature reveals just how

unique was the work of Macaulay, who fit neatly into neither of the two groups, either ideologically or in terms of age.

Despite women's peace movements before 1914 and some feminists' peace efforts which were reinforced with the outbreak of World War I, the majority of feminists in England supported their government's war effort. Women's peace movements since the late nineteenth century until the time of World War I were strongly tied to the suffrage campaign, which united women across national boundaries. The nineteenth-century women's peace movements, such as the Women's Peace and Arbitration Auxiliary of the Peace Society, adopted the idea that women's vote was critical to peace making. The International Council of Women, founded in 1888, consisted of suffragists and pacifists, although more members were enthusiastic about peace than suffrage. The International Women's Peace Congress, formed at The Hague in 1915, also recognized the connection between suffrage and peace: "We consider the introduction of women suffrage in all countries is one of the most powerful means to prevent war in the future."⁵ However, during World War I, many women moved away from the peace effort. Well-known suffragists such as the Pankhursts, mother Emmeline and a daughter Christabel, not only supported the war but also worked for conscription, although another Pankhurst daughter, Sylvia, remained a pacifist feminist. As Richard Evans says, many feminists became "super-patriots" (130).

Such patriotic sentiments also pervaded the literary world. Not many women writers, let alone their male counterparts, attempted to deliver messages of peace. In an analysis of literary trends during the war years, Claire Tylee points out that some women writers over age 50 produced novels which embodied their "high Victorian belief that war would revitalize a society in danger of decadence, replacing materialist values with

spiritual” (104). While such writers as Mrs. Humphry Ward and Edith Wharton “glorified the opportunity for heroism offered to young men,” some feminist writers, such as May Sinclair and Beatrice Harraden, expressed enthusiasm for the war because of opportunities opened to young women (Tylee 104-05). Referring to the exaltation of the women, in “Soldier’s Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women, and the Great War” Sandra Gilbert asserts that “metaphorically speaking . . . [they] distributed white feathers to large audiences of noncombatant readers” (209).

Patriotism was shared by many women of the younger generation. As Nicola Beauman points out, “the violence and the pointlessness of the War years did not induce British women writers to make a vehement protest; rather, it perpetuated the tyrannical grasp of the concept of renunciation and self-sacrifice which had for so long been a dominant force.”⁶ A letter by Vera Brittain, aged twenty-one at the beginning of the war, to her fiancé, Roland, exemplifies young women’s idea of self-sacrifice at the time. Referring to his remark that college was “a secluded life of scholastic vegetation,” Brittain wrote: “That is just what it is. It is, for me at least, too soft a job . . . I want physical endurance; I should welcome the most wearying kinds of bodily soil.”⁷ The idea of self-sacrifice exalted the spirit of many young women. Brittain certainly believed that her generation would be different because of their experience of war. She wrote to her mother while working as a V.A.D. nurse: “It seems very hard that we should be the generation to suffer the War, though I suppose it is very splendid too, and is making us better and wiser and deeper men and women than our ancestors ever were or our descendants ever will be.”⁸ As suggested in Brittain’s letter, the concept of self-sacrifice was not applied just to young women of the time. A novel *Little England* (1918) by Sheila Kaye-Smith, aged twenty-seven in 1914, describes young men’s self-sacrifice. An

extract from her novel, which modifies the famous lines of Brooke's "The Soldier," reads: "They [soldiers] had not died for England—what did they know of England and the British Empire? They had died for a little corner of ground which was England to them, and the sprinkling of poor common folk who lived in it."⁹ As Beauman suggests, Kaye-Smith might denounce "an abstract concept of patriotism."¹⁰ Nevertheless, Kaye-Smith was subject to patriotic thinking as much as the soldier poet who wrote the original lines. She glamorized war by emphasizing soldiers' self-sacrifice. She fell into the idea that soldiers died as heroic protectors of the little spot of land and the people they knew.

Patriotism, combined with the concept of romantic heroism, was very prevalent among young women. Despite her admiration for Olive Schreiner, a pacifist writer, Vera Brittain was preoccupied with a sense of duty to her country. In her essay "Why I Stand for Peace" (1937), Brittain describes the youth of the time: "In August 1914, I was hardly more than a child, young in years but younger still in mind and experience. At school, patriotism had been presented to us as a form of religion. *Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori* held, in our eyes, the supreme validity for fathers, brothers and lovers" (53).

Although Brittain does not make a connection between patriotism and the Victorian beliefs that the women writers of the older generation cherished, as Paul Fussell argues in *The Great War and Modern Memory*, the younger generation's zealous support of their country and its warfare was indeed grounded in the romantic tradition in Victorianism. For instance, Fussell asserts that when Sassoon, in a letter, used irony in order to present a popular concept of "the happy warrior," he was "rejecting a whole Victorian moral and artistic style" (169). Sassoon came to ridicule such Victorian beliefs after taking part in actual fighting. Similarly, Brittain's patriotism became shattered by her experience as a V.A.D. nurse, although, as she admitted, even in 1917 she did not raise her voice against

war propaganda.¹¹ As exemplified by her Testament of Youth (1933) and Honorable Estate (1937), Brittain's pacifist writings appeared almost twenty years after the First World War. During the war years, there were few who rejected the Victorian ethic of duty and militarism. Women's writings that dealt with V.A.D. nurses generally demonstrated "women's ability to act within a framework of acceptable female role models—as prescribed by the V.A.D. command" (Ouditt 36). Young women's experiences of the war, which turned out to be nearly as traumatic as those of young combatants, were largely disregarded in the late 1910s. It was the soldiers' poetry of trench life and their disillusionment about their patriotic duties that prevailed in literature during and right after the First World War. In general, literature on women's war experience had to wait until the late 1920s.

As demonstrated in Brittain's writings, women's war literature of the 1930s conveys the voices of women who were in their twenties and remained at their war duties during the First World War. A major theme which frequently recurred in the literature "was the inadequate response of those at home to those who have been in France or even nursing in England."¹² Women's literature on the First World War echoes soldiers' war literature, such as Sassoon's Memoirs of a Fox-Hunting Man (1928), Graves' Good-Bye to All That (1929), and Erich Maria Remarque's All Quiet on the Western Front (1929). As Sharon Ouditt states, women's anti-war writings bear a close parallel with soldiers' literature: "the texts published in the late 1920s and 1930, in the boom of war writing and often in response to male war stories . . . were often written with the express purpose of revealing the horrific nature of nursing men wounded by a new, mechanized and chemical armory" (36). The main idea in those women's writings is that there was no glory in young women's calls to warwork. In addition, a predominant theme of the women's texts

is the alienation they felt from women at home, especially women of the older generation, who did not share their experiences. The sharp division between home and the front turned out to be “the fracture . . . between mother and daughter”: “an event common to the narrative trajectories of these texts is the realization that these daughters can no longer communicate with their mothers” (Ouditt 40). The young Vera Brittain’s comment on Roland’s mother reveals such feelings of many young women who had personal experiences of the war: “Roland’s mother received me with warmth and generosity, though she was somewhat perturbed by our flippant announcement that we were engaged Love, for her, was something to be gloried in and acknowledged; like so many others, she had not seen enough of the War at first hand to realize how quickly romance was being replaced by bitterness and pessimism in all the young lovers whom 1914 had caught at the end of their teens.”¹³ Brittain does not indicate the opposition between mother and daughter, yet she implies the gap between older people at home and young people close to the real battle, if not at the front.

Women’s war literature of the 1930s mainly deals with women’s firsthand experiences of the First World War and consequently displays the gap between them and people who did not share their experiences. In comparison, Non-Combatants and Others does not convey any such division. The novel suggests that one’s anti-war feelings do not necessarily result from one’s personal involvement with war and one’s later disillusionment about it. Macaulay’s main focus is women, whether young or old, who get a good understanding of war without active participation in it. Her portrayal of the women illustrates the same views that her contemporaries, such as Mary Hamilton and Virginia Woolf, present in their anti-war novels. The similarity between Mary Hamilton’s Dead Yesterday and Macaulay’s Non-Combatants and Others clearly lies in the way the

theme of peace is embodied in the characterization of mother and daughter. Both novels centralize the daughter who becomes a successor to her pacifist mother. The mothers—Aurelia Leonard in Dead Yesterday and Daphne Sandomir in Non-Combatants and Others—hold firm beliefs in peace in opposition to the more prevalent patriotism. Unlike them, a mother of a combatant, Betty Flanders, in Virginia Woolf's Jacob's Room does not express her voice concerning war. However, the characterization of the mother reflects Woolf's belief that a woman is able to understand the grim realities of war without seeing "enough of the War at firsthand." Betty Flanders is not a mother who accepts patriotic arguments. Her sentiment regarding her son, Jacob, opens the reader's eyes to the war-related, senseless death of a youth. Another mother figure in Woolf's Mrs. Dalloway also represents a woman who sympathizes with a combatant. Clarissa Dalloway, despite differences in gender, class, and age, becomes the double of Septimus Warren Smith, a veteran, who has suffered from shell shock and eventually kills himself. All the mother figures created by these three women writers are unlike a "Little Mother" in the propaganda whose image was widely accepted by combatants as well as non-combatants during World War I.

The distinctiveness of Non-Combatants and Others lies in the fact that the plot, the setting, and the characters are all embedded in the context of the First World War. In addition, the novel presents various responses of civilians as well as of combatants to the war in the year of 1915. Although Hamilton's Dead Yesterday is similar to Non-Combatants and Others in its characterization of mother and daughter, Dead Yesterday mostly describes the life of pre-war times while focusing on a growing relationship between Aurelia Leonard's daughter and a journalist Nigel Strode. Once the government enters the war, the public's response is almost unanimous. People support the

government's effort at mobilization. Aurelia Leonard alone is conspicuous in her dedication to peace. Her daughter who has no thoughts about any issue, including war, comes to realize that she cannot agree with Nigel about the war after witnessing the war's impact on people, such as a young widow and a child. As she begins to establish her anti-war views, she becomes a type of woman Nigel does not want to have as his fiancée. She becomes closer to her mother and breaks up the engagement. Compared with Dead Yesterday, Woolf's Jacob's Room and Mrs. Dalloway present the issue of war in a more subtle and indirect way. In both novels, the war is rarely mentioned. The first covers Jacob's boyhood and his life before he is killed in action; the second deals with the post-war era. Both novels are concerned with a mother figure and her relation to a young soldier who is now dead, yet they are set in a context larger than World War I alone.

By comparison, focusing on one year of the First World War, Non-Combatants and Others takes on people's reactions to the war, which are by no means unified. Its basic message is that people's reactions to the war vary regardless of their age or gender. Unlike Dead Yesterday, the novel does not resort to a dichotomy between a pacifist mother and the rest of the characters. In Non-Combatants and Others the pacifist mother is not the only one who sees the grim realities of war. Even some mothers' ignorance of war does not make them become so patriotic that they are willing to send their sons to the front. A wounded Belgian soldier's wish not to go back to the battlefield is supported only by his mother. A young woman protests about the common notion that mothers' meetings are filled with jingoistic talk and asserts that mothers in general do not know enough to support war. Mothers only hope that "their boys won't go" (93). As D. A. Boxwell accurately points out, "if the Parliamentary Recruiting Committee urged the women of Britain to 'Say Go!' Macaulay's work of fiction is remarkable for its message

that mothers “Say No!” (89). In addition, the novel questions the prevailing cliché regarding women’s nurturing instinct. Not all women have the instinct which functions in nursing wounded soldiers. Some young women are willing to support the government’s war effort; others ignore the state of war and continue in the same way of life as they had in pre-war time or enjoy opportunities created by war. Even among V.A.D. nurses, Macaulay presents no uniform response. The novel describes a great deal of hardships that V.A.D. nurses suffer while working in a hospital. Yet their attitudes are various; some of them remain unaffected regardless of their witnessing gruesome scenes. The diversity of responses to war is also illustrated in the characterization of soldiers on leave. The portrayal of several soldiers in the novel manifests that trench life does not have the same impact on every soldier. One soldier suffers from combat neurosis; another indicates a bit of enjoyment in combat. The only characteristic common to both soldiers is that neither sees the war beyond the personal level. Contrary to the young men in their war duties, a few young men who have not enlisted express their views of the war and its influence on humanity.

According to Macaulay, all the characters can be categorized largely into three groups—“respondents,” “reactors,” and “indifferents,” the definitions of which are discussed in Non-Combatants and Others. The first is a group of people who “respond to the movement and join in all its works and are propelled along in a certain direction by it”; the second is a group of people who “react against it, and are propelled in the opposite direction”; the third is the biggest group who are “fundamentally untouched” by war (93-95). In general, “respondents” are supporters of war, whereas reactors are against the war effort. However, Macaulay’s characterization demonstrates that such division is by no means clear. Some “respondents” are busy and happy about what they do for the war;

others cannot cope with the difficult tasks they have participated in. Some reactors may express strong opposition to the war, yet refuse to put their beliefs into action. In addition, not all “indifferents” are ignorant of the war. Some of them seemingly disregard the realities of war and lead their pre-war lives; nevertheless, they are “indifferents” only in a superficial sense. The presentation of various responses to the First World War in this novel illustrates that the distinction between war and peace or between the jingoist and the pacifist is far from simple.

Alix: A Daughter

Non-Combatants and Others starts with a scene in which Alix draws a little boy. It is “a green late April evening” in 1915. Her drawing is emphasized in contrast to her cousin Dorothy’s work in a V.A.D. hospital. Alix appears to be insensitive to wartime conditions because she only concentrates on drawing in an idyllic place, yet her choice of the boy as a drawing subject reveals that she is well aware of the war. Dorothy’s participation in nursing, along with many civilians’ war activities, led to closing the boy’s Sunday school, and the boy has changed from “the worst little boy in the Sunday-school” to “the worst little boy in the wood” (3). The narrative implies that the boy is out of touch with civilized life because of the war. The boy is not in the least a figure in the romantic tradition. Macaulay’s choice of the mythical name, Percival, reveals that she is deliberately parodic of the tradition. Percival poses “with his small cleft chin lifted truculently . . . frowning brows, one scratched brown leg bare to the knee, dirty hands thrust into torn pockets” (3). He is not the type of boy that is frequently depicted in soldiers’ poetry. As Paul Fussell explains, boys depicted in soldiers’ war literature were especially beautiful and often blond, and such images of boys originated in part from the

homoerotic romanticism in Victorian literary tradition. Soldiers' depiction of the boys stresses male bonding and self-sacrifice. It also appealed to civilian readers. As shown in the popularity of Robert Nichols, a large audience "took pleasure in images of the war that featured fated, beautiful soldier boys mourned sentimentally and 'romantically' by their intimate male friends."¹⁴ The image of unpleasant-looking Percival suggests that Alix is not influenced by the tradition to which many people cherished by the time of World War I.

Alix's drawing reflects not only her ambivalent attitude toward the war but also her break with the Victorian tradition in other ways as well. The following description of Alix's physical appearance suggests that she is not a romantic heroine:

She had a pale, narrow, delicate, irregular sort of face, broad-browed, with a queer, cynical, ironic touch to it, and purple-blue eyes that sometimes opened very wide and sometimes narrowed into slits. When they narrowed she looked as from behind a visor, critical, defensive, or amused; when they opened wide she looked singularly unguarded, as if the bars were up and she, unprotected, might receive the enemy's point straight and clean.

(3)

Alix is very different from a stereotypical heroine. As later described, she is also lame. Tylee argues that "Alix's crippled body manifests the incapacity of her nature to meet the demands of war-time society" (114). However, Alix's body may represent more than her inability to participate in any war work. After all, her active cousin, Margot, insinuates that Alix has chosen not to engage in war activities. Calling Alix "a lazy little beggar," Margot points out that she even does not "draw the window-curtains against Zepps" (7). Alix's physical traits resemble those of Oliver Vallon in Macaulay's earlier novel *The*

Valley Captives (1911). Vallon is a “pale, tired-faced” and “cynical cripple” whose lips tend to twist “slightly in a curious smile” (1-3). Vallon’s disabled body apparently symbolizes his inability to protect his own children from his powerful, violent step-children, yet his powerlessness also results from his conscious choice not to take a side in a case of conflicts. As a father, Vallon has the authority to free his children from the influence of his step children when his sister asks him to let her take the children to Italy for a while. But Vallon refuses to exercise his authority and contributes to the misfortune of his children. Similarly, it is not entirely Alix’s body that stops her from doing war work. Alix has made a willful decision not to be involved. Her strong disagreement with Clive Bell’s anti-war book¹⁵ implies that Alix holds her own opinions on the issue of war and that she does not value peace efforts. Nevertheless, being surrounded by her relatives at Wood End who are very busy with war activities, Alix seemingly remains indifferent to the war. With her eyes narrowed, she displays her attempt to be an artist who completely disregards wartime realities. When Alix’s relatives, the Ormes, ask questions to her cousin John, who is on leave, Alix watches the family through the window. She clearly sees the red scar on John’s face, which reaches from his jaw to his forehead, as well as the odd movement of John’s throat when he speaks. Despite her own observation, Alix acts as if she is only concerned with painting. Seemingly shutting her eyes to John’s wound, she narrows her eyes against the family in the room and thinks that the scene would be worth painting (5).

Alix’s aloofness in fact disguises her sensitivity to war. As suggested by her wide-open eyes, Alix is very susceptible to the horror of war. Her reactions to three combatants reveal that she is prone to war-related pain. First, Alix tries to ignore the content of Basil Doye’s letter: the trenches, a rat, noises of explosive shells, his wish to have had a

combat, and a soldier who was “stopped . . . with his head” (9). She instead concentrates on a pastoral painting by Basil Doye, which reminds her of pre-war time. For her, the life of that time represents “a reality, a sanity, an enduringness, a beauty”; in contrast, life now is full of “evil dreams” (10). Alix’s longing for pre-war life is also implied by her preference for poems produced before the war: she “preferred this poetry to any written since August 1914, which had killed fairies” (133). Alix’s effort to think about only the pre-war time does not succeed. Doye’s letter, like all letters from the front, affects Alix “like bullets and bits of shrapnel crashing into her world, with their various tunes” (9). Alix feels miserable despite the somewhat cheery tone of Doye’s letter. The narrator speculates about Alix’s emotion by using the same words Doye has used: Alix “might, from her nervous frown, have been afraid of ‘stopping one’” (9). While Alix has been displeased by Doye’s combatant spirit, she is also troubled by her brother Paul’s lack of it. She reads a letter from her brother Paul, who was an excellent school boy before the war. From his poorly written letter Alix senses the degradation of his intelligence and feels angry about the gender role which is imposed on her eighteen-year-old-brother. She thinks that the front is “no place for children, and, as Paul’s elder by nearly seven years, she knew all about his nerves” (10). Paul is too young and too sensitive to be a soldier. Because Alix does not accept Paul’s moral obligation to go fight, his death drives her to despair. While her cousin Mrs. Frampton states that Paul’s life has not been “a wasted” one, the supposedly comforting words become “a foreign language” to Alix (69). As if Alix did not hear, she repeats: “But he hadn’t lived yet” (70). The reality about some soldiers’ nerves is demonstrated by John. While sleepwalking, John betrays horrors that he experienced in the trench by “crying, sobbing, moaning, like a little child, like a man on the rack” (18). Shocked at what she has seen, Alix asks Dorothy to stop John and

becomes “most suddenly and violently sick” (18). Dorothy, who has efficiently reacted to the situation, gives Alix advice: “You’ll never be any use if you don’t forget *yourself*, Alix After all, what they can bear to go through, we ought to be able to bear to hear about. But of course you’re not used to it” (19). Dorothy implies that anyone, combatant and non-combatant, can be used to war-related miseries. After Dorothy has gone to sleep, Alix talks to herself:

What they can bear to go through But they can’t, they can’t, they
can’t . . . we can bear to hear about . . . but we can’t, we can’t, we can’t.
(19)

Using Dorothy’s words, Alix discloses the fact that the war has generated pain which is unbearable to many combatants and many civilians. John’s breakdown disturbs Alix so much that she is not able to paint. The next day Alix is lost in thoughts of the trenches, Basil, and the sleepwalking John’s talk about the dissected bodies of his friend. She feels as if she had firsthand experience of trench warfare. The incident subsequently drives Alix to leave Wood End for London. On the recommendation of her aunt, Mrs. Orme, Alix decides to stay at Violette with a cousin, Emily Frampton, and her two daughters, Evie and Kate Tucker, who, according to her aunt, “probably know nothing about the war, except that there is one” (23).

Living with Mrs. Frampton and Evie and Kate Tucker, Alix appears to be well guarded from the war. Her female relatives at Wood End are “respondents,” who actively participate in war work, and they give the impression that “the war has been good for them” (91). In contrast, Mrs. Frampton and her daughters are “indifferents.” For the residents of Violette, the war is an event very remote from their lives. The name of their residence, Violette, confuses both Alix’s aunt and her mother with flower names such as

geranium, pansy, and violet. It hints that they are women of conventional, feminine virtues. The Violette residents are concerned about whether their meals are properly cooked even when hearing reports on the war. They esteem the domestic virtue of rectitude as women's proper conduct. War is no concern of theirs. A report on casualties of babies from a Zeppelin attack does not hold their attention long. Responding to Mrs. Frampton's sympathetic remarks on the babies, Kate simply states that the Germans are "just unhuman murderers . . . I expect they're dead to shame by now" (31). After that, Mrs. Frampton and the daughters continue talking about bacon, toast, tea, and blouse patterns. It is clear that war-related stories do not arouse their interest. Their indifference is also reflected in their attitudes toward combatants. Mrs. Frampton briefly expresses sympathy with Basil when Alix mentions Basil's injury. Such a story has no impact on Kate and Evie. Along with Mrs. Frampton and the daughters, Alix acts aloof from war news, at least when she is not asleep. All the stories seem insignificant because they do not concern Paul's troop. At Wood End Alix refused to do anything and only concentrated on painting. In contrast, she now even volunteers to help the Tucker sisters with house chores.

Ostensibly Alix enjoys life, as if she knew nothing about the war. With the group of art students, Alix seems to be her pre-war self, a young artist who does not see the harsh realities of life due to her lack of firsthand observation. However, the narrator explains that Alix and another male art student are silent on the subject of war because they abhor it. Such comments imply that although all four art students turn their eyes from anything that reminds them of war, such as soldiers and V.A.D. nurses, intrinsically they have different attitudes toward war. Alix, along with that male student, acts indifferent, but in reality she is not.

While Alix is too disgusted with war to discuss it, her brother Nicholas clearly expresses his distaste for it. Nicholas, a twenty-seven year old journalist, believes that war is “too ridiculous a business for him to take part or lot in” (41). However, his refusal to serve is not founded on either moral or religious beliefs. The narrator explains that Nicholas “was completely lacking in any sense of veneration for anything, negligently put aside as absurd all forms of supernatural religion . . . had from an infant reacted so violently against the hereditary enthusiasm which nevertheless looked irrepressibly out of his eyes that he had landed himself with an unintelligent degree of cynicism in all matters” (41). Nicholas clearly sees the negative impacts of war on humanity and literature. Reading to Alix some passages from The Effects of the War on Literature on which he has to write a review, he argues that World War I has given “an unhealthy stimulus to hundreds of minds and thousands of pens” (45). The argument in the book that war provides writers with opportunities to write great heroic works annoys him. In response to what the book says, Nicholas asserts that the majority of literary works which convey heroism and patriotism do not reach the level of first-rate art. His point is that war hinders good writers from producing fine works, because “the first-rate people, both the combatants and non-combatants, are too much disgusted, too upset, to do first-rate work” (45). In his fervent talk about war’s negative impact on humanity and literature, Nicholas sounds like a propagandist for peace. He even seems to represent his creator’s view of war and literature. Nevertheless, his anti-war argument does not share Macaulay’s view that any attempt to establish peace is of value. Nicholas just expresses anti-war feelings. Except that Nicholas is more outspoken, he is like Alix in that he has refused to take any part in the war. Nicholas is a dissident, and he disdains peace efforts as much as war. For him, peace efforts of his roommate, Reverend West, are a foolish thing to try because

they are destined to be a failure. When Alix finds West's peace effort interesting, Nicholas equates it with their mother's: "It's been as unsuccessful as the peace conferences mother attends. But apparently the members of both are obliged, by their faith, to be incurable optimists. West's always full of life and hope; nothing daunts him" (50). From her brother's statement, Alix concludes that West's religious faith helps him to forget about war, just as painting does for her male fellow art students. Alix's view of West later proves wrong because West has faced the war by helping people who have been terribly affected by it. Alix still has an unrealistic idea that if she only concentrated on painting, she would not be haunted by thoughts of the war.

However, the war cannot be forgotten. Even at Violette, reports on war-related issues are always brought into conversation, although they are not seriously discussed. Mrs. Frampton and her daughters talk about some stories of war, but ignore overall issues related to war by setting a high value on being conventionally feminine in war time. For them, war is men's business, and women's job is to have some concern about it or, as Evie believes, to enjoy life, defying the fact that the country is at war. In a gathering at Violette, a wife of a young lawyer who has not enlisted thanks to his prestigious position, speaks about a major difference between the sexes: "The way I see it is, the men are fighting for us women, and where should we be but for them, and the least we can do is not to forget all about them, seeing gay musical plays. The way I'm made, I suppose, and I don't pretend to judge for others" (55). Similarly, Mrs. Frampton thinks that women should not worry about issues beyond the bounds of home. She is willing to read or talk about the war only because she believes that "it improves the mind" (60). Moreover, she is easily touched by stories of the front. However, Mrs. Frampton's opinions are little more than reactions. Reacting to a newspaper article on "atrocities practised by the

enemy,” Mrs. Frampton clicks “horror with her tongue” (52). She expresses her idea that such actions of the Germans are incongruous with civilization and then goes on to say, “I’m sure any one would think they’d be ashamed” (52). A little later on, she changes her view of Germans after listening to Kate read a soldier’s letter in the paper. The letter claims that German soldiers, who lack courage and act like powerless prey—running rabbits or squealing pigs, are forced to fight by their superiors. Without thinking about what she said a moment ago, Mrs. Frampton sympathizes with them: “Poor things, I’m sure one can’t but be sorry for them” (53). The only consistency in her opinion is that a woman should not desire “any more than her home and her husband and children, if she’s a proper woman” (57).

Alix mostly remains silent during the conversation. She thinks that everyone’s opinion lacks substance, including the opinions of a young woman guest, who expresses opposite perspectives on women’s roles. Although Alix silently agrees with her that the dominant opinions are wrong, she is to a great degree disturbed by the young woman’s “crude sentiments,” which she believes are the tendencies of women in the earlier century. Only at one point, when that young woman argues about the duty of women like Kate or herself, does Alix break her silence and betray her latent commitment to impossible tasks, such as abolition of poverty or permanent peace.

“*You* may be all right, in your station of life, but you’ve got to look at other women’s—the poor. We’ve got to do something about the poor. The vote would help us.”

“There have always,” said Mrs. Frampton, “been the poor, and there always will be.”

“That’s just why,” suggested Alix, momentarily joining in, “it might be worth while to do something about them.” (56-57)

Mrs. Frampton’s point is that any attempt to help the poor is beyond human capability. For Mrs. Frampton, like prospects of war, it should be left “in the hands of the Almighty” (54). The religious faith which Alix has incorrectly believed makes Reverend West forget about the war causes Mrs. Frampton to remain passive in dealing with social and political issues. When Kate delivers her preacher’s arguments that war is God’s punishment upon human beings and that “the only way to stop the war is a change of life,” Mrs. Frampton speaks out that human efforts “don’t make much difference after all” (84-85). Alix’s objection to Mrs. Frampton’s remark about the poor foretells her later approach to peace efforts: despite the impossibility of resolving problems, such as poverty or war, any effort is worth trying.

Alix’s exposure to the war continues. In the hospital where Alix and a fellow art student go to see Basil Doye, she observes combatants and nurses go through physical and mental ordeals. Doye, who has earlier expressed his disappointment at the lack of combat experience in a letter to Alix, does not show any symptom of mental disorder. His main complaint about trench life is boredom. Doye has been stricken physically rather than mentally, although there is a clear change in his mind, which is later shown in his new relationship with Alix. He is facing the possibility of losing his career as a painter because of an injury to his fingers. Next to Doye lies a soldier whose head contains shrapnel. His mental disorder is more disturbing than his physical pain. The soldier, a former prisoner, sings German songs, as if he does not know which side he is on. His voice occasionally breaks into the conversation among Doye and Alix and the other art student. The fragments of the songs, along with one ward named after a German,

Wilhelm, signify how absurd is the make-believe division between our side and the enemy. The lyrics do not express belligerence, and implicitly contradict what people like Mrs. Frampton believe, which Alix sums up: “it’s a righteous war, though of course war is very wicked. Righteous of us and wicked of the Germans” (74). In the belief that the war is for a good cause, many British men and women have participated in war activities, but not everybody is capable of carrying out the obligation that the society has imposed on him or her. Just as some soldiers can not cope with combat, some nurses have nervous breakdowns from their work at the hospitals. A young Red Cross woman has fainted and been carried out of an operation room. Some V.A.D. nurses faint from standing for long periods of time in accordance with improper hospital rules.

With her observation of the hospital, Alix pretends that she can dismiss all war-related, unpleasant facts from her mind. However, everybody knows that Alix has been very much disturbed by the war. Alix’s state of mind, intertwined with Doye’s changed mentality, makes her relationship with Doye difficult. Before the war Alix and Doye kept good company with each other, discussing many topics, particularly painting. Doye now tries to avoid Alix’s company because she is “too nervy” (73). The narrator explains that Doye’s experience of the trenches drives him to desire “some girl with poise, and tone, and sanity, and no nerves, who never bothered about the war or anything” (73). Doye is “sick of hurt and damaged bodies and minds” (73). Thus, while having tea with Alix, he shows great interest in Evie, Alix’s cousin, the moment he sees her. He describes Evie to Alix:

“Now a person like that, who looks like some sort of wood goddess . . . and looks as if she’d never had a day’s illness or a bad night in her life, is so—so *restful*. So alive and yet so calm. No nerves anywhere Being

out there plays the dickens with people's nerves, you know. Not every one's, of course; there are plenty of cheery souls who come through unmoved; but you'd be surprised at the jolly, self-possessed sportsmen who go to pieces more or less—all degrees of it, of course. Some don't know it themselves; you can often only see it by the way their eyes look at you while they're talking, or the way their hand twitches when they light their cigarette They dream a bit, too Talk in their sleep, you know, or walk." (77)

It is clear that Doye talks about a certain number of combatants from his firsthand experience, yet the characteristics of the combatants can be easily applied to Alix. Compared with Evie, Alix is one of the "hurt and damaged bodies and minds," whom Doye avoids meeting. Ironically, as betrayed on Doye's hand movement, observed by Alix, Doye himself is to a certain extent one of the "hurt and damaged bodies and minds." What Doye sees in Evie is "Woman" as defined by the narrator as "life itself which, like love and hate, is primitive, uncivilized, intellectually unprogressive, but basic and inevitable" (98).

The triangular relationship among Doye and Alix and Evie results from a change in Doye after his participation in the war. Applying Macaulay's definitions of "mental females," "mental males," and "mental neutrals," Doye has changed from a mental neutral to a mental male. In her novel *Mystery at Geneva* (1922), Macaulay divides people into three groups according to their interests in certain topics: first, "mental females, or womanly women, are apt to talk about clothes, children, domestics, the prices of household commodities, love affairs, or personal gossip"; second, "mental males, or manly men, talk about sport, finance, business, animals, crops, or how things are made";

third, “mental neutrals of both sexes . . . talk about all the other things, such as books, jokes, politics . . . plays, music, current fads and scandals, public persons and events, newspapers, life, and anything else which turns up” (150-51). The first and second groups are men and women whose minds are set on the basis of sex division, whereas the third group consists of men and women whose capacities are beyond sex division. Before the war, as their interest in diverse issues proved, both Doye and Alix were mental neutrals. However, Doye is now a mental male. As a manly man, he feels drawn to a mental female Evie, who believes in a clear distinction between men and women in every respect. For Evie, even smoking is men’s business; women should not smoke because they, unlike men, “can’t fight for the country” (121). In contrast, like a good number of combatants, Alix smokes heavily. Her smoking indicates that Alix is a mental neutral who does not leave war matters to men. Furthermore, Alix is in as great an anguish as many soldiers are. Her psychological attachment to war causes Doye, who has discarded his pre-war self, to feel alienated from Alix. Doye’s interest in Evie grows, and Alix becomes jealous and hurt.

The psychological impact of the war on Alix escalates when she hears about how Paul died. A friend of Alix’s cousin accidentally tells Alix about a soldier’s suicide without knowing that Alix is the sister of the dead soldier. The man describes the young soldier as “a nervous, sensitive sort of chap,” who “never ought to be out there at all” (99). While recalling the soldier’s eyes, he sees the soldier’s look in Alix: a “white, shamed face and great haunted blue eyes and crooked, sensitive mouth and brows” (99). Alix is Paul’s double. The identical looks of the sister and the brother, which take after their father, indicate that a certain number of both sexes are susceptible to war neurosis. The one great difference between the sister and the brother lies in their gender roles: the former has had

no moral obligation to take part in the war; in contrast, the latter tried to perform the task imposed on him and eventually succumbed to nervous breakdown. Making an effort to console Alix, her cousin says that Paul is in a better condition because “if he’d come through it he’d have kept on remembering all the things one tries to forget” (102). Unlike his older brother, who earlier had a mental breakdown, this cousin of Alix has not been scarred by trench life, and his carefree spirit is very much like Evie’s. He advises Alix how to overcome Paul’s death: “The thing is . . . not to *think*. Not to *imagine*. Not to *remember* It’s *over*, don’t you see, for Paul” (102). His words convey the same advice as Dorothy’s when Alix witnessed John’s breakdown. Alix realizes that an evasive attitude is not the answer to confronting war. Being shocked at the information about Paul’s suicide, Alix, for the first time, speaks out her pretense of aloofness and its ineffectiveness: “what—what on earth are we to *do* about it all? It—it’s going on now—this moment I’ve tried so hard not to let it come near . . . and now . . . now” (103). Alix’s sentence is completed by her cousin: “Now you’d better go on trying” (103).

Once Alix breaks her silence regarding her indifferent attitude, she clearly expresses her ideas both in thoughts and in words. She looks for the answer to her question of what to do about the war. She thinks about the meaning of Paul’s death and the religious faith of three people—Mrs. Frampton, her daughter Kate, and Reverend West. She ponders how they view life and war. The three people’s religious beliefs underline the diversity in Christianity. People take different attitudes toward war, although they almost unanimously find war abhorrent. Similarly, Christians differ from one another in their understanding of God. Alix’s examination of diverse perspectives on God reflects the author’s view as well. In her 1934 biography of Milton, Macaulay points out the subjectivity in interpretation of the Bible. She argues that Milton “exalts

Scripture, indeed, and bases his whole structure on what he believes it to say. But his use of it is yet one more example of the adaptability of the Scriptures to the needs of those who search them. As others have, Milton found that they spoke to him as he wished” (119). All three religious people in Non-Combatants and Others have found their own ways to understand God and human affairs. Based on their independent understanding, they have reached different conclusions about war. Mrs. Frampton’s Almighty God “could, and would, unless for wise purposes he chose otherwise, keep men and women physically safe, protect them from battle, murder, and sudden death” (105). Paradoxically, it is the same God who “somehow was responsible for the war” (105). For Mrs. Frampton, there is nothing that mankind can do about misfortunes or tragedies, and war is one of them. In comparison, Kate believes that there is hope of abolishing war. According to Kate, because war is God’s judgment, it will cease when each individual stops leading a wicked life. Alix outlines the difference between Mrs. Frampton and Kate: “Mrs. Frampton worshipped a God of Things as they Are, who has already done all things well, and Kate one who is little concerned with the ordering of the world at all, but only with individual souls” (107). Alix’s dissatisfaction with both of them implies her desire to do something about war on the world-wide level. Although Alix does not know enough about West’s faith to analyze it, she is sure that it is different from Mrs. Frampton’s and Kate’s. She comes to think that West’s God may offer a remedy for her agony over Paul’s death as well as the war itself because his approach is full of “energy, effort, adventure, revolt, life taken at a rush” (106).

Examining similarities and differences between Kate and West, Alix continues seeking solutions to her agony. Her personal suffering is in line with Paul’s and that of the human race, as manifested in the parallel of Paul’s “desperation and pain, her own, all

the world's" (107). In Kate's church, Alix discovers that Kate is "caught in the toils of some strange, surprising force" (110). Kate's faith is as strong as that of West. However, the difference between the two is obvious because Kate's faith only helps her to have peace of mind. Along with other people in the church, Kate is described as one of "untaught children" (113). The word "untaught" contributes to forming a striking contrast between Kate's force and Daphne's peace efforts. Daphne believes education is one of the solutions to international conflicts because it can awaken the uneducated public to realities of war. In contrast to that of Kate, West's force looks toward world peace. From a preacher's sermon on the concept of "the strong city," Alix deliberates how that concept applies to Kate and West. The preacher defines the strong city as "the city of refuge for which we all crave, and more especially just now, in this day of tribulation" (111). Alix is not sure that Kate has found the strong city. In contrast, Alix's speculation about West's faith contains a somewhat definite tone:

. . . what sort of strength had that city? Was it merely a refuge . . . where one might hide from fear? Or had it strength to conquer the chaos? West would say it had; that its work was to launch forces over the world like shells, to shatter the old materialism, the old comfortable selfishness, the old snobberies, cruelties, rivalries, cant, blind stupidities, lies. The old ways . . . of destruction and unhappiness and strife, that had led to the bitter hell where boys went out in anguish into the dark.

The city wasn't yet strong enough, apparently, to do that. Would it be one day? (112)

Alix's understanding of West is based on her earlier meeting with him at Clifford's Inn when she went to see her brother Nicholas. West has acknowledged that all efforts to

break the problems from “the old materialism” to “lies” have been failures, yet he is always positive about their future success. Thinking about West’s faith, Alix identifies the old problems with ways of life which have contributed to making war. Interestingly, those are the same kinds of problems that are satirized in Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract, such as exploitation, selfishness, snobbery, cant, and stupidity. All of them contradict the artist’s truth. Alix’s thoughts, however, end with uncertainty. She is skeptical about any possibility of abolishing those problems. Despite her preference for West’s force over Kate’s, Alix does not share West’s utopian belief, which Nicholas calls “incurable optimism” (142). Indeed, no one can provide the answer to Alix’s needs. Alix comes to develop her own way to deal with war.

Alix feels keenly the necessity of taking action in order to overcome the agonies generated by the war. The war’s impact on Alix is worse than she has realized. The war has given her more than pain; it has changed her in nature. Out of jealousy, Alix lies to Evie about Doye’s passion. Referring to the pre-war relationship between her and Doye, she insinuates that Doye is not serious in his relationship with Evie, and Alix’s lie provides Evie with an excuse for breaking up with Doye. Evie acts upset about the alleged insincerity on Doye’s part. However, compared to Evie’s self-deception, Alix’s lie is next to nothing. Evie has been getting tired of Doye and enjoying attention from a handsome cavalry man, who, unlike Doye, has been “cool, unruffled, unscarred, and mentioned in despatches” (123). Despite the truth, Alix feels miserable afterward. Because of her ability to lie, she sees herself as a person who suffers from “the mental and moral collapse” in the time of war (129). She is aware that there are people who, as exemplified by her female cousins at Wood End, have been “strengthened, steadied, made

more unselfish and purposeful . . . [and] could even minister to combatants without envying them” (129).

The psychological effects of the war on Alix are illustrated further after the broken-hearted Doye has refused to acknowledge Alix’s affection for him and left for the front. Nicholas draws a parallel between Alix and shell-shocked combatants in a hospital. As if confirming Nicholas’ analysis, Alix frankly speaks about her agonized self. She confesses that the war has affected her so much that her paintings have deteriorated. After that, on an impulse she puts several ideas in words. One idea is about the prohibition of her gender from combat: “I want to go and help to end it Oh, it’s rotten not being able to; simply rotten Why shouldn’t girls?” (141). Alix suggests that if she were a man, she would join the war in order to end it. She seems to forget that Paul’s nerves, like hers, were not a soldier’s. However, Alix is on no account a sister who envies her brother for his heroic adventure or his opportunity for doing glorious, patriotic duty. Her statement simply implies that even “respondents,” who are actively engaged in war work, do not really want war yet support the government’s war effort in the belief that they would contribute to ending it. It contrasts with some people’s self-justification in which they distinguish themselves from “respondents.” The wife of a young lawyer states that her peace-loving mother does not allow her brother to go to fight. She indicates that her brother has not been able to take part in battle because of the mother’s concern about his safety, but other young men who like to fight should go. She also quotes her civilian husband, who has said, “leave war to those that want war” (75). Her point suggests that anyone who has participated in war is a militarist. By comparison, Alix does not draw such a distinction between combatants and non-combatants. She refuses to label combatants militarists. Instead, she believes that non-combatants have to do something to

end war while combatants try to achieve the same goal at the front. This idea betrays the guilt Alix feels as a non-combatant, and guilt also underlies a statement by Reverend West, who shares these views with Alix. Referring to war news, West deplores the position of non-combatants, which cannot contribute to stopping the current warfare. He expresses how psychologically vulnerable non-combatants can be in war time simply because they are not directly involved in the combat:

“War’s beastly and abominable to the fighters: but not to be fighting is much more embittering and demoralizing Probably largely because one has more time to think. To have one’s friends in danger, and not to be in danger oneself—it fills one with futile rage. Combatants are to be pitied; but non-combatants are of all men and women the most miserable. Older men, crocks, parsons, women—God help them.” (143-44)

As Alix has observed, not all civilians suffer from not fighting in a battle. West himself is aware of some exceptions to his generalization regarding non-combatants. After all, his roommate, Nicholas chose not to enlist; neither is he embittered by his status as a non-combatant. Despite this exception, West’s point is significant because it implies that both men and women share Alix’s anxiety.

Alix realizes that the difference between West and herself lies in their different gender. She now seeks her own war time role that fits her gender and nature. She has discovered that most people are categorized as either a “respondent” or an “indifferent,” each of whom she can not pretend to be. Her observation of the “respondents” at Wood End and the “indifferents” at Violette has opened her eyes to the fact that she does not belong to either group. For the first time Alix indicates a possible adoption of her mother’s approach to war: “Something *against* war, I want to be doing, I think.

Something to fight it, and prevent it coming again I suppose mother thinks she's doing that" (141). Alix's vague idea of pacifism comes to shape as Daphne talks about her beliefs and peace activities.

Daphne: A Mother

Daphne is physically and mentally the opposite of Alix. Her vibrant appearance symbolizes her strong mind: "she was a tall, graceful, vigorous person, absurdly young and beautiful, vivid, dark-eyed, clever, and tremendously in earnest about life" (148). Her looks and spirits are very similar to those of her sister at Wood End, who is actively involved in various war work. The sisters, however, are completely different in the stand they take on war. Daphne concentrates on long-term solutions to international conflicts and mass violence, whereas her sister supports the government's war effort. Although Daphne participated in ambulance operations to rescue wounded soldiers in France, her activity has not been founded on the love for country which her sister feels while doing her war work. The two sisters show the same degree of energy in what they do, although their directions are opposite. World War I has not affected Daphne, except that all of her pre-war activities are now oriented toward peace. Before the war, she had diverse interests, such as "eurhythmics, and eugenics, and the economic and constitutional position of women, and sweated industries, and baby creches . . . and twenty other of the causes good people have at heart" (147). After the war broke out, Daphne went to several European countries and the United States of America in order to explore the causes of war and to promote peace activities among nations. She also attempted, "but failed, like so many others, to attend the Women's International Congress at the Hague" in 1915 (148). It is not explained why she failed to attend the conference, yet the description that

she was one of “so many others” indicates that her failure resulted from the government’s effort to restrict women pacifists’ activities at the time.¹⁶ All these peace actions make her sister believe Daphne to be “a wrong-headed younger sister” (23).

After devoting herself to peacemaking in foreign countries, now Daphne is back at her home in Cambridge, where she formed a local branch of the Society for Promoting Permanent Peace. She clearly expresses her views on various issues related to war, including Alix’s need for physical and mental strength. She argues that Alix will never be able to paint unless she disciplines her mind and body. She urges Alix to be strong enough to endure miseries of war. Referring to the painful time when her husband died in a Warsaw prison, Daphne suggests that Alix should not give herself up to an emotional, depressive reaction to the war, as she herself did not do. Daphne’s suggestion seems to disregard her daughter’s innate inability to cope with harsh realities of life in war time. Alix surely feels that she has gone through more troubles than her mother realizes because of her knowledge of Paul’s suicide and of her failed relationship with Doye. Nevertheless, what Daphne demonstrates is a mother’s intuition about her child’s potential aptitude. She knows that Alix has unsuccessfully tried to be an “indifferent.” She is also aware of Alix’s intellectual capacity to understand the significance of peace efforts. Daphne’s talk with Alix illustrates her belief in her daughter’s potential, although Alix is obviously too weak and too sensitive to commit herself to the peace movement. The mother equates the daughter with herself:

We’ve got to be strong women, for our own sakes and the world’s—especially we who have the brains to be some use if we try. The poor old world needs help so very badly just now, with all the fools . . .

who hinder and block the way. You and I have both got to help There
is so much to get done. (152-53)

What Daphne stresses is not the private self that Alix has hoped to forget by doing anti-war work. She describes such work as “impersonal idealism” (164). In order to live up to her idealism, Daphne believes that Alix should think and help others think. The word “think” connotes the reasonable approach to peace beyond Alix’s own peace of mind. Daphne’s suggestion decisively contradicts the advice of her cousins when Alix was afflicted by John’s mental breakdown and Paul’s suicide. Alix’s attempts to forget herself, as her cousins suggested, advice have not been much help. Daphne provides an alternative to her earlier unsuccessful attempts, and Alix now looks for a task which must be different from those of respondents or indifferents. Daphne arouses Alix into a sense of duty as a woman at a time when many young men have been affected by their actions at the front. She suggests that women undertake the responsibility of resolving problems, such as “poverty, and injustice, and vice, and cruelty, and sweating, and slums, and the tendencies which make war” (162). Ignoring these problems is “the curse of this world” (162). The dichotomy between men and women in Daphne’s argument, however, is not based on an innate division between the sexes. As suggested in her statement concerning the dichotomy between the jingoistic old generation and the peaceable young generation, one’s “temperament and training” determines one’s attitude toward war. Daphne’s pacifism is highlighted as Alix makes comparisons between her mother’s ideas and other pacifists’ at meetings of the Society for Promoting Permanent Peace.

At a meeting, Alix listens to diverse opinions concerning the issue of peace. She asks herself about the rationale of each argument, including her mother’s. Not all of the speeches are rational; many of them betray the speakers’ “lack of clear thinking” (164). In

particular, some arguments founded on a generalization about a certain group of people and on a division between one group and the other, either by age or sex or political activity, do not appeal to Alix. Some pacifists divide people into “good” and “bad” based on age difference: older men are “bad, stupid and militarist,” whereas “young men are good and intelligent and pacifist” (164). Some others believe that “women are the guardians of life, and therefore mind war more than men do” (164). Alix objects the sex division, as revealed in her thoughts responding to such an argument: “What did that mean That women are the chief sufferers from war. A debatable point, anyhow; and what did it matter, and why divide humanity into sexes, further than nature has already done so?” (165). Alix’s disapproval of such a division coincides with her earlier refusal to take for granted women’s traditional roles. Alix values humanity over her female identity. Thus, she does not approve of separative rhetoric, such as “we” pacifists versus “they” non-pacifists, which some pacifists employ in delivering their ideas. Alix believes that pacifists should focus on humanity, instead of alienating themselves from people who have not been politically active in peacemaking. Non-pacifists’ inaction does not indicate their preference for war. Any good observation of humanity would dispel such simplistic notions. Alix’s disagreement with such division implies that pacifists ought to stress the significance of their approaches to peace, yet should not exclude others because of apparent differences.

Pondering various arguments, Alix comes to realize that people in general want peace despite the diversity of their ideas and approaches; they are “surely one in the common bond of that great desire” (167). Alix’s focus on humanity makes her embrace different groups of people who devote themselves to making peace. One group consists of clergymen whose approaches are rejected by her mother. In this respect, Alix is more

flexible than her mother. Daphne acknowledges the diversity among peace activists. She has indicated that at her age she has “learnt to *swallow* people without getting indigestion” (164). Nevertheless, she persists in her view that “parsons are hopeless” (152). According to her, parsons are so much concerned about the other world that they do not act to resolve conflicts in this world. Daphne has been impressed by West’s commitment to peace and intelligence, but cannot notice the similarity between his work and hers, although both of her children—Nicholas and Alix—have perceived it. As the narrator describes, Daphne is “at times irrelevant, inconsequent, prejudiced, whimsical, perverse” (162). These traits are revealed when Daphne is briefly distracted by referring to West’s idea that the old human problems, including war, must not be ignored. Making her point concerning people’s ignorance of such problems, Daphne states: “It’s sheer criminal selfishness and laziness and stupidity. Mr. West was talking about it the other day. I like that young man; he believes in all the right things. And in so many of the wrong ones as well—I can’t imagine why. I told him I couldn’t imagine why; and he said he found the same difficulty about me. So there we are. However, what was I saying? Oh yes—laziness, selfishness and stupidity” (162-63). As far as clergymen are concerned, she discloses her prejudice and limitations. The difference between Daphne and Alix demonstrates that Alix does not accept entirely her mother’s version of pacifism. Alix develops her convictions from her own experiences and thoughts. Her view on human beings’ anti-war nature leads to a perplexing question: if everybody does not want war, how does it ever break out? She cannot but help thinking that there must be “some anti-peace elements in every country, in every class, in every interest, nay, in every human being, that somehow subverted and hindered the great desire” (168). Alix comes to

realize that humanity is a paradox, an idea that Macaulay presents as the main theme of All in a Maze (1938).

Alix contemplates the validity of other speakers' ideas concerning general problems related to war, although she notes that they are short on presenting details as to how to achieve their goals. Alix's responses to the ideas illustrate the development of her convictions. One speech exposes profiteers and describes them as people who cannot see long-term prospects for peace. The major targets of its criticism are some newspaper owners and government officials of many nations, whose main concern is to make profit from the ammunition industries in which they have invested their money, an issue which is fully explored in Macaulay's novel Mystery at Geneva (1922). Although the novel deals with the League of Nations in the post-war era, the protagonist makes a public disclosure that her former boss made profits from the ammunition industry, yet fails to make others see the truth about him. One focal point is that profiteers during the First World War continue to prosper by blocking disarmament agreements after the war. The novel embodies Macaulay's view that powerful, self-interested individuals would be an obstacle to the progress of peace talks. Alix's disapproval of the profiteers thus appears to reflect a genuine concern of Macaulay's. Alix questions the profiteers' understanding of economics on the grounds that they obviously do not count the higher taxes they have to pay in wartime; in addition, newspaper owners lose their sponsors due to war. Nevertheless, it is likely that the profiteers will remain powerful, as they are in Mystery at Geneva. The only thing that the speaker can do is to draw attention to the issue of profit taking from war.

More speakers address peace issues, although their goals seem unattainable. One speaker emphasizes the necessity of disarmament. Alix is not completely satisfied with

the proposal because the speaker has not touched the question of how to make different countries join the agreement. Nevertheless, she believes that the idea deserves attention and actualization. Similar to the proposal for disarmament, the idea of “Continuous Mediation without Armistice” is hard to realize. Alix wonders whether persistent, international attempts at mediation may excite a common desire for peace. As earlier manifested in her objection to Mrs. Frampton’s fatalistic attitude towards poverty, Alix does not devalue any peace effort solely based on the improbability of achieving its ultimate goal.

Alix’s reactions demonstrate that her developing pacifism has fundamentally the same aspects as her mother’s. As one of the speakers, Daphne discusses “the attitude towards war of the common people in the neutral and belligerent nations, on principles of education, and particularly on the training of children in sound international ideals” (169). Stressing long-term solutions to international conflicts, Daphne’s main concern lies in “peace in general and in future, not a premature end to this particular war” (177). In response to the criticism that she should not talk about peace in war time, Daphne compares war to a plague and implies that any means to eliminate war should be discussed. Her object is to prevent any future war. Daphne presents education as one solution to achieving the goal, and asserts that education will help people to see war’s detrimental impact on humanity and to be free from hostility toward the enemy. Daphne aims at interests beyond those of one nation. In addition, as shown in Daphne’s choice of the word, “children,” instead of “boys,” she presents her pacifism without drawing a sex distinction. The narrator summarizes Daphne’s views of women and men: “she took women as human beings, not as life-producing organisms; she took men as human beings, not as destroying-machines” (170).

The sex distinction is not the only binary vision to which Daphne's pacifism declines to resort. Daphne does not make distinctions between the old and the young or between the pacifist and the non-pacifist. She expresses her objection to the popular concept among young people that the older generation, specifically people over forty, tend to be warlike. Referring to her first-hand observation, she refutes this concept: "Personally I know just about as many young fools and obscurantists and militarists as elderly ones. Any number of both. It's not a question of age; it's temperament and training" (163). Her comment on temperament implies that a certain number of people cannot be trained to be peace-oriented. Daphne has viewed the residents of Violette as people whose temperament is hopeless. Nevertheless, Daphne's basic point is that people in general are capable of making peace through education and training. Thus her argument does not rely on the idea of inherent differences between non-pacifists and pacifists. Giving her speech to an audience that is far from homogeneous, she says that "I am, in a general way, pro-peace and anti-war, as I am sure we all are in this room" (177). For Daphne, governments and peoples of all nations are responsible for making war; they have contributed to waging war "encouraging commercialism, capitalism, selfishness, ignorance, and bad habits of thought" (178). Therefore, her arguments lead to a belief that all of them should work together to bring peace.

Another crucial aspect of Daphne's pacifism, shared by Alix, is her realistic expectations about peace efforts. Despite her enthusiastic, energetic attitudes, Daphne is aware that the goal is not likely to be accomplished. Her focus is on those endeavors to pursue the goal. When Daphne asks Alix to join the Society for Promoting Permanent Peace, she notes the significance of each individual's consistent attempts at peace: "One mayn't be very successful, and one may be quite off the lines; but one has to keep trying

in the best way one personally knows” (171). Like Alix, Daphne believes that “keep trying” has meaning. Compared with Alix, she is an optimist and an idealist.

Nevertheless, Daphne’s opinions indicate that she is not blind to reality. While delivering peace messages in small villages, she does not expect to see dramatic results from her peace work. She sounds almost uncertain: “If it only in the end results in improving ever so slightly the mental attitude of a person here and there, adding ever so little to the political information of a village in each country, it will have done *something*, won’t it? And—you never know—it may do quite a lot more than that” (172). For Daphne, any peace effort is “to seize fragments of truth” (172). Such description of peace efforts suggests that each pacifist’s peacemaking is analogous with Isis’ ceaseless assembly of truth, and it signifies two aspects: one is that Daphne’s ultimate goal will never be completely fulfilled; the other is that any effort to bring peace counts. What motivates Alix is not Daphne’s promise of world peace but her emphasis on action for it.

Alix finally decides to follow the steps her mother has taken to fight war. Yet she adapts one aspect that Daphne has not included in her pacifism: religious faith. She tells Nicholas about her resolutions to join Daphne’s group and to accept the church. As shown in her explanation for why she has determined to do so, Alix’s convictions are more obscure than satisfactory: “As I can’t be fighting in the war, I’ve got to be fighting against it. Otherwise it’s like a ghastly nightmare, swallowing one up. This society of mother’s mayn’t be doing much, but it’s *trying* to fight war; it’s working against it in the best ways it can think of. So I shall join it Christianity, so far as I can understand it, is working against war too; must be, obviously. So I shall join the Church That’s all” (185). Alix’s statements contain her earlier ideas that combatants fight to end war at the front and that only anti-war efforts are proper activities for non-combatants, especially for

women. In response to Nicholas' indication that she does not seem to be convinced, Alix states that her decision is based on the value of trying.

Undoubtedly Daphne has inspired Alix. Nevertheless, it is Alix who sees the possibility of carrying out her beliefs after listening to her mother's and others' ideas. Overall, Daphne has not been successful in convincing others about the significance of peace activities. Nicholas remains a dissident. He even openly criticizes his mother's optimism. When Daphne proposes toasts to "the new world . . . to construction, sanity, and clear thinking . . . to goodwill and mutual understanding . . . to the clearing away of the old messes and the making of the new ones . . . to Freedom . . . to Peace," Nicholas refutes:

"Heaven help you, mother You don't know what you're saying. All your toasts are incompatible, and you don't see it. And what in the name of anything do you mean by Freedom? The old messes I know, and the new ones I can guess at—but what is Freedom? Something, anyhow, which we've never had yet After war, despotism and the strong hand. You don't suppose the firm hand is going to let go, having got us so nicely in its grasp War is the tyrant's opportunity. The Government's beginning to learn what it can do Lots of people will prefer it; they'll be too tired to want to take things into their own hands: they'll only want peace and safety and an ordered life. They'll be too damaged and sick and have lost too much to be anything but apathetic. Peace, possibly (though improbably): but Freedom, no." (183-84)

Nicholas makes two points. In a post-war era, government will insist on its control over individuals, which has been consolidated because of the war effort. Additionally, many

people will be eager to give up their freedom in the belief that they are protected thanks to the government's endeavor to maintain public peace. It is interesting to note that the post-war situation Nicholas predicts here is satirized in What Not: A Prophetic Comedy, which Macaulay finished writing before World War I was over and eventually published in 1919. The novel focuses on a fictional government agency, the Ministry of Brains. The agency has been established for the purpose of "further social progress and avert [ing] another Great War" (22-23). On the premise that people's stupidity was the cause of World War I, the Ministry of Brains has prescribed numerous regulations concerning people's intelligence with methods of "stimulation, reward and punishment" (24). It is a dystopia in which "everyone held a Ministry of Brains form, showing his or her mental category, officially ascertained and registered" (24). A pamphlet of the Ministry of Brains reads: "It is the duty of every man, woman, and child in this country so to order their lives in this peace crisis as to make the least possible demand upon the intelligence of others. It is necessary, therefore, to have some of your own It was lack of brains which plunged Europe into the Great War. Brains . . . must make and keep the Great Peace" (85). The people fall under control of the government as if the country were in crisis. The only difference from the wartime is that the current state is described as "the Great Peace." Peace means the opposite of war; it is simply the absence of war. The concept of peace in What Not: A Prophetic Comedy is similar to what Nicholas believes peace to be, which is different from Daphne's perception. Despite his insight into the negative effects of war, Nicholas does not conceive the meaning of any peace effort. For Nicholas, a focus on individualism, humanity, and elimination of hostility among nations through education provides no answer to international conflict. As if the son's words confirmed the mother's sense of a gap that could not be closed, Daphne does not respond to his criticism this

time. Earlier, Nicholas charged her with an idealized conception of the Cretan when she gave them as an example of how humanity can recede through history. Daphne has stated that a modern Cretan is very different “from his early ancestors, who saw life steadily and saw it whole—at least that’s what one gathers from his remains” (179-80). Nicholas’ reaction to her statement was blunt: “You over-rate the early Cretan. I’ve noticed it before. You over-rate him. He wasn’t all you think; and anyhow, he had a smaller island to think out; any one could have got a grasp of Cretan affairs. He was probably really as selfish as—as Alix, or me” (180). Although Daphne disagreed with her son, she tried to compromise with him by making a suggestion that he join any peace organization and educate others. Nicholas simply stated that he had no desire to do the kind of work his mother had done. After listening to his mother say that he would change when reaching her age, he ended the discussion with a sarcastic remark that at the time she needed to “entertain no further hopes for me” (180). Daphne does not make the same vain effort to convince Nicholas that he should join her in peace effort. Nicholas’ criticism of Daphne’s pacifism reveals that this novel is far from simplistically didactic. As in her other fiction, Macaulay repeatedly uses characters to counterpoint one another’s views, including Daphne’s. She also employs Nicholas to emphasize that peace efforts do not guarantee success. Daphne’s peace work itself is an attempt to help people to see realities of war and oppose international conflicts.

Rose: A Writer

Unlike the main characters of Non-Combatants and Others, Alix and Daphne, Rose Macaulay did not take part in any pacifist movements during the war years. Her lack of political activity seems to indicate that Macaulay did not act in accordance with her

beliefs in the significance of peace efforts “to seize fragments of truth.” However, her novels of the time demonstrate that Macaulay attempted to contribute her own discovering of pieces of truth to the collective efforts for peace. As expressed in her letter to Reverend John Hamilton Cowper Johnson, dated February 28, 1953, Macaulay might believe writing to be her “own individual share” in the face of mass problems in humanity. Although the letter was written over three decades later, it represents Macaulay’s belief in the significance of each individual’s contribution to abolishing war, even if this task will never be completed.

My sister asks, what does the Bp of Bristol (Cockin) mean when he says he “*repents*” of the disunited Church. Does he mean he feels personally that he is doing wrong about it? If so (she asks) why doesn’t he amend, so far as he personally can? But I think what he feels is not quite repentance but a kind of collective guilt He wants unity, but not to pay the price of surrender of Church principles. But he feels guilty, as I do about (say) war, and the preparation of terrible weapons; I can do nothing about it, having no power, but I feel guilty. Also about poverty. There is a very real sense in that one feels the guilt of one’s human community, its dreadful cruelty and selfishness, while all one can *mend* is one’s own individual share.¹⁷

Discussing her sister’s question concerning Reverend F. A. Cockin’s ambiguous attitude toward the unity of the Church, Macaulay discloses her own feelings about war, armament, and poverty. Despite the time lag between Non-Combatants and Others and this letter, Macaulay’s opinion on war is very much the same: war reflects certain aspects of human nature, its cruelty and selfishness; nevertheless, one should not renounce one’s

hope to eliminate it; each individual must take his or her share in order to accomplish such an impossible task. By the time Macaulay wrote this letter, her "own individual share" had not been limited to writing literary works. In the 1930s when there were signs of the Second World War, she was active in the peace movement. In contrast, during the time of World War I she expressed her convictions only through the creation of pacifist characters, and her activities during wartime did not seem to reflect the peace ideas which are represented through Alix and Daphne. In fact, Macaulay had a part in the government's effort to mobilize the public and the country. About ten months after World War I broke out, she volunteered to be a V.A.D. nurse, but soon found herself unfit for the job. Constance Smith points out that Macaulay "tended to vomit or faint at the sight of blood or the mere mention of horrors" (78). The unconscious nurse whom Alix sees carried out of an operating room seems to be a close image of Macaulay as a nurse. Nonetheless, Macaulay continued working in a hospital for six months, not as a nurse but as a scrubber, until early 1916 when she began to work as a land-girl in a farm. A year later she became a civil servant at the Exemptions Bureau of the Ministry of War in London. Macaulay's work in the Ministry resulted from a government project, authorized in 1916, for hiring university women in the Civil Service. As a civil servant Macaulay worked for ten hours daily, which probably did not give her much time for writing. Moreover, whatever she did in the Ministry was not in the least the kind of peace work that Daphne and Alix do.

However devoted Macaulay seemed to be to her work at the Ministry of War, she probably did not share the patriotic sentiments that drove many men and women to participate in the government's war effort. As reflected in her characterization of Alix and Daphne, she believed that no reasonable person could be for war and that everyone

should participate in the effort to end it. What led Macaulay to work in the Ministry is not clear. Nevertheless, her novel of the time, What Not: A Prophetic Comedy (1919), which was based on her experience in the Ministry of War, provides a clue to her views about the Ministry. In the novel, a character who works at the Ministry of Brains thinks that “the whole work of the Ministry . . . was a joke” (76). A heroine of the novel, who is also an employee at the Ministry, believes her work to be “the fantastic lunacy” (137). In What Not: A Prophetic Comedy, the fictional governmental department, the Ministry of Brains, is clearly a satiric version of the Ministry of War during World War I in England.

According to Jane Emery, the Ministry of War was founded on the government’s concept of warfare as “the dissemination of persuasive rhetoric and misinformation” (160-61).

The novel mocks the Ministry of War by shifting its focus from the concept of warfare to that of peace. It reflects Macaulay’s longing for peace when everyone was drawn into the First World War. At the time when the novel was completed, any peace talk did not appeal to the majority of people. Even the disastrous battle of Somme in summer of 1916 did not change the people’s attitude toward the war, and it actually solidified British people’s determination to win the war. The narrator of What Not: A Prophetic Comedy explains the meaning of peace in wartime: “The danger of the word Peace dated, of course, from the days when Peace had not yet arrived and discussion of it was therefore improper, like the discussion of an unborn infant” (33). The analogy implies that peace should be naturally addressed even during wartime. Despite her work in the Ministry of War, Macaulay’s main object seems to be to promote peace rather than to support the government’s war effort.

Macaulay’s pacifism during the time of World War I was not shown through political activity but embodied in her focus on war literature that challenged heroism and

patriotism. Macaulay perceived the significance of soldier poets' anti-war writings even when their poems were not popular.¹⁸ In *Non-Combatants and Others*, Nicholas, a reviewer of literary works, expresses his views of war's impact on literature as well as soldiers' writings.

“Who was it who said the other day that the writers to whom war is glamorous aren't as a rule the ones who produce anything fit to call literature. War's an insanity; and insane things . . . aren't what makes art. The war's produced a little fine poetry . . . but mostly—oh, good Lord! The flood of cheap-heroics and commonplace patriotic claptrap

Well, I'd rather have the futurists than the slops poured out by the people who unfortunately haven't brain enough even to go mad The futurists at least were trying to keep close to facts, even if they couldn't digest them but brought them up with strident noises.” (45-46)

The poets whom Nicholas defines as futurists¹⁹ are soldiers who have experienced horrors of war and have expressed their disturbed minds in a literary form. Nicholas considers their works superior to poems that are full of unrealistic, patriotic language.

Nicholas' opinions resemble those of Macaulay. Despite his view that anti-war poems are better than traditional war literature, he does not think that the soldiers' poetry is good literature, for the soldier poets have not been able to “digest” the harsh realities of war. Their emotional reactions to war permeate their poems. As an example, Nicholas discusses Cathcart's book.²⁰ He asserts that it is “the work of a shaken, broken man” (46). He goes on to say that the reader “can almost hear the guns crashing into it as he tried to write” (47). Nicholas' major point is that Cathcart's work only delivers the author's disturbed mind. The characteristics of Cathcart's work cannot be true of every soldier's

text, and Macaulay, unlike Nicholas, probably was aware of the danger in the generalization. Nevertheless, the voice of Nicholas reflects Macaulay's own ideas on literature with respect to war: literature should present the realities of war; a writer should discipline himself so that he is able to convey messages about war, not a shattered picture of the writer himself. Such ideas may be expanded beyond the relationship between war and a writer. Anyone who wants to be productive regardless of horrible realities in wartime should take the advice that Daphne gives Alix: "You'll never be any use at painting or anything else while you're mentally and physically incoherent and adrift" (150).

With regard to discipline, Macaulay recognized that non-combatants were in a better position. She had the advantage over her male counterparts; she was a woman, who did not have the obligation to fight on the battlefield. As repeatedly expressed in Non-Combatants and Others, soldiers at the front did not have time to think. Their mental capacities, which could be fully cultivated in peace time, diminished substantially as they led their trench lives. Moreover, according to Macaulay, war excites men's masculinity, which reinforced sex division between man and woman, although not all men become combative. Those men, she suggests, might become closer to the human race as it was at the early stage of civilization. Even if some soldiers were able to think, they might lose their self-control in dealing with the very subject by which they were afflicted. Macaulay probably felt that it was her duty to speak for the combatants about the horror of war. She seemed to believe that her work could lessen their burden. As West expresses to Alix, non-combatants have "a unique opportunity" (144).

Non-Combatants and Others is a product of Macaulay's awareness of her opportunity as a woman writer in the time of World War I. Relying on her firsthand

observation, Macaulay concentrates on a female non-combatant's perspective on war. Nevertheless, the novel does not just display the young woman's growing pacifism. In the novel, Macaulay presents various pictures of people, whether combatants or non-combatants, who have been affected by World War I and also utilizes a narrative technique which underscores her own views. Through depicting such diverse characters, Macaulay tries to avoid confirming the gulf between men and women, which has widened because of the difference in their gender roles during the war. Macaulay's dedication of the novel to her younger brother, Aulay, and other combatants demonstrates that the writing of Non-Combatants and Others is her way of joining combatants' efforts to bring the war to an end.

Notes

¹ Jean E. Kennard, "Feminism, Pacifism, and World War I," Turn-of-the-Century Women, vol. 2, no. 2 (1985): 15-16.

² Rose Macaulay, The Writings of E. M. Forster (London: Hogarth, 1938) 290.

³ The term "happy warrior" originated from Wordsworth's "Happy Warrior" and was used often to describe the young soldier during World War I. It is also associated with Siegfried Sassoon not only because of his frequent, ironical use of it but also because of Robert Graves's description of him as a "happy warrior and bitter pacifist." See Fussell, The Great War and Modern Memory 168-69; Graves, Good-Bye to All That: An Autobiography 339.

⁴ Kennard 15-16.

⁵ Kennard 12.

⁶ Nicola Beauman, “‘It Is Not the Place of Women to Talk of Mud’: Some Responses by British Women Novelists to World War I” in Women and World War I: The Written Response, ed. Dorothy Goldman (New York: St. Martin’s, 1993) 138.

⁷ Vera Brittain, Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years (New York: Macmillan, 1938) 140.

⁸ Brittain, Testament of Youth 317.

⁹ Beauman, A Very Great Profession: The Woman’s Novel, 1914-39 (London: Virago, 1983) 31.

¹⁰ Beauman, A Very Great Profession 31.

¹¹ Brittain, “Why I Stand for Peace” in Let Us Honor Peace with a foreword by Canon H. R. L. Sheppard (London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1937) 54.

¹² Beauman, “‘It Is Not the Place of Women to Talk of Mud’” 132.

¹³ Brittain, Testament of Youth 184.

¹⁴ Fussell 297.

¹⁵ Clive Bell’s pamphlet Peace at Once (Manchester: National Labor Press, 1915) was banned by the order of the Lord Mayor. Except Alix’s disagreement with Bell’s book, Macaulay neither explains the content of the pamphlet nor specifies which arguments Alix does not agree with. Bell’s fifty-six page pamphlet opposes the ongoing war and presents peace ideas. His arguments for peace with emphasis on the value of civilization are similar to those of Macaulay presented in her various writings. In the pamphlet, Bell challenges nationalism underlying war by repudiating its justification such as “National Existence” or “National Honor.” He questions the concept of “us,” which makes many people naively believe that they fight against the barbaric enemy. As demonstrated in his statement that “every month of war postpones the triumph of the

sensible, civilized people,” Bell is convinced that war only leads the human race to barbarism. Focusing on war’s impact on humanity, he appeals to the public for “an immediate peace.” He also argues that it is not a war but each individual’s “change of heart” that will eventually end all wars. Bell’s main point is outlined: “the hope of permanent peace must be looked for in democratic control and a better state of mind, not in the crushing of any particular Power; and nothing can be more unfavorable to the chances of democratic control, clear thinking, and decent feeling than a long, embittering war” (37).

¹⁶ See Catherine Foster, Women for All Seasons: The Story of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (Athens: U of Georgia P, 1989) 11.

¹⁷ Rose Macaulay, Last Letters to a Friend, 1952-1958, ed. Constance Babington-Smith (New York: Atheneum, 1963) 87.

¹⁸ Soldiers’ writings about tragic war experiences were not popular in the first two years of the war. Most war poems still expounded heroism, patriotism, and the idea of self-sacrifice. Siegfried Sassoon’s The Old Huntsman and Other Poems in May 1917 probably was a start of the publication of soldiers’ poetry that presented gruesome pictures of war. In The Times Literary Supplement dated May 31, 1917, a reviewer of Sassoon’s book wrote: “What Mr. Sassoon has left to be the most sordid and horrible experiences in the world he makes us feel to be so in a measure which no other poet of the war has achieved” (259).

¹⁹ The term “futurists” here does not indicate the Futurists, whose artistic movement started in Italy about 1909. The tendencies of the Futurists are marked by their rejection of tradition and by their focus on the formal expression of the dynamic energy and the movement of mechanical processes. Macaulay’s character, Nicholas, seems to use

this term only in the sense that the soldier poets attempt to describe their horrible experience at the front by repudiating the conventional ideas of war.

²⁰ Macaulay refers to the soldier poet only as Cathcart. The Times Literary Supplement from the outbreak of the war to the publication of Non-Combatants and Others contains no record of Cathcart's book. In addition, there is no record of such a publication in the National Union Catalog. It is possible that Macaulay uses the name to allude to the family of Earl Cathcart, which was known for its production of distinguished war heroes and generals for centuries. By using the military family's name for a shell-shocked soldier poet, Macaulay seems to challenge the common conception of military ancestry.

CHAPTER IV

AND NO MAN'S WIT: "SOME CORNER OF A FOREIGN FIELD
THAT IS FOR EVER ENGLAND"

After 1919 England officially engaged in no war until the fall of 1939. Yet a civil war in a foreign country, Spain, polarized the British people. In the October 9, 1936 appearance of her weekly column "Marginal Comments" of The Spectator,¹ Macaulay describes the atmosphere in England in the midst of the Spanish Civil War:

The British are divided just now, it seems, into those favoring the Spanish Government of the Spanish rebels, and many a sharp word passes between the two camps. The one side are called, according to the degree of favor with which they are regarded, Patriots, Loyalists, Government, Lefts, Communists, Marxists, Reds or Anarchists; the other are Patriots, Nationalists, Anti-Reds, Rights, Insurgents, Rebels or Fascists. Anyhow, what with all these names flying about, and what with the keen competition in rival atrocity stories, there is plenty of ammunition for waging the Spanish war on the British home front, though some combatants, not content with this, dash off periodically to Spain to wage it at closer quarters. (580)

Macaulay points out that both sides in England successfully propagandized for their cause. In addition, as manifested in the term "Patriots," both opposing sides believed that

their ideologies would serve their country. They were less concerned with the specific domestic strife in Spain than the advocacy of their ideologies in general.

And No Man's Wit, published in 1940, displays the preposterous divisions of ideologies and regional conflicts which permeated Spain even after the war was over. The novel is set right after the Spanish Civil War and on the verge of World War II. From the Spanish people's viewpoint, the British who intervened in their civil war were foreigners and had no right to meddle in Spanish politics. Ramón del Monte, a Spanish character in And No Man's Wit, sarcastically alludes to a line of Rupert Brooke's famous poem of the First World War, "The Soldier": "some corner of a foreign field that is for ever England" (280). In the poem, the narrator speaks about his own possible death in a foreign land and depicts it as dust that would lie there, transforming that country into England. Although his remark directly points to Gibraltar, a port that belongs to Britain, Ramón implies that British people of the 1930s were still under the influence of the romantic idealism prevalent during World War I. Throughout the novel Ramón repeats that the war and post-war conflicts are matters for Spaniards to resolve. Macaulay recognized the Spanish people's resentment about non-Spaniards' involvement in their civil war. Nevertheless, for Macaulay the war was one of the "recurrent fits of madness," which she called all wars collectively in the introduction to All In a Maze.² Like the First World War, the Spanish Civil War had a great impact on any one who was concerned about war. It also became a popular subject that many British writers used in their writings in order to fight for their ideological beliefs.

The Spanish Civil War deeply troubled Macaulay. The differences among ideologies remained unresolved even after the war was over. The civil war certainly proved that the use of force did not end strife. And No Man's Wit is a product of

Macaulay's concern for a humanity which constantly resorts to armed force. This chapter shall explore Macaulay's efforts to present the complexity of frictions underlying a civil war, which is confined neither to the country of Spain nor to the 1930s. In addition, this study of And No Man's Wit shall demonstrate that Macaulay intended to produce a literary work which expounded the absurdity of political conflicts yet did not fall into mere propaganda for peace.

And No Man's Wit embodies Macaulay's sense of moral obligation in the time of conflict. As a writer, Macaulay believed that her novel would contribute to humanity by dealing with human problems even if, as the title suggests, they were incapable of being solved. In her analysis of And No Man's Wit, Jane Emery argues that what Macaulay attempted to achieve coincides with Stephen Spender's idea of poetry in a political crisis. Stephen Spender spoke about a close correlation between literature and politics in the 1930s. The young poet's statement at a Book Exhibition was cited in Macaulay's "Marginal Comments" of November 20, 1936: "I am not concerned with writing a particular kind of poetry, but with writing about something I believe to be very important. The poet has to make a synthesis out of the moral life of our time, and this life is lived at this moment on a political plane" (892). In connection with the poet's goal, Macaulay, says Emery, expressed uncertainty as to whether "there would ever again be for writers 'a time to fiddle and a time to dance'" (246). Because of the uncertainty, Emery argues: Macaulay longed for "a time to create art, which gives, not political instruction, but delight"; Macaulay's creation of a fairylike character, Ellen Green, and her death in the novel "sadly implied that the myth of art is not strong enough to provide escape from the violent contemporary world" (261). Ellen symbolizes art that focuses on the pure aesthetic experience with no reference to reality. She may represent her creator's wish to

flee from the turbulence in the real world. As Emery suggests, Macaulay might have felt that she was pushed to pursue politics rather than aesthetic pleasure. In Life Among the English (1942), Macaulay indeed states that the 1930s was “more serious, less cultured, less aesthetic, more political” (46).

Nonetheless, Emery’s interpretation misses Macaulay’s crucial point that literature should not exist in a vacuum unrelated to the real world. In the column from which Emery draws the conclusion, Macaulay proclaims that Shelley’s “O World, O Life, O Time” illustrates an artist’s proper response to real life. She points out that not all artists share a concern with a terrible reality. For Macaulay, they are “the perverse, unpolitically minded artists, word-weavers, scholars and entertainers, bent on their craft alone, who see art in large letters and life in small.” Macaulay even draws a parallel between them and “a Nero or the village fool” who fiddles “while it burns instead of manning the hose.” Macaulay’s emphasis on politically oriented literature does not make her fail to see a danger that literature may become mere propaganda for the sake of presenting moral, social, or political issues. In the same essay, Macaulay provides Andrew Marvell’s “Bermudas” as an example that a poem can become an object to express the poet’s moral position. Drawing attention to the phrase “prelate’s rage,” she makes the point that “the rebel Puritan has shouldered the poet aside.” The column also notes that in the late 1930s, although this is by no means unique in history, “there is a strong case for piping all hands to the service of the hazardous world, for the poet, the prose-writer, and the priest to spend themselves on causes, if they can do anything to save those imperilled and drifting, World, Life and Time, from the rocks.”³ For Macaulay, it is a writer’s duty to contemplate the critical situation of the real world and to make efforts to rescue it.

Another essay that discusses the young poets' general tendency in the 1930s points to the same idea. In "Marginal Comments" of January 10, 1936, Macaulay defends young poets' angry voices in their poetry. She views their anger as expressing their compassion for humanity and affirms that poets should "express in verse the indignation which they have always, and very properly, felt against the exasperating actions of other human beings and the shocking world which we have all helped to make" (49). Macaulay asserts that throughout history poets have been stirred by human problems and transformed their feelings into words with the belief that they would save humanity. As long as poets have not reduced poetry to a mode of didactic discourse, they have produced great poems. Thus the young poets' anger with troubled world of the 1930s should not be criticized. Macaulay agreed with the young poets who had a deep involvement with politics, although she admitted that she could not cherish their optimistic belief that their works would help to produce social change.

Based on Macaulay's concern with the relation between politics and art, I divide this chapter into two sections. The first concentrates on the politics characterized by the complexity of regional and ideological divisions during and after the Spanish Civil War. This section shows that the novel reflects the author's belief in active involvement with a world in great straits. Moreover, it shows that Macaulay's interest in politics embodies her pacifism. The second section deals with art which exists in a fantasy world alien to reality, and it serves to strengthen Macaulay's point that art can not exist separate from real life. Before discussing issues of politics and art in the novel, I shall examine Macaulay's views as a writer and pacifist, which were often expressed in her weekly column "Marginal Comments" of Spectator in the late 1930s. I shall also investigate And No Man's Wit in the tradition of literature of the Spanish Civil War.

“A Convinced Pacifist” or “A Neutral?”

In the 1930s, Macaulay was an active advocate for peace and defined herself as “a convinced pacifist.”⁴ Nevertheless, as a writer who had criticized the usage of conventionalized words in writings such as Catchwords and Claptrap, she challenged a common conception of a pacifist and recognized the necessity of defining the word. Macaulay’s effort to defy the general conception of a pacifist is illustrated in An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist. The pamphlet points out that many people believe passive resistance to war or mere renunciation of violence is the core of pacifism. Such a general conception only contributes to the misunderstanding of pacifism which Macaulay believes should focus on active participation in peacemaking. Macaulay’s crucial point is that pacifists are not idealists who, with no consideration of political effectiveness of their actions, only express unattainable goals, such as absolute abolition of violence. In addition, at the time of the Spanish Civil War, the term “peace” was employed in a negative sense by many left-sympathizers who advocated actual fighting against fascism. Thus, by redefining the word, Macaulay’s challenge to the common definition of a pacifist indicates her effort to clear up the confusion.

Although not as explicitly as in An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist, Macaulay in And No Man’s Wit deals with the general conception of pacifists. The broad, vague definition of a pacifist is applied to two characters in the novel. One is Ellen Green, who is aloof from problems of the real world; the other is Dr. Kate Marlowe, who is politically active and is willing to make every effort to solve conflicts. When Ellen Green says, “I don’t like any fighting,” she is defined as a pacifist (104). Similarly, Dr. Kate Marlowe’s statement that she deplores war induces Ramón to ask whether she is a pacifist. Although

Ramón does not conclude that she is a pacifist at the moment, she is considered to be one when Ramón later repeats her statement to her son Guy. Just as the general definition of the term is used for Ellen, so is it for Dr. Marlowe. However, there is a huge gap between the former and the latter. Ellen merely abhors violence. The person who shows only reactionary emotion concerning war should not be called a pacifist. Dr. Marlowe's idea of a pacifist seems to echo her creator's. Dr. Marlowe critically approaches the vague term "a pacifist" and expresses the necessity for active methods of ending war. In response to Ramón's question, she says:

"Oh, what does one mean by pacifist? I think war is horrible and cruel and grotesque, of course, and belongs to the dark ages as much as the rack and thumbscrew do. But if you ask me, is nothing worse, I think it's worse to let more and more people be tortured and enslaved without protest—I mean, effective protest. On the other hand, *is* war the only way to stop it, and have we tried all the others? Of course we haven't. You see, I don't know what I think; one's altogether confused. It would be simpler if one could be wholly pacifist. But the pacifists don't seem to have alternative ways to suggest of stopping the Nazis I heard one woman at a meeting suggest that if women all lay in front of trains it would somehow stop war—but I really don't know why it would or how it could, though of course it would slow the trains down . . . I suppose I believe in economic boycott really, if only we could all combine." (287-88)

Dr. Marlowe's words—"wholly pacifist" and "pacifists"—signify people who eschew all sorts of fighting. Taking the definition literally, Ellen is certainly one of them. However, Dr. Marlowe indirectly questions such a definition. A person's condemnation of violence

does not prove that he or she is a pacifist. Dr. Marlowe detests war and seeks other methods than war to resolve conflicts. Nevertheless, she has difficulty agreeing with a woman who thinks that passive resistance to mass violence is the only way to bring peace. Dr. Marlowe's voice reflects her creator's disagreement with the public's simplistic views of pacifists as well as with what pacifists themselves suggested at the time. Macaulay's ideas as a pacifist did not go along with many people's conception of pacifism. She did not agree with pacifists who renounced violence without thinking about how to bring peace. As implied in Dr. Marlowe's skeptical view of the woman's naive suggestion, Macaulay stressed the need for pragmatic ways to achieve the goal.

What could a convinced pacifist do in order to end the Spanish Civil War? Macaulay did not believe that taking one side or the other was the answer. She was known as a Left sympathizer, yet did not zealously support the Republican Government, the opposing force against the Franco regime. No matter how it was interpreted, the support of the Republic meant war. The Independent Labor Party's slogan "Against War and Fascism" showed that the war was justified in the name of peace. Macaulay's indirect opposition to such justification reflected her pacifism, and such a position was officially tied to the Peace Pledge Union in 1937. Macaulay intended to explore the factors underlying the Spanish Civil War. Her attitude toward the war seemed to be passive. In "Marginal Comments" of July 23, 1937, Macaulay admits being captivated by the key words used in an invitation to a symposium, such as "culture, Fascism, tyranny, liberty, war" (141). She also analyzes the major topic of the symposium into several questions with respect to the Spanish Civil War: "What lessons should be drawn from the war in Spain? Who are responsible for it? With what dangers do the events in Spain face Europe and the world? . . . What should the democratic and peace-loving Powers do to prevent a

world conflagration? Last (an easy one, which had better be done first), do you think it necessary to co-ordinate all the forces for peace and freedom?" (141). Macaulay implies that people would have different answers to each question, yet they might believe that their ideas and actions are for a good cause. She brings up two more questions that seem to contain clear distinction between right and wrong: "Am I in favor of liberty, peace, democracy, justice, humanity and culture? Am I against tyranny, dictatorship, and war, which means the murder of women and children by Fascist bombs?" (141). The questions do not expect "no" as an answer; they assumed the sympathy of the questionee. Nevertheless, Macaulay's anti-fascist inclination does not make her say "yes."

Instead of taking a side, Macaulay discusses a trite issue that involves the expression of the war as "the murder of women and children by Fascist bombs." She points out that such cliches not only fail to report the death of a greater number of men but also are "liable to make men careless about starting these deplorable affairs" (141). She also acknowledges that this kind of phrase has been abused by both sides in order to generate the public's antagonism toward the other side. Macaulay's disapproval of such language is manifested in another "Marginal Comments" column of July 16, 1937. Macaulay questions the anti-Fascists' language that dehumanizes Fascists, as exemplified in a statement that "Fascists are not people; they are Rats, and/ or "Whiskey-drinking Hyenas" (102). The column also repeats the popular conception among anti-fascists that Fascists were people who made "war on democracy by killing women-and-children first" (102). Macaulay's criticism of the phrase echoes her critical view of the conventional language which was commonly employed during the First World War. In another "Marginal Comments" of October 16, 1936, Macaulay denounces a stereotype of the Spanish. She notes that the civil war seemed to reinforce the British's conventional

perception that Spaniards were full of “a very barbarous barbarity” (630). Questioning the validity of the oversimplified generalization of the Spanish, Macaulay draws a parallel between the stereotype of Spaniards at the time and popular descriptions of enemies in war propaganda during World War I: “Those who delight to spread these tales of Spain presumably believe or wish them true, and think that we ought to be told what the Spanish are like, so that we may hate them. The same was done, on both sides, during the last European War: the Germans said that we gouged out the eyes of prisoners of war; we said that they made a habit of cutting off the arms of Belgian children and of crucifying Canadians. And so, one supposes, these odious relations will go on, so long as war itself goes on” (630). For Macaulay, war propaganda which depicts the other side in inhumane terms is merely part of a war game.

Macaulay’s avoidance of a simple answer to the questions seems to address indirectly the polarization that young writers created with respect to the Spanish Civil War. In June 1937 Stephen Spender and W. H. Auden, along with ten others, sent a number of writers a questionnaire that ostensibly aimed to survey British writers’ attitudes toward the war.⁵ The questionnaire reads: “It is clear to many of us throughout the world that now, as certainly never before, we are determined or compelled, to take sides. The equivocal attitude, the Ivory Tower, the paradoxical, the ironic detachment, will no longer do Are you for, or against Franco and Fascism?”⁶ The published responses to it in the pamphlet *Authors Take sides on the Spanish Civil War* (1937) show that the majority of the writers, 127 out of 149, were against Fascism, while only five were for it. The rest of them were regarded as “Neutral?”

The questionnaire was sent to writers who were generally believed to be anti-fascists. The result of the responses was somewhat maneuvered. As Valentine

Cunningham points out in *British Writers of the Thirties* (1988), some respondents who were equivocal yet pro-Republic—George Barker, Geoffrey Grigson, and Tom Harrisson—were published; some others who were equivocal yet critical of the questionnaire—James Joyce and George Orwell—were dismissed; some respondents who did not clearly take the Republic side were conceded to be “Neutral?,” whose status was degraded by the question mark.⁷ The questionnaire ignored the fact that, like the Spanish Republicans, anti-Fascists were diverse in political beliefs. As to the polarizing efforts manifested in the survey, Cunningham sums up: “neutrality, equivocation—the hesitations of a liberal like Grigson seriously worried by Communism, an Orwell who had learned that Spanish politics were exceedingly messy, a pacifist like Vera Brittain, a Christian like T. S. Eliot, intent however un-neutrally on achieving the Christian Third Way—were not acceptable. If no other label would avail, then Vera Brittain and Eliot must be content with a begrudging ‘Neutral?’” (439). Interestingly, the anti-Fascists’ stand against equivocation was akin to that of the totalitarian Right (Cunningham 439). It also reflected the very same attitude that the anti-Fascists renounced on the grounds that it was a trademark of Fascism.

Macaulay observed that anti-Fascists tried to suppress the opposite views, although not as much as or no more than their counterparts did. Paradoxically, what they did was exactly opposite to the political beliefs they in fact stood for with regard to the Spanish Civil War. In a *News Chronicle* symposium of 1937, Stephen Spender expresses his stand against Fascism.

... the struggle that is going on in Spain today seems to me the dramatization of a struggle between poverty, nationalism and tyranny

against internationalism, freedom of expression and the classless society which is taking place all over the world.

I believe that the interests of artists lie with the democrats and not with the tyrants, because I have seen that in several countries where the workers have been crushed, freedom of speech has been crushed also.⁸

Macaulay would be willing to support the causes of anti-fascism which Spender presents. As noted by Alix in Non-Combatants and Others, poverty and war are issues that are unlikely to be resolved yet worth trying to abolish. Any effort to eliminate poverty and nationalism, which Spender views as characteristics of Fascism, would be like the active opposition to war. It is what Macaulay implicitly stresses through her characterization of Alix and Daphne in Non-Combatants and Others.

Nevertheless, Macaulay seemed to be troubled by the anti-Fascists' binary division between "us" and "them" and by their adaptation of the Fascists' method that they had previously attacked. In "Marginal Comments" of July 16, 1937, she notes that some anti-Fascists journalists "deprecat[ed] the idea of free speech in this British square being permitted to British Fascists, who chanced to be engaged on a Sunday afternoon ramble and concluded it with a chat among the lions" (102). Macaulay does not openly criticize the anti-Fascists. Instead, she only implies that what they asserted is a characteristic of Fascism. She herself witnessed the Fascists' suppression of the opposing force at their meeting. Her observation is recorded in March 27, 1936 "Marginal Comments," which focuses on the authoritarian leader, Sir Oswald Mosley, and the Fascist mob. The Fascists did not believe in freedom of speech, and any one who did not agree with their political views was not allowed to express his or her opinions. The group was indeed proud of the fact that their belief in the control of speech made them different

from “the old effete constitutional parties” (574). Macaulay concludes that the meeting was “too like a meeting in a mental home” (574). What Macaulay objects to is the polarization between “us” and “them” based on dehumanization of the other side; this kind of polarization is often practised in the time of war.

For anti-Fascists who stressed the sharp division between themselves and Fascists, Macaulay was a “Neutral?”⁹ The authors who wrote the questionnaire claimed that the British and French governments’ policy of neutrality concerning the Spanish Civil War would only result in a prolonged war. In August 1936, both the British and French governments proposed the policy of non-intervention in the belief that it would help avoid a general war. They hoped that other countries—Germany, Italy, Portugal and Russia—would not engage in Spain’s conflict. As history shows, the policy of non-intervention was not pursued by others. In July 1936, before the policy was proposed, Hitler had already agreed to respond to Franco’s request for aid. Italy and Germany ostensibly accepted the policy, but both of them continued sending military aid to Franco from the summer of 1936 on. In the fall of the same year, the Soviet government stated that it would not be bound by the policy and sent aid to the Republic. In addition, a good number of foreigners volunteered to fight against Franco. Despite the British and French governments’ effort at non-intervention, the Spanish Civil War showed signs of becoming an international conflict.

Macaulay’s stand was seemingly akin to the policy of non-intervention. As the results of the questionnaire showed, many writers were against the non-intervention policy which appeared to work for the fascist government in Spain. Such attitudes toward the Spanish Civil War became prevalent among the British public in the early 1937. Events, such as the nationalists’ bombing of the Basque town on April 26, 1937,

increased opposition to the British government's neutral policy. Like other writers, Macaulay was against the Franco regime, but did not buy the argument that helping the Republic fight against Franco was the only solution that would lead to peace in Spain. Instead, on July 23, 1937 she expressed the wishful thought that Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany would withdraw their troops from Spain: "I foresee . . . a speedy collapse of this Spanish business: General Franco's foreign allies will surely desert him in disgust and go home. For this ungrateful General is again issuing a statement that his army has never received or required any foreign assistance whatsoever. Had the French Staff said as much (instead of not quite as much) during the last European war before this one, what would their British allies have done about it?"¹⁰ Macaulay sounds naive rather than insightful. Yet her voice reveals that she wishes not to see another war analogous to World War I. Macaulay indirectly criticizes Italy and Germany as if they were the cause of the Spanish Civil War and could end it.

From World War I, Macaulay realized that the public became jingoistic once a war broke out. Literature also reflected the general mood. Public and literary responses to the Spanish War were not very different. With the outbreak of the war, "pacifism changed to war-mindedness; the National government was attacked not for warmongering but for appeasement; the writers were ready to fight in defense of England in war."¹¹ The writers who created a new literary tradition with respect to the Spanish Civil War were young men who were largely sympathizers of Republican Spain and who were willing to fight for their beliefs. About a year before the Spanish Civil War, Macaulay compared a poet with a war horse, asserting that the majority of poets throughout history had been jingoists; she also noted poets of World War I and poets of the thirties as similarly fascinated by war: "At the beginning of our last war, nearly all the poets were, I think

bellicose, though by its end most of them had seen through it. Our poets are not, for the most part, militaristic just now, but then we have no war in prospect (or so we too fondly hope). When we have, perhaps the poets will help to beat the drums.”¹² Macaulay seemed to foretell the literature of the Spanish Civil War, which Spender called a “poet’s war.”¹³

Concerning young writers and their literary works at the time of the Spanish Civil War, Valentine Cunningham states: “When the Spanish Civil War broke out many of the young . . . seized on it as the chance to catch up with their fathers, their older brothers and the dead Old Boys, to wipe out their guilt over having missed the First War With a terrible kind of naturalness the writings of this period fell into war language, into a semiotic supplied by what had been learned from the war-time fronts. The War was in almost every writer’s mental luggage” (49-50). Of course, not all the writings espoused militarism. Nevertheless, young writers generally displayed enthusiasm for the Spanish Civil War to the same degree that poets of World War I did at the beginning of that war. Moreover, like many young poets of World War I, some of them who took up arms against the Fascist government eventually “had seen through it.” The literature of the Spanish Civil War generally “reflects both the idealism and the disillusion of the writers who had seen it as a holy war.”¹⁴

Macaulay’s writing did not support the cause of anti-fascism that the young writers believed in and fought for literally. It was not because Macaulay thought that their jingoism led only to poor literature. She recognized that “hot-headed nationalism,” which was often transformed into jingoism during war, had been embodied in literature by many good poets—Shakespeare, Spenser, Marlowe, Milton, Dryden, and Wordsworth.¹⁵ Like the young poets of the thirties, Macaulay believed in a writer’s responsibility toward humanity. She acknowledged that literature could be made to serve a political purpose.

Nevertheless, she did not concede that her writing should show the political side that she supported. Of course, the poets of the thirties were not in consensus as to whether they should openly expound their political beliefs in their works. This disagreement was exemplified in articles by C. Day Lewis and John Lehmann in the Left Review. Both of them consented that “writers pay stricter attention to the ‘complex of facts and theories that make up the problem of Fascism, war and the social revolution’ so that their art might depict more exactly the social forces at work in the world.”¹⁶ Nevertheless, while Lewis advocated writers’ openly supporting the Republican cause in every literary form, Lehmann expressed an opposing view that “the creative artist must ‘never engage in any other activity, for the cause of peace and liberty he is supporting, to the extent of abandoning, or seriously curtailing for any length of time, his activity as an imaginative creator.’”¹⁷ Macaulay’s voice was closer to Lehmann’s. Her And No Man’s Wit was designed to expound the complexity of the Spanish Civil War, and as a result did not directly present the creator’s own anti-Fascist views.

Despite its focus on politics in Spain and the civil war, And No Man’s Wit is not classified as literature of the Spanish Civil War, which generally includes only writings of male writers who were young and could volunteer to fight against fascists at the Spanish front. Most of the writers, such as Auden, Spender, and MacNeice, visited Spain for a short period of time, but did not participate in actual fighting. Only a small number of them, including George Orwell, went to fight, and some of them, like John Cornford and Julian Bell, were killed. Whether they fought at the Spanish front or not, those young male writers formed a literary tradition of the Spanish Civil War. As in the time of World War I, the writers who had seen the battlefield or who were believed to have firsthand knowledge of the war dominated the literary tradition. Macaulay, a woman writer in her

fifties during the Spanish Civil War, again was outside the center of literary experience of the war. Her And No Man's Wit is certainly different from the androcentric literature of the Spanish Civil War because it presents diverse perspectives on the war in the post-war time. Although the war experience of young British men is not neglected, combatants and the battlefield do not make up the central subject of the novel. The novel focuses on the deep-rooted, unsettled strife in post-war Spain, which is observed by a mother figure who did not have first-hand experience of the war. It presents "gender-inflected" views of the war. Moreover, the novel does not confirm the writer's anti-Fascist beliefs. It only underlines that the use of force never solves any conflict. As Robert Kuehn asserts in "The Pleasures of Rose Macaulay," the novel has "rare qualities—rare at least in the political literature of the thirties" in that the point of view by Macaulay in the novel is "essentially neutral, humane and cynical" (242).

And No Man's Wit is grounded on Macaulay's idea of the relationship between literature and war. Macaulay believed that literature should aim at presenting the realities of war, which could never be justified for any political beliefs. Because of Macaulay's political alliance with the Left, some critics postulate that her characterization of Dr. Marlowe reveals her opposition to fascism. Constance Smith draws a parallel between Dr. Marlowe and her creator: "Rose's portrayal of this lady's progress through Franco Spain may represent some sort of wish-fulfillment; she herself had tried to arrange to visit the country even before the war ended. It is not surprising that she failed, for her left-wing sympathies were well known. For example she helped to promote an anti-Fascist meeting at the Queen's Hall organized by the Association of Writers for Intellectual Liberty" (146). Smith does not see diverse political views being presented in the novel. Dr. Marlowe represents only one out of several ideological parties, which have contributed

collectively to the Spanish War. Moreover, unlike her creator, Dr. Marlowe holds fast to her political beliefs by all means, including violent resistance. Although she later expresses her strong distaste for the use of force, she is initially in spirit like her son Guy, a young International Brigader, because “she was herself all for such subversive work in foreign lands against tyrannous regimes as she liked to tell herself that Guy was probably performing” (5). Dr. Marlowe’s support of her son demonstrates that Macaulay keeps a distance from her major character. As revealed in “Marginal Comments” of November 6, 1936, Macaulay tried not to slip into antagonism against fascism no matter how she abhorred it: “Does your blood boil when you think on General Franco, Senor Largo Caballero, Herr Hitler, Signor Mussolini, M. Stalin, or other of the world’s loud men? Do not brood over them; let them not fester in the blood” (806). And No Man’s Wit does not show a bent for one group’s political ideologies.

In this time of confusion when war against fascism meant peace, Macaulay would be satisfied with the label “a Neutral?” Her political activities for peace ended in March 1938 as she resigned from the Peace Pledge Union, when the Nazis occupied Austria. The Spanish Civil War was still going on and another world war seemed to be about to take place. Macaulay’s withdrawal from the peace movement might have had something to do with the death of the Reverend Dick Sheppard in late October 1937. Nevertheless, Macaulay probably felt that the peace movement the Reverend led would work only in those circumstances when people were not engaged in mass violence. It did not provide solutions to the international conflicts that were currently pending. As Jane Emery argues, Macaulay might have concluded that “although non-violent resistance might work between individuals, it was ineffective in modern war” (251). Hugh, a character from And No Man’s Wit, talks about a civilized way to deal with a dispute based on the

Reverend Dick Sheppard's method of non-violent resistance. In London, where the actual war did not take place, he used the method to intimidate a friend of his, whose fascist views raised a disturbance between them: "I rather liked him, except when he talked Fascist—then we all treated him as a ghost and pretended he wasn't there till he stopped; that's a very useful technique invented by a man who belonged to the Peace Pledge Union; he called it non-violent resistance, and tried to put it across us that it would work on a mass scale on the enemy. That's where those people can't see straight, but it really does work with individuals" (10). As demonstrated in the present tense of his statement, Hugh still believes in the effectiveness of non-violent resistance on the individual level. Other characters do not repudiate his argument, as if there is a consensus about the method. While writing *And No Man's Wit*, Macaulay did not discard her belief in the necessity of peace efforts. She simply concentrated on writing a novel for the cause of peace. She probably believed that the way she approached the Spanish Civil War in *And No Man's Wit* would make some contribution to humanity by exploring the absurdity of the ideological and regional divisions in which the war originated.

Politics

As Dr. Marlowe goes across post-war Spain looking for her elder son, Guy, who has been missing since February 1939, the reader is exposed to the political strife which provoked the civil war and still lingers over Spain. Dr. Marlowe is not alone in her search for Guy. Initially, she is accompanied by her younger son, Hugh, her daughter, Betsey, Guy's fiancée, Ellen Green, and a chauffeur, Ernie Kent. Ramón del Monte later joins the group at Dr. Marlowe's request to help them find Guy. All in Dr. Marlowe's group, except apolitical Betsey and Ellen, are for the defeated Republican government. Hugh did

not participate in actual fighting in Spain, but has been working at a publisher's office in London on behalf of anti-fascism, especially communism. Ernie was Guy's comrade on the Spain front, and as a man of the working class, Ernie's anti-fascism is founded on class distinction rather than political ideologies. All three British men are anti-Fascists, yet their responses to the Spanish Civil War are different from one another. In opposition to these British Leftists, the Spanish aristocrat Ramón represents the voice of fascist Spain. The trip is constantly heated by ideological debates.

From the beginning of the novel, the narrator describes Dr. Marlowe as a person who has very firm beliefs against the Franco regime. Although her main goal is to find her son in post-war Spain, Dr. Marlowe already makes plans to use the experience, which she believes will only confirm her views of fascism. She feels "quite free to report on her return the reactionary totalitarian tyranny which she would observe, and to get the Committee for Liberty to which she belonged to write letters to the newspapers about it, and even to send a cable to the President of the United States asking him to stop it" (4). Dr. Marlowe is not the kind of mother who worries about the possible death of her son. She is a liberal who views the Spanish Civil War as a war that aimed to save democracy from fascism. She claims that it was "everyone's war" (22). She also believes in violent retaliation. After her vain effort to get information about Guy's whereabouts at the British consulate, she calls a vice-consul a "damned little Fascist timeserver," although not to his face (6). She even wishes that the consulate would be bombed in the next anti-fascists' military uprising. It seems that she would participate in actual fighting if she were a man of her son's age.

Dr. Marlowe shares the fundamental beliefs that provoked Guy to join the International Brigade. Her intolerance of other political beliefs, along with her condoning

violent acts, does not reflect her creator's views. Macaulay was not such an adherent of the liberal ideology that she thought of the Spanish Civil War as just. For her, the argument that it was a struggle of democracy against fascism could not serve as justification. Moreover, Macaulay believed that such justification of the war only excited a number of young men to sacrifice themselves for their ideological vision. She saw a parallel between the combatants of World War I and the young men of the 1930s. Macaulay's creation of Guy reflects her ideas of young men at war, whether overtly ideological or more simply patriotic.

Macaulay names the young volunteer after Guy Fawkes, a British conspirator in the Gunpowder Plot of the seventeenth century. Guy Fawkes was arrested and eventually executed, and England has celebrated November 5 as Guy Fawkes Day, with bonfires and fireworks and the carrying of "guys" or effigies, through the streets. Around the time when the celebration took place in 1935 and 1936, Macaulay in her "Marginal Comments" examines the meaning of Guy Fawkes Day and presents her perception of the man. In the column of November 8, 1935, she defines him as a "simple, devout, and persevering man," who was led to a plot that "higher brains than his had originated and shaped" (773). Compared with the time of Guy Fawkes, she appreciates democracy, in which peaceful communication between rivals would override violent retaliation on the other side. In the following year, Macaulay's expectation of civilized confrontation was shaken by the extreme stands of both the Right and the Left with respect to the Spanish Civil War. In the "Marginal Comments" column of November 6, 1936, she again discusses Guy and calls him a "brave tool of less courageous superiors" (806). Noting a violent act for the sake of one ideology, Macaulay recognizes the parallel between the Gunpowder Plot and fights against "the world's loud men," such as Franco, Hitler,

Mussolini, and Stalin. She states that Guy became “a very popular character.”¹⁸ Nevertheless, Macaulay does not criticize men like Guy. She is to some extent sympathetic with them on the grounds that they are victims of ideology. She only resents the circumstances in which Guy becomes enslaved to violence.

In And No Man's Wit, Guy becomes an one-sided man of action with the outbreak of the Spanish Civil War. Before he is later found, his beliefs and actions concerning the war are presented by other characters who take opposing political views. For the British characters, Guy has been fighting for the good cause; he is a war hero like many combatants of World War I. In contrast, the Spanish characters describe him as Liberal, Red, anti-God, and anti-Spain. Guy paradoxically brings two opposing parties to exchange their views of the Spanish Civil War, although the peaceful communication does not lead to any resolution to political strife. As Betsey and Hugh remember, in the pre-war time at Oxford, Guy was on good terms with Ramón. Because Dr. Marlowe has felt the need to get help from some powerful person of the Right, the group drives to Ramón's residence. At the del Montes', the Marlowes are confronted with a Spanish family whose members hold different political views, yet are united in their opposition to the British liberals. Ramón's mother is a fanatical Carlist, while his grandmother is a monarchist. His sister, Antonia, is an imperialist and centers her interests on the old Spanish empire and its colonies. Ramón represents the landowner who wants to keep his privileges but with no monarch. He defines himself as a feudalist. The political views of the del Montes demonstrate that the political strife provoking the Spanish Civil War had a long history. In addition to the Spanish family, a young Frenchman Armand Arachon, a friend of Ramón and Guy, expresses his own opinions on political divisions in Spain from a capitalist's point of view.

Dr. Marlowe tries to avoid talking about politics with Ramón and his family because she hopes to get some assistance from Ramón to find Guy. Nevertheless, the gulf between the two families emerges whenever they address certain issues. From the moment Dr. Marlowe explains to Ramón that Guy is missing, the British left and the Spanish right collide.

“Guy has lost himself? In Spain, you say? He was fighting, was he not?”

So he knew that.

“Yes, he was fighting. In the English Battalion of the International Brigade. You think that dreadfully wrong, of course”

The marquis’s smile deprecated so uncivilly excessive a view.

“It was the wrong side. Yes . . . Guy was always Red. So he fought against Spain—against us.”

.....

“Yes,” she said. “He did fight against you. But for Spain, as he thought—as we think Don’t let us quarrel over that now. He lost. And he *is* lost.” (28)

As implied in the conversation between Ramón and Dr. Marlowe, both the Right and the Left have claimed that their side was the one that loved and defended Spain. Grounded on self-righteous patriotism, Ramón reveals his opinion on the International Brigaders, whom the current Spanish authorities call “invaders” (29). Angered at the word “invaders,” Hugh disputes Ramón’s statement by raising a question about the involvement of the Italians and the Germans in the early stages of the war. Neither side consents to the other’s argument. Throughout the novel, the Spanish family stand their ground, while the British family believe their position in Spain should be treated in the

same way that Germans' has been. If they are considered to be invaders of Spain, so are the Germans. Only the reader sees the point of each side's contention.

The exchange of political views at the del Montes' illustrates that the conflicts between Dr. Marlowe and Ramón lie deeper than each side's biased interpretation of the Spanish Civil War. A history of Ramón's ancestry reveals that the family's diverse opinions have been rooted in historical facts over centuries—the struggle that existed between Queen Elizabeth and Spain in the sixteenth century, Gibraltar, which Spain had to yield to Britain as the result of the War of the Spanish Succession in the early eighteenth century, and Spanish civil wars between Carlists and liberals in the nineteenth century. In all those conflicts, Spain, Britain and France interacted. From the Spanish family's perspectives, the British family represents a foreign force that again intervenes in Spanish affairs. On the other hand, the Marlowes believe that they have every right to be concerned with the Spanish struggle which is, according to them, an epitome of the world's ideological conflicts.

The difference of the del Montes from Dr. Marlowe is first displayed in the decorations of the house. As Ramón leads the Marlowe group to the house, the guests see various trophies, including a mummified shark, which were collected by Ramón's ancestors. The trophies signify the del Montes' love for hunting and their warlike nature. They indirectly support Ernie's analogy that gun-crazy Spanish fighters were like game hunters. What the del Montes represent through the dead animals is a great contrast to the beliefs of Dr. Marlowe, who is a member of "anti-blood-sport societies" (12). Along with the trophies, another item betrays the fighting spirit in the family of del Montes. It is a nineteenth-century oil painting which depicts "a sleek and ferocious black bull" (33).

Ramón exuberantly talks about the fierce bull of his great grandfather, which “won a hundred fights, and gored three hundred horses and quite seventy matadors” (33-34).

The surroundings of the del Montes reveal that the strife in Spain is deeply rooted in history. The painting of the bull, which has a daisy chain, reflects the civil wars between Carlists and liberals in the nineteenth-century. Carlists were defeated in their resistance to the advance of liberalism, yet in the 1930s re-emerged in strength against the liberalizing concepts of a fully developed bourgeois democracy. As Ramón’s mother exemplifies, one ideological group’s loss in a war does not bring the extinction of the ideologists. Ramón also realizes that the recent war did not end the existence of the Left in Spain. He sounds almost in dread of their resistance. In response to Ramón, Armand raises a question about the repeated struggles between the Right and the Left in Spain: “how regularly in your history the ghosts of your slain political constitutions become revenants and take again bodies, to blow their slayers sky-high in their turn, what can be more natural and historic than this perseverance of the Left? Your constitutions go and come with the regularity of troops marching—Left, Right, Left, Right, pom, pom, pom! The same regularity as in the more tranquil countries, only you do it with guns instead of elections” (35). Armand’s point is that many countries have the same ideological divisions that Spain has. The only difference between Spain and other countries is the mode of dealing with the divisions. The Spanish resort to force, while the Right and the Left in other countries contend for power through election. Ramón does not refute Armand’s analysis. He even argues that the Spanish’s preference for guns is “in accord with our traditions and culture” (35). Yet, unlike his French friend, Ramón does not think that elections are the answer to the strife in Spain. He believes that elections tend to be corrupt because the vast majority of the people are illiterate. Ramón’s opinion concerning

elections is echoed by his mother, who is also against elections on the grounds that the ignorant masses are not properly led to vote the way she wants the voting turnout to be. Ramón and his mother certainly do not advocate educating the illiterate public. Their statements imply that the ineffectiveness of an election justifies the force which has been used for centuries in Spain. Unlike Daphne in *Non-Combatants and Others*, who emphasizes the significance of educating the public, Ramón does not see that education will provide an answer to political struggles that have been worsened by means of force.

The disagreement between Armand and Ramón seems to suggest that Armand is politically close to the Marlowes. Nevertheless, the conversations between Armand and the Marlowes when not in the presence of the Spanish family betray that Armand is a man of the Right. Armand describes himself as a man who is “for stability of regime and property, and against all those wild schemes for redistributing wealth that vex and excite the imagination of the Left” (42). He disapproves of only the violence that the Rightists have employed for their cause. He thinks of himself as “l’homme moyen sensuel, who likes to avoid the betises of extremity and goes tranquilly on his way” (42). Armand applies the same reasoning to Guy, and he asserts that Guy “committed . . . a barbarism and a betise when he would leap into the affairs of another land, like Lord Byron, and fight against its pronunciamientos” (42).

Because of his distaste for the violence of both the Right and the Left, Armand sounds like a pacifist. However, he is not a pacifist as Macaulay believes one should be. Armand pursues only comfort with no consideration for others. As if he were a man of non-violence, he says: “All that we bourgeoisie ask is to be left in peace to cultivate our garden, to make our chocolate, to spend our money well—and what peace do we get, with all these terrible intoxicated men raving round Europe?” (43). The word “peace” in

Armand's statement means peace of mind, which he believes should not be disturbed by ideological struggles. In his viewpoint, Guy is one of the men who are terribly intoxicated with ideologies and have disturbed his private, peaceful life. According to Ramón, Armand does not understand ideological purposes that justify their means. Ramón explains to Hugh: "You and I . . . we would doubtless quarrel if we talked of politics, as Guy and I quarreled, but we would agree that they are matter very serious, matter to raise passion, matter for guns. We would not be like this farceur here who lives only for amusement, art, and chocolate" (124).

Since Armand does not take part in ideological strife, he plays as a fair informant about the political views of three Spanish women—Ramón's mother, Antonia, and Ramón's grandmother. The first is from a family of the leaders in the first Carlist war in the nineteenth century. Armand describes her as *beata*, a woman who is "under the priests and give[s] much to the Church" (40). The second, a sixteen-year-old sister of Ramón, is a member of a society called "Hispanidad" whose main objective is to restore the old Spanish empire overseas, which would repossess a large portion of America. From Antonia's obsession with the glorious Spanish empire, Armand generalizes the family members, including Ramón's grandmother, as dreamers of the past, yet distinguishes each one's dream based on his or her political views. What Antonia has is "a gallant imperial dream"; her mother has "Carlist dreams, of religion and of reaction"; Ramón's grandmother, an anti-Carlist, lives in the past "of the Alfonsist court, and before that of the court of the Regency and of Alfonso XII" (45). Armand adds another family member's dream, that of Ramón. According to Armand, Ramón cherishes the glory of his ancestors who fought against their kings. Despite the differences among the members of the family, they are all against the British family, who they believe are liberals,

communists, and anti-religious. In addition, all of them feel that the British should not meddle with their affairs.

Of all the family members, the marquesa particularly shows distaste for the Marlowe group. The differences between Ramón's mother and Dr. Marlowe typify the antagonism between the Right and the Left, and point to their different views of women's roles. The marquesa dislikes Dr. Marlowe not only because of her opposing political views but also because of her profession and her behavior. According to the Spanish lady, women should not take roles that are traditionally forbidden. Dr. Marlowe certainly does not conform to the stereotype of women. In addition, as if nullifying her sex identity, she is always addressed as Dr. Marlowe, except once at the beginning of the novel. She is not an ideal woman to a person who values women's traditional gender roles and who stresses the fundamental differences between men and women. To the marquesa, Dr. Marlowe is a "woman doctor, indeed. A profession no modest woman would adopt. A widow . . . but, in that heartless English way, she wore no signs of it" (49). The marquesa's negative view of Dr. Marlowe is based on the conventional conception of women's roles which are culturally and socially determined. Dr. Marlowe's challenge to such roles of women is also illustrated in her slacks and swimming suit, which she wears while traveling around Spain. Those items of clothes violate the dress code for women which has been reinforced by priests and the government of new liberated Spain.

Compared with her Spanish counterpart, Dr. Marlowe defies the gender fixation which she believes is set for both woman and man. When Betsey, who is conscious of others' opinions, expresses her fear that people might suspect her sanity if she does not polish her nails in red the same way other young girls do, Dr. Marlowe asserts her voice against gender fixation.

“ . . . this fear that haunts us all of being supposed to be insane. Even children in kindergartens are afraid of suspicions of lunacy; I get a lot of cases of infant maladjustment arising, I’m sure, from such fears. There is a strong element of morbid hysteria in them. We attribute to others suspicions we should never harbor ourselves on such trivial grounds. Boys at school are the worst victims of the disease; girls a good second. Some people keep it all through life, and even get worse. The fear really does gradually turn their brain You really must be careful not to let it grow on you.” (81)

Dr. Marlowe uses the word “hysteria” to describe the mental status of both sexes. She thinks that both sexes’ mental capacity results from cultural and social bias against them. As she refuses to accept gender fixation, Dr. Marlowe also emphasizes the education of women, which is “one of her most active hobbyhorses” (157). Referring to many women’s hypersensitive reactions to air raids during World War I, Dr. Marlowe argues that women are not trained from childhood to be resistant to such horror. Her crucial point is that women act differently because they lack the education which has been given exclusively to men throughout history. She states that “if women had been educated to be the intellectual companions of men, their position as a sex would have been quite different, surely” (157). Like Daphne in *Non-Combatants and Others*, Dr. Marlowe does not believe that the biological differences between men and women cause their different attitudes toward war. To Ramón, who believes that God created women less intelligent than men, Dr. Marlowe’s contention represents “English Liberal nonsense, perhaps even Red rubbish” (157). His reaction to the British female doctor’s idea is similar to his mother’s. Dr. Marlowe’s views on women reflect to some extent her ideological line. For

her, the issue of education of women is closely connected with the issue of women suffrage. She has believed that the Republic would give women votes (174). However, not every Leftist agrees with her on women's issues. Hugh, a Red, believes the only training women need is to cook better. Like Betsey, who does not dare to challenge a fixed idea about women's nails, Hugh also adheres to the conventional idea of woman's role as cook. Hugh only changes his view of women when the Spanish nobleman attacks his ideological conviction by implying that every "Red" advocates the idea of educating women. Ramón asserts that to give women "more education, to train them in mind and body to be men, that is one of the silly notions of the Reds" (158). And then he asks Hugh to agree that what men ask of women is only to be women as God created them. Offended by Ramón's remarks on the Reds, Hugh in a lukewarm attitude states that women "had better be trained" (158).

The only woman's role that Dr. Marlowe is willing to play is that of mother. Nevertheless, the role of mother does not make the two mothers closer. When the marquesa says that "we mothers must all do what we can for our children when they are fallen in trouble, even when they have deserved that trouble through their own fault," Dr. Marlowe is annoyed by the marquesa's implication that she herself views Guy the same way the marquesa, a woman of the Right, does (113). In Dr. Marlowe's view, Guy has done nothing to cause his current trouble. In addition, when the two mothers talk about their daughters, they again become divided because of their different views on a daughter's gender role. The marquesa is concerned about her daughter's strong interest in politics, which is far from "ladylike ways." In contrast, the British mother has been disappointed with her daughter, who has interests in only films and books which have nothing to do with politics. Dr. Marlowe has vainly tried to make Betsey find politics

interesting. She openly expresses her disappointment when Betsey states that she can not finish What Hitler Wants because of her lack of interest (17). Thus, when the Spanish lady wants to replace Antonia's current governess with one who will teach her ladylike ways, the British mother exclaims: "Oh, but what a pity that would be! Ladylike ways! Turn that fine, fiery little creature into a young person with ladylike ways—surely not" (51).

In contrast to what she describes as "ladylike ways," the marquesa reveals herself to be a woman who is very politically minded. She and Dr. Marlowe become heated in arguments over censorship. The marquesa believes that censorship is necessary for "the new liberated Spain" without realizing that the modifier "liberated" indicates a self-contradiction. In comparison, Dr. Marlowe argues that censorship may prevent foreigners from helping Spain. The Spanish lady is annoyed by the British woman's intrusive attitude toward Spanish affairs. In addition, the British guest criticizes the new Spanish government for policies that only facilitate "poverty and hunger and ignorance . . . and all these very distressing political trials and executions" (69). The marquesa refutes Dr. Marlowe's argument by pointing out that the very same social problems exist everywhere, including Dr. Marlowe's beloved country. For the Spanish lady, those problems are often associated with the lower classes, who are traditionally deprived of the privilege she enjoys. They do not deserve improvement. Based on her firm belief in class distinction, the marquesa also states that the old times when her class owned slaves "were happier for all" (70).

The marquesa's dream of a class-divided Spain provokes Dr. Marlowe to ask about the discrepancy between what she envisions and what the Generalissimo Franco has been doing after his victory over the Republic. Dr. Marlowe suggests that the new Spain

is becoming more like the new Germany under the rule of Hitler rather than the Spain that had a strict social stratum. The marquesa disputes such a comparison, underlining the religious aspect of the new Spanish government. The British liberal responds to the marquesa with a statement that, despite the religious element of the Franco regime, the two governments are fundamentally the same. She even uses the word “tyranny” in her description of the governments. Such a description offends the marquesa. It is clear that even the marquesa is against tyranny. Despite the Generalísimo’s absolute power, the Franco regime is not tyranny in the marquesa’s view because Franco exercises the clericalism that the marquesa espouses.

The marquesa’s clericalism also provides the ground for her opposition to college education in Spain, which she believes poisons young men by instilling anti-clerical views. While talking to Hugh, a graduate of Cambridge, the marquesa affirms that Oxford “grows now more clerical, more Catholic” (88). Based on such unfounded prejudice, she plans to send her younger son, Felipe, to Oxford. She seems to have forgotten that Ramón, Armand, and Guy are graduates of the college. None of them is religious. Her own son Ramón does not share her conviction of faith. Nevertheless, to the marquesa only Guy is anti-clerical because of his opposition to the Franco regime.

The marquesa’s political views against the Left are shared by her mother-in-law, although the conversation between the old marquesa and Dr. Marlowe is less confrontational. The marquesa vieja centers her focus on the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in the late nineteenth century. Unlike her daughter-in-law, she is not a Carlist. Nevertheless, her opinion reveals that the marquesa vieja is certainly in opposition to Dr. Marlowe. According to the old lady, “universal suffrage, freedom of meeting and of worship, freedom of speech and of press, trial by jury” are all “revolutionary follies” and

“pieces of liberal nonsense” (97). These are principles that Dr. Marlowe stands for. The old marquesa argues that the time of King Alfonso, who banned all revolutionary ideas, was the good old days. She also asserts that despotism works best in Spain, although she does not approve of the Franco regime. In the new Spain, the marquesa vieja does not find betterment of the people’s lives. Since Alfonso died shortly after he took power, Spain, according to the old lady, has gone from one disorder to the next. She maintains: “The same corruption, the same follies, the same talk, talk, talk, that conducts nowhere. Our people, so turbulent, so extreme, so ignorant, need to be ruled with firmness by a king and the old aristocracia. These new vulgar men, these little caudillos, they have not roots, they will soon blow up themselves” (98).

Focusing on these cyclical struggles, the old marquesa deplures violent acts of all the groups. Yet her distaste for violence does not lead to a search for methods to stop it. The old lady only expresses nostalgia for the past monarch. Listening to her, Dr. Marlowe suggests that improved literacy would change the violent aspect of the ideological struggles. Like her daughter-in-law, who has pointed out that the social problems in Spain exist in other countries, the old marquesa asks how much literacy has changed the British public. The British doctor responds: “Oh, we’re none of us very wise. But reading does help. I mean, our poor are much more intelligent than they were sixty years ago, when they were largely illiterate” (99). Dr. Marlowe is aware that literacy is not a panacea to all social problems. Nevertheless, she believes in the long term impact of literacy on humanity.

Despite the differences in their opinions on various issues, the old marquesa and Dr. Marlowe respect each other. The old marquesa’s cordial communication with Dr. Marlowe explains her friendly relationship with Guy when he stayed with the family

before the war. Both of them treat each other “with the implacable understanding of enemies who would fight to the death for their views but without rancor or scorn” (99). Their civilized manners are rooted in their intelligence and their recognition of the other side’s views. In addition, they have something in common. The old marquesa does not insist on women’s lady-like ways. When Dr. Marlowe notes that Ellen does not have the slightest idea about politics, the old lady states that “she is, then, a good young girl, like most of our *senoritas* here” (104). However, that statement does not reflect what she prefers to see in a young girl. Similar to Dr. Marlowe, the old marquesa likes “a young lady to have thoughts on any topic” (104). She is not bothered by her granddaughter’s great interest in politics, although she is well aware that it does bother her daughter-in-law. Because of their civilized manners and their esteem for opinionated women, she and Dr. Marlowe are closer than she and her daughter-in-law are. The two women’s conversation displays the possibility of peaceful debate between opposing sides without bitterness. It is a precedent for the civilized communication among Guy and Armand and Ramón, which takes place later in this novel.

The talk between the old marquesa and Dr. Marlowe reveals more than two women’s political views. It betrays the fact that the British doctor has not fully understood the realities of ideological struggle in Spain. At the moment when they meet, the old marquesa points out that Dr. Marlowe’s presumption that Ramón wields the influence to aid her in her search for Guy is unreasonable because Ramón is not a part of the power structure of the New Spain. She also notes that British liberals are not welcome in the current Spain. In response to the old lady, the British liberal doctor admits that she is at her wit’s end (94). She goes on to say that her visit to Ramón is founded on her hope that the friendship between Guy and Ramón would overshadow the ideological

differences between them. Dr. Marlowe's answer reveals that she does not see the deep gulf between the two friends caused by their different ideologies.

Dr. Marlowe's idea of Guy's living conditions in the Franco Spain also discloses her naiveté. The old marquesa suggests that Guy, like other liberals—"many excellent professors from the universities"—may become a bandit if he is still alive yet not imprisoned (101). Dr. Marlowe simply denounces the possibility: "I don't think Guy . . . it would be too useless a life, he wouldn't be doing that . . . I think he is going about in disguise, working secretly" (101). The idea that Guy may rob for a living is again brought up by Ramón after the group's vain efforts to locate Guy in prison. Ramón implies that Guy may be with other "conspirators" who rove about the mountains. Dr. Marlowe attempts to dispute Ramón's conjecture with her wishful thinking: "He might be living in some Bibao or Santander or Madrid slum, printing leaflets in a cellar or something" (223). Ramón shrewdly asks who could financially sponsor Guy's work if he is indeed printing leaflets. Dr. Marlowe realizes that such a chance is very slim. Nevertheless, she contends: "I don't know what Guy is living on; I can't even guess. He may be doing some kind of paid work. Or he may be living with friends who don't want pay from him. Guy wouldn't mind that, any more than he'd mind supporting friends himself if he could" (223). As it later turns out, Guy's living conditions are closer to what the old marquesa and Ramón have suggested. As the narrator explains, Dr. Marlowe's purpose in taking Betsey to Spain is "to wake Betsey up to reality" (15). Nevertheless, the confrontations between her and the Spanish family reveal that Dr. Marlowe herself has been blind to some of the realities regarding the political strife in the foreign land with which her son is deeply involved.

Traveling with Ramón around the new Spain gives Dr. Marlowe a chance to observe that the opposing political views with which she has been confronted at the del Montes prevail among the Spanish people. Even a simple term such as liberty is not interpreted the same way as it is by liberals. As shown in a parade, the public seems to believe that they have been liberated from many ills engendered by the ideological groups of the Republic. Ramón delivers their view that all actions against the defeated side, including prosecution, are justified in the name of liberty. Challenged about such a self-serving interpretation of liberty, Ramón responds: “why should all those stupid liberals be allowed to utter their foolish thoughts aloud or on paper?” (144). The concept of liberty is only applied to the people who were against the Republic in the civil war. The difference in the application of such a term illustrates that the gap between the Spanish Right and the British Left is deep.

Since Dr. Marlowe desperately needs Ramón’s help, she tries not to upset him while exchanging views. However, collisions between the Spanish marquis and the Marlowes are unavoidable. They include each side’s stereotyping the other side, as manifested in their debate on differences between the English and the Spanish concerning the treatment of prisoners. Dr. Marlowe deplores Spain’s execution of war prisoners. The marquis makes a sarcastic remark on the difference between the two nationals: “since they were English, and the English behave always so well, are so good, perhaps they didn’t deserve be shot, perhaps they weren’t criminals and murderers like our Reds” (155). He suggests that such a treatment of prisoners is not confined to Spain. The British doctor admits that England has a bad record in the treatment of its political enemies: “What with India, and Ireland, and African natives, and the Boer War, and firing Indians from guns, and flogging, and the stocks and pillory, and the state of our prisons till quite

lately, and hanging children, and the dreadful Poor Laws, and Cromwell on too many occasions, and Queen Mary on practically all, and Henry VIII and King John, and witch-hunting, and the Elizabethan pirates . . . and capitalism and the poor . . .” (155-56). Dr. Marlowe acknowledges that the British past is nothing to be proud of. Nonetheless, she does not completely yield to the marquis’ argument. She reflects that the Spanish treatment of enemies has been “far more cruel” (155). In addition, when referring to capitalism and the poor, Dr. Marlowe again offends the Spanish nobleman because she does not share his support for capitalism and class distinction.

Although Dr. Marlowe seems firm in her political beliefs, she starts to have moments of “a sudden sense of frustration, of futility” (166). She thinks about sending telegrams which convey her anti-fascist appeals: her appeal to the American President would be to stop the Japanese; her appeal to the British Foreign Secretary would be to visit Moscow; her appeals to the women of Britain and the shops of Britain would be not to buy and sell silk. Moreover, Dr. Marlowe wants to express her regret at her absence from meetings and her support for the meetings’ objectives. Yet she begins to doubt whether any effort of hers would bring the change she hopes to see: “A few more messages, a few less, more efforts to save anything, more protests against this savage world, what difference did they make? None, it seemed, none at all. The savage world always won . . . all are vain, horror and scorn and hate and fear and indignation . . . all vain” (166-67). Dr. Marlowe’s frustration is also related to her fruitless visits to several prisons. She realizes that the civil war created a great number of prisons and becomes skeptical about the possibility of finding Guy. She also feels the bitterness of disillusionment about Guy’s and his friends’ fight against Fascism: “Spain was a cenotaph of lost causes and slain hopes . . . all who interfered in Spain wasted their time,

unless they were content with the brief rewards of temporary success There was no finality of achievement, no settled success; once established, all regimes rocked and toppled to destruction. Guy and his kind, in fact, had fought to no purpose” (189).

Dr. Marlowe’s doubt does not drag on. Ramón’s view of Dr. Marlowe indicates that Dr. Marlowe is an iron-willed woman of the British Left. Ramón confides to Ellen, who has no idea of politics: “She alarms me . . . she is like Britannia, not to be defeated. And she will talk to me of Spanish politics, of which she knows nothing and of which I don’t care to speak. I don’t wish [to] be questioned and lectured on my country’s condition by the English, and too by English Reds. Would they like if I would lecture on them on English politics and ask them when Britain will cease to be democrat?” (175). Surprisingly, Ellen’s answer is yes. What Ramón does not understand is that Dr. Marlowe’s attitude toward Spain is grounded on her ideological beliefs, not nationalism. Ideology for her does not have geographical boundaries.

Throughout the novel, Ramón presents himself as a Spaniard who is annoyed by foreigners’ interference with Spanish politics. For him, the Marlowes represent the British who have intervened in Spanish affairs, political or religious, over several centuries. Ramón’s resentment about the Marlowes’ intervention in Spain does not indicate that he is a nationalist. His antagonism against foreigners has nothing to do with nationalism. Making a distinction between himself and his sister, who is, in his words, “too patriotic,” Ramón believes himself “to be a little cosmopolitan” (178). He admits that he likes the British to a certain degree. His affection for the British, which was apparently fostered during his stay at Oxford, indeed originates in the idle life he was able to enjoy in England. He had a good time playing tennis and cards, hunting small animals, and making many friends. Like his French friend Armand, Ramón only concerns himself with

the preservation of his comfortable life. During the civil war, he “went to Monte Carlo with Armand to forget it” (180). Ramón has never tried to make any contribution to the resolution of conflicts in his country. He only lodges complaints against the intrusiveness of foreigners. Ramón’s selfishness seems to weaken his argument against the Marlowes.

Nevertheless, certain elements of the civil war support Ramón’s point that the Marlowes do not know enough about Spanish politics to meddle. The Marlowes’ interference is based on the assumption that the Spanish are on the whole political and ideologically divided. However, Dr. Marlowe comes to witness that politics means nothing to a good number of people who live in devastating conditions. Jaca, a city, is full of poor and hungry people who have no concern with politics. A pharmacist states that he himself knows nothing of “revolutionary talk, anti-Franquisto propaganda, Republican plotting” (162). Both sides contributed to bringing “trouble and starvation to Jaca”; “Fascismo, Marxismo, Anarquismo, Carlismo, the Monarchy, the Republic, the Fascist Revolution, everything had ruined Jaca” (162). In another city, San Sebastian, the Marlowes find a similar view of the civil war, as they talk to an old fisherman who has no ideological beliefs. As far as the old man is concerned, the civil war, like all other Spanish struggles, was “a regional affair” (205). He states: “Yes, Guipuzcoa has lost the war. Catalonia also. Neither the one nor the other will have its freedom now, not until the next insurrection. Burgos and Pamplona and Zaragoza have won; yes, Castilla and Navarra and Aragon have won the war this time” (204). Since the old man does not see the civil war as war of ideologies, he is upset with the labelling of him as one of the “Reds.” Ramón confirms that the Spanish Civil War was no less a regional war than an ideological one. Taking people in the Basque province as an example, he notes: “it was never a class war, or a war of Left and Right, of political regime, of land, of money, of the

Church, of Marxists, anarchists, Monarchists, it was a war of Basques against a central government” (212).

The regional conflict is a lot more complicated than the British outsiders have realized. When Ernie is arrested for drunkenness and sedition, the Marlowes and the marquis face two Navarrese policemen. Dr. Marlowe tells the policemen that she always thought the Navarrese and the Vascos are ethnically the same. One of them repudiates her idea by saying that “there is no kinship between the Vascos and the Navarrese” (221). He also argues that the people of two different regions do not share culture, language, or religion. The Navarrese policeman is not completely right. Historically speaking, the sharp division between the two regions originated in 1931 when the Navarrese rejected joining Basque home rule by a very narrow margin. One fifth of all Basque speakers in the 1930s lived in Navarre.

The Navarrese policeman’s statement illustrates how preposterous all the divisions are. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the civil war has sharpened the gulfs among regions. The same policeman also generalizes about all people who live near the sea on the basis of his prejudice against the Vascos. He extends his theory to the Portuguese. A question is raised: what about the French and the British? The policeman goes on to say in a still confident manner that all coast dwellers, in Spain as well as in England, show the same vulgar characteristics. He does not accept the fact that there are always exceptions.

Divisions created by the war also affect friends. The confrontation between Guy and Ramón betrays not only a friendship shattered by the war but also their ideological differences. Guy is with a group of gypsies who make their living by regularly stealing hens and eggs and performing in front of spectators. The gypsies do not know much about

the war and do not care for any region or ideology. Living as a gypsy, Guy is waiting for another Spanish uprising. The two friends' peaceful exchange of political views could have brought them back to their college days when "discussing life in one of their rooms at night" (246). However, the gulf between them is too deep to be bridged. Ramón, who has earlier stated that he has no sympathy for the people of the defeated side, is glad to see Guy's eye-patch and the scar on his head. For Ramón, Guy represents the foreign force that has meddled in Spanish politics. He does not appreciate his British friend's deep involvement with Spanish affairs. He becomes irritated when Guy describes his state of mind as "bitter and greatly disagreeable" over issues that "matter much more than love affairs" (247). The Spanish friend makes a pointed remark: "You mean Spain, and being prisoner, and your side losing. What made you come and interfere with us? You had no business" (247). Guy responds that he does not espouse the nationalism that underlies Ramón's argument. In addition, he makes the point that since other countries sent their aid to Spanish Fascists, he as a Leftist had to try to help the opposing side, which he believed was "the fashionable thing to do" (247). For Guy, the war was the ideological struggle of "Left against Right, democracy against absolutism, freedom against suppression" (247).

Neither Guy nor Ramón yields a single point in his argument. Nevertheless, the first is a little bit more flexible than the latter in that he admits that both sides are responsible for certain undesirable activities. When Ramón argues that Spain was saved from the Reds, Guy resents Ramón's labeling as a "Red" anyone who was against Fascism. Ramón points out that Guy's side has labeled anyone who is not a Liberal a Fascist. Guy states that both sides have resorted to labeling, which is "idiotic" (248). Guy also talks about the cycle of savage acts on both sides: "there were plenty of savages

about, Red and White and no color at all One savage makes another; one side murders a politician on the Left, the other murders someone on the Right in revenge” (248). However, his acknowledgment of both sides’ extreme activities stops at a point. He accuses Ramón’s side of allowing all the savagery in order to prevent Spain from being a democratic government which can “level up the classes a little and let the peasants have some land and the poor some better schools and people in general a little more money to live on” (249). According to Guy, the vicious cycle of savagery will end only when the Liberals win. Because Guy is waiting for another uprising, he would be likely to participate in committing the savage acts that he has criticized. Ramón makes a statement concerning his British friend’s possible participation in the next revolt: “in case you would like to know it. It is that the next revolution, when it comes, will be a revolution of the Right. So perhaps you would better not wait to see it, for it might suit you no better than the last” (254).

As illustrated in the talk between Guy and Ramón, there lies irreconcilable differences between the Right and the Left. Even if one side defeats the other by using force, the conflict does not become resolved. Each side’s labeling the other demonstrates that both sides focus on faulty definitions of the other in order to stir up constant antagonism and to justify their cause. Conversing with the Marlowes, Ramón labels the professors of Madrid as Reds. He argues that “in Spain, most secular teachers and students incline to that color” (269). His labeling, which has been refuted by Guy, becomes a target of Hugh’s criticism. Hugh ridicules the loose definitions of each term that the Spanish Rightists use:

“They can see nothing straight. Azaña’s Liberal government, the whole of the intelligentsia, the communists, the anarchists, the moderate

Republicans, and a herd of simple, hungry peasants who couldn't read, were all 'Marxist' to them, while our Tory plutocracy and the fussy French bureaucracy are Liberal democracies. Why do people like that always get their terms all wrong? They ought to bring out a special dictionary, if they want to be understood. *Marxist*: A man who thinks wages should be higher. *Russian*: A member of the Spanish militia . . . *Liberals*: Corrupt Jacobins and Encyclopedists (see Marxists). *Patriots*: Adherents of the parties of the Right in any country. *Red criminals*: Adherents of the parties of the Left. *Criminal Passivity*: Failure to join in a rebellion of the Right. *Criminal Activity*: Resisting a rebellion of the Right." (275)

Ramón counterattacks the Leftist loose definition of Fascism, democracy, and freedom:

"*Fascism* . . . they applied not only to the Italian, German, and Portuguese political systems, the model we have now followed in Spain, but to the conservative capitalism and individualism of their own government, which seemed most peculiar to me. And *democracy* was the very strange name some of them would give to the system of Soviet Russia; they even would at times call it *freedom*" (275-76). All these labelings underline their absurdity.

However, in this ideologically divided world, everybody sees only the other side's ridiculous definitions. The civil war has deepened the gulf between the two sides. Despite his war experience, Guy does not give up his belief in the use of force to defend his cause. Even Dr. Marlowe is not critical of Guy's decision when she hears that Guy is waiting for a chance to have his revenge on Fascist Spain. She simply says that "Guy must follow his destiny" (285). As a war against the Nazis is about to take place, Guy will continue his

fight against Fascism, although this time his fight ostensibly will be tainted with patriotism.

Before his departure, Guy reminisces about his part in the Spanish Civil War. For him, the war “was the ancient twofold war—the principle of authority and suppression against the principle of liberty and democracy, the principle of rich-and-poor against the principle of economic equality” (324). Such an ideological struggle has taken place repeatedly throughout history. Despite Ramón’s beliefs, the civil war was not solely concerned with Spain. The division between the Right and the Left exists everywhere and cannot be abolished. The conflict between the opposing sides will never end. Guy recites lines from John Donne’s “Elegy.”

The sunne is lost, and the earth, and no man’s wit
 Can well direct him where to looke for it.
 And freely men confesse that this world’s spent . . .
 ’Tis all in pieces, all coherance gone;
 All just supply, and all Relation(325)

Thinking about the poem, Guy realizes that individuals who try to abolish struggles engendered by divisions are destined to fail because the world is always “all in pieces.” He has been fighting for a cause that will never be accomplished. However, he cannot give up. Guy concludes: “Perhaps only individuals were worth troubling about: and again they returned to him, the imprisoned thousands of defeated men, for whom such as he could do nothing, except (he believed) one thing, and that thing he was on his way to do” (325). The thing Guy can do is to take part in the war against the Nazis.

Guy’s willing participation in wars does not prove that he is a militant man. Guy knows that “war is the devil Brutal, arrogant, conceited, philistine, intolerant, a

tyrant, against all culture” (333). Nevertheless, his awareness of the vice of war does not make him a pacifist. Compared with his mother, who thinks that “war *is* grotesque as a means of settlement,” he confesses that he does not “feel the horror of it that many civilized people do today” (342). As a Liberal, Guy certainly believes that wars against Fascism are justifiable; he says, “it will be better to make this war against the Nazis than not to make it” (333). Guy’s statement seems to echo his mother’s in that both of them support the military conflict against the Nazis. According to Ramón, Dr. Marlowe has said that “all wars are the wrong wars, since war is so grotesque, so cruel, and so out of date, but that if there could be a right war it would be this against Hitler” (341). However, there is a difference between mother and son. Guy’s statement indicates that he is convinced of the justification of the war. In comparison, the subjunctive mood in Dr. Marlowe’s statement betrays her uncertainty about “a right war.” Thus, when Guy says that he has been involved in the Spanish Civil War “too long to be pacifist,” he implies that his mother is one (342). The difference suggests that their distinctive gender roles lead to different approaches to war, although not all young men take part in actual fighting as exemplified by his old college friends.

Guy’s conversation with Ramón and Armond clearly shows that Guy continues to support the use of force. The three old college friends—Guy, Ramón, and Armond—are again divided because of their different views on the impending war against the Nazis. Guy sees the war as another struggle of Liberalism against Fascism. In comparison, Armond views it as a war between France and Germany. He argues: “I . . . prefer that Germany should not conquer and control my country, whatever the political views of Germans may be” (342).

From the debate about two kinds of war, Armand makes a point that a war of ideologies, such as Guy's war against totalitarianism, never ends. In contrast, war founded on nationalism is always brought to an end. He predicts that if France wins, Germany will be ruined yet "will remain very Nazi" (347). Pointing out the ongoing political strife in Spain, Armand argues that the goal of an ideological victory is unattainable: "War doesn't convert. That is why I think nothing of your ideological wars, my dear Guy, and feel that all wars should confine themselves to their *métier*" (347). Armand and Guy will take the same side, yet their approaches to the upcoming war are not the same. For Armand, it will be a war against Germany, while for Guy it will be a war against the Nazis.

Compared with his two friends, Ramón expresses his opposition to empire, such as the one Mussolini seems to be trying to restore. He is not interested in the debate as to whether the upcoming war is based on nationalism or ideologies. Based on his nationalism, Armand suggests that he and Ramón will take opposite sides, for Franco and Hitler have had a close relationship. Ramón does not agree with him because he will not take a side in the war. He states that he is not going to take any part in it. As he did during the civil war, Ramón is seeking a place where he can be comfortable: "It is time. Well, our fleet at Cadiz, or our generals, always see to our revolutions quite well, so I will leave it in their hands, and for my part I will stay in France till there is less noise" (348). Ramón is aware that his plan is in contrast to Guy's. Comparing himself and Guy, Ramón calls his Liberal friend an altruist, who takes "interest in the fate of others," and defines him as "a man of no frontiers . . . no nations" (348). Ramón's description of Guy is by no means a compliment. His further portrayal of him as "one of the little princes of the new petty principedoms with no patriotism" shows his disapproval. Ramón does not realize that he

himself is a nobleman of a province who has no patriotism. His only interest has been in Aragon, his province, and his property.

The further debate reveals the ironical situation in which Guy finds himself. Although, based on his liberal agenda, Guy has been pursuing a government in which everyone gets education and enjoys freedom, he falls into the idea that this good cause can be forced without considering individuals' free choice. By forcing all children to go to public schools, he assumes that everybody will be educated. In addition, as manifested in his remark on the Pope, Guy believes that a person of power should exercise his power to change others' political views which could only lead to the creation of Fascist states or international conflicts. In Guy's confidence in the Pope's immense power, Armand points out a self-contradiction in Guy's argument. He warns Guy that he would believe himself to be a powerful man and would "commence to issue decrees and encyclicals" (350). Guy would become the kind of person whom he has been fighting against. But if Guy would be consistent in his liberalism, allowing everyone, including his enemies, to do whatever they wanted, then he would be again suppressed by the opposing side. Armand analyzes the inevitable failure of Guy's ideal government by saying, "My poor Guy, you and your Liberalism, you fight in a losing cause If you hanker after freedom and such droll sentimentality as humane Liberalism, this firm age will know how to deal with you without mercy. You will be pulverized between the two irons, the iron of communism and that of Fascism, and you will fly into little morsels If you can force freedom and humanity on the world . . . but you won't" (350). Guy does not refute Armand's point. As he himself has realized, he is in a never-ending battle. By making Armand pinpoint Guy's self-contradiction, Macaulay implies that his goal will never be achieved however justifiable his war of ideology may be. Her creation of Guy reflects her idea that "wars to

end war only give war a fresh lease of life.”¹⁹ Despite his noble goal, Guy only contributes to degrading himself as well as humanity.

Art

According to Jane Emery, the world in And No Man's Wit is divided into two: the world of Ellen Green and the world of the rest of the characters. Emery defines the first as poetry and the second as rhetoric. The two worlds represent art and politics respectively. Ellen Green, a character who confused many reviewers when the novel was published, is a symbol of art in the world of politics. Emery says: Ellen “is a creature of the imagination, a power which can in times of peace transcend the earthly. But in 1939 she cannot survive either on the arid Spanish field of battle or in her own supernatural universe” (261). Thus, according to Emery, And No Man's Wit “sadly implies that the myth of art is not strong enough to provide escape from the violent contemporary world” (261). This portion of my study on And No Man's Wit is grounded in Emery's interpretation of Ellen, yet it will show that the art alien to the world never provides an escape from reality. The violent world is not confined to the 1930s. As illustrated in the novel, political struggles recur in history, and artists who live in times of conflict have to face reality and deal with it.

As Emery points out, Ellen represents a person who lives isolated from the world of political conflicts. Throughout the novel, she has no opinions on any issues related to politics. It is not because she is forming her ideas listening to others. Ellen simply has no interest in politics. The narrator explains what politics means to Ellen: “dust, and dazzle, and the din of streets. From there her daunted mind fled, to stray about cool caves and wet sands, so that the Plaza Francisco Franco, the Rambla Adolf Hitler, the Strada Viva Duce,

and Calle Queipo del Llano . . . and the churches wavered and receded into a blur” (20). Ellen is estranged from both the Marlowes and the del Montes, who are eager to speak out their political views. She certainly does not belong to any ideological group. Her indifference to politics, along with her delicate beauty, attracts Ramón, who sees God’s will in a womanly woman. For Ramón, any woman who is interested in politics and willing to debate is not a proper woman. Ellen fits the stereotype of woman Ramón likes. However, she appears to be a conventional woman only because she has no concern with politics. Ramón later finds out that Ellen is “outside all fashions and all conventions, innocent, unworldly, a law to herself” (263). Ellen represents art that exists in its form of beauty.

Ellen’s poetry only concerns aesthetics, which has nothing to do with reality. Macaulay’s characterization of Ellen shows that she is an isolated being in every respect. Ellen does not exhibit basic human qualities. Although she has been engaged to Guy and attracts Ramón, she does not seem to have any emotion for either man. She is often believed to be stupid or lost. The best description of Ellen is “a type without life” (66). It is true at least as long as she resides on land. When she is near the sea and in the sea, Ellen becomes vivacious. Because of her love for water and her swimming skill, she is considered to be a mermaid. She swims like a fish, although she never formally learned how to do it. As Betsey says, “she had begun to make jokes; she would talk gaily as she went about her Neptunian affairs She would come up radiant and laughing, and perhaps break into a song” (258). Despite the change, Ellen’s poetry never reaches the reader. Her jokes, talks, and songs in the sea are not directly conveyed to the reader. What the reader is able to envision from Ellen’s vitality is a world that governs itself with no

connection to political struggles. However, it turns out that this world without politics is by no means a world of perfect peace.

Despite Ellen's extraordinary swimming skill, she does not belong to the world of the sea. Just as she has been estranged from others on land, Ellen is completely isolated in the sea world. Her isolation comes from her ignorance of the laws of nature. Under the seemingly placid sea, every being is engaged in the struggle for existence, which started earlier than political conflicts on land. As the narrator describes, no one can be an exception: "Appetite rages on land and sea; eating, eating, eating, without pity One must eat to live: inescapable law, basic cruelty which forever damns life. The obscene horror of the world it is impossible to escape; appetite and fear and destruction, the weak caught by the stronger, the stronger by the stronger still, death and fear and iridescent beauty twisting in and out of one another in a wild game of hide and seek" (296-97). When Ellen gets hungry, she thinks about going under water and catching a fish to eat. Yet she decides not "to visit the bottom of the monstrous world" (298). She is at her wit's end and wants advice. She realizes "with a strange certainty that none of her kind remained among the sea's creatures" (299). Ellen's death signifies that art would not be autonomous. Art cannot exist if it does not recognize struggles in life. It would perish if it were alienated from reality.

Throughout the novel, a question concerning the relation between art and the world of politics is frequently raised. The general conception is that art cannot thrive in the condition of political strife. If so, what can an artist do in such circumstances? When Guy talks about Spain with Ramón for the first time after Franco defeated the Republic, he remarks on art, along with other humanities, under the reign of Franco: "if you expect me to admire what Franco and his Fascist friends have made of Spain, well, look at it

now. One vast and cruel concentration camp on the Nazi model. I don't ask, where's freedom, because you don't want freedom for the Spanish people, but where's culture? Where's art? Where's literature? Where's civilization? Where's education?" (249). Guy suggests that art and other humanities have no place in the world of totalitarianism. This view reflects his creator's statement that "culture and the arts are among the most vulnerable war targets."²⁰

Although Guy does not make a direct suggestion concerning artists' roles, his resentment about the state of art implies that artists should be concerned about Fascism not just for themselves but for the human race. Guy's point is clear in his advice to Martin Olivar, a young poet whom he met in the Pyrenees. Olivar asks what he can do for Spain under the oppression of the Franco regime once he successfully exiles himself to France. Guy answers: "You must write about it" (332). Guy seems to believe that Olivar is obliged to write about Fascist Spain in order to help the people in distress. Of course, there is a possibility that Olivar would become a propagandist rather than a poet. After all, his poetry has "not been so good as his patriotism" (326). Nevertheless, according to Guy, artists should fight against Fascism, which has caused the deterioration of humanity.

Not all artists are concerned with the deterioration of humanity. No matter how horrid human conditions are, there are always, in Macaulay's words, "unpolitically minded artists . . . who see art in large letters and life in small."²¹ In *And No Man's Wit*, Armand and Betsey represent such artists, although the first is not so much an artist as a dilettante. Both of them do not care about the real world as long as they are able to enjoy their personal lives through their arts. Armand, who always seeks pleasure, believes that art exists only to give delight. He is to a certain degree troubled by the fact that art has deteriorated under the rule of Franco. He says: "it is so different from before the civil war.

Culture is killed—or, let's hope, stunned only. Madrid had exhibitions of modern art which were superb; now, since the artists were mostly of the Left, they are in prison or exile, and the modern pictures one sees in the shops are all bad, common stuff, as in Nazi Germany. It is the same with literature and music; culture is crushed" (123). Armand believes that the suppression exercised by the totalitarian governments has caused poor quality art. His opinion on this issue seems to echo Guy's. However, his further comments reveal that he is interested only in his own amusement. Armand resents that people "stay at home at night instead of making nights at the opera and the play and the cafes" (123). His art does not address issues, such as poverty, liberty, or political injustices, which concern the general public. As long as people of the leisure class, like himself, can go to the theatre, there should not be any noise about the government's suppression of individual freedom. Furthermore, the Spanish people's loss of entertainment is not his problem. Since he is not part of the struggle, Armand is still able to entertain himself by looking at the oppressed people as characters on a stage: "Spain is always entrancing, always sensational. The people seem . . . like those characters in opera to whom violent events incessantly occur, and who always are being assassinated or assassinating . . . being imprisoned in dungeons and bursting forth with loud song, or suffering from atrocious tortures, or experiencing some other grand sensation. They are a people très accidenté, like their roads" (123) Armand sounds almost like "a Nero" who, as Macaulay said, fiddles while a village "burns instead of manning the hose."²² The meaning of art to Armand is manifested in the narrator's description: Armand "bought pictures, concerned himself with films, and wrote a little poetry, less because he enjoyed or was fitted for these activities than because they were the fashion, and one must keep

one's end up against the more intellectual Left" (31). Thus Armand may not actually enjoy the opera on the stage. He only acts in the manner expected of a man of wealth.

Compared with Armand, Betsey really enjoys art, especially fiction and film. She even reads novels in the car, which her mother does not approve of. The narrator describes her: "Betsey looked up from her novel, keeping a finger on the line at which she had paused. Betsey . . . had the expression . . . of the stupefied fiction addict (she even wrote the stuff), sliding entranced from dream to dream" (9). Betsey, unlike Ellen, does not live in a fantasy world. She only sinks into it from time to time. Her fiction provides an escape from harsh realities which she does not completely ignore yet feels no interest in.

Betsey's obsession with fiction contrasts with Dr. Marlowe's deep concern with politics and current affairs. The difference between them is illustrated in their reading materials. While Betsey reads a novel, her mother reads a newspaper. Dr. Marlowe believes that Betsey reads fiction only to avoid reality, so she deplores and strives "against this idle and foolish escapism" (14). Betsey's reaction to her mother's claim that newspapers provide all they have to know betrays that she is not interested in reality:

Inarticulate addict, Betsey could not formulate her reply, that all was there except art, the art that took life, adventure, love, hate, revolutions, murders, people, conversations, jokes, and molded them into a neat, lovely, dazzling pink shape like sherry trifle stuck with almonds. Art: that magical chef. To read of a murder in a newspaper, that is dull, melancholy, and very likely disgusting; to read of it between the gay covers of a novel, that immediately entralls Even people driving along a road—you may see them at it any day, and who cares? But let them but start up their

cars and move off in a story or film, and how eagerly Betsey hung upon their every motion, absorbing such details as novelists do not hesitate to mention Any Saturday afternoon can offer a surfeit of such material in the raw; but Betsey, not being a have-not power, had little craving for raw materials; she preferred them cooked. (14-15)

Betsey does not want to tackle reality. To digest a tragedy in fiction is a lot easier than to read about it on a newspaper. Betsey admits that victims of disastrous events in a novel do not cause her to worry about them afterward. She is not the kind of artist her creator believes one should be; she certainly is not the artist who can make the viewer “know the ‘thing seen’ in its purity,” as manifested in Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract. Despite her distinction between art and the newspaper, Betsey’s art is similar to the feuilleton of the newspaper that one of the girls in Non-Combatants and Others regularly reads. The feuilleton carries melodramatic stories which are far from realities, and it pleases the girl, who believes that war is only a men’s business. In addition, the association between Betsey’s art and sticky desserts reveals that Betsey is like the characters at Violette in Non-Combatants and Others, who play only conventional women’s roles and concern themselves with how well their food is cooked even when war issues are discussed. Betsey is not a conventional young girl to a person like the marquesa who believes in “ladylike ways,” for she tends to absorb herself in books and wears slacks like her mother. Nevertheless, she tries to conform to the gender fixation.

Betsey’s apparent lack of interest in politics makes her politically minded mother deprecate her writing. While talking to the old marquesa, Dr. Marlowe states that Betsey has no literary gifts, although she does not rule out the possibility that Betsey “may become a best seller when she begins to publish” (100). She adds that her daughter’s

books “would be *bad* best sellers” (100). In response to Dr. Marlowe, the old marquesa notes that as long as writing makes Betsey happy, it serves Betsey’s need. The old lady goes on to say that “Art is like love, it possesses the soul quite; neither art nor love needs be of the highest to be strong felt” (107). For the old marquesa, art does not have to do more than give delight. Such a view does not reflect that of Macaulay, who believes in an artist’s responsibility to humanity.

As the old marquesa observes, Betsey is often absorbed in writing even at the del Montes. While others talk to one another, Betsey finds time “to sit in the room saying nothing and write” (114). Nevertheless, the confrontation with the Spanish family who have completely different political views from her own family forces Betsey to participate in political discussions, although she tries to avoid them as best as she can. Betsey engages in discussion when Antonia, whose political interest is as strong as her mother’s, claims that the majority of states in America will become Spain’s territory again. She does not argue with the Spanish girl, yet raises an interesting point which displays that she is not completely ignorant of political struggles. Betsey asks: “When does Spain begin getting them? It’ll mean a lot of wars, won’t it—[the] United States, France, us, and about a dozen South American states. When do you begin, and with what?” (56). Betsey’s question proves that her mother’s view of her as “stupid” is not accurate. She even asks Antonia whether Ramón likes Franco after Antonia states that her brother likes only nobles. When Antonia abruptly states that “we do not much talk of politics with strangers,” Betsey apologizes to her and says: “I don’t much talk politics with anyone, if I can help it. I get too much of them at home, and I think they’re lousy” (57). And then Betsey changes the subject to the one she likes best, books.

Betsey is more cognizant of politics than her mother acknowledges, although she is not sure of what she really believes. Responding to what Guy said about Fascists, Betsey raises the question of how long the Franco regime could unite different ideological groups. She also wonders about each country's territory after listening to Antonia. She sympathizes with Antonia, yet she does not like the idea that each country would try to take its old territories by force. Betsey expresses her thoughts to Armand: "I don't blame her, I must say. Gibraltar, too It started me thinking I ought to get bothered about America, and Calais and the other bits of France we lost to you. Like Hitler does about the old German bits, and Mussolini about the Roman ones. But I was brought up wrong, because of my parents not being really patriotic and not holding with empires. Still, I must say I'd quite like our old bits of France back again, though I wouldn't like us to go and take them, like Hitler does" (93). Betsey knows that her views are influenced by her parents'. Her understanding of Antonia's antagonism toward the British over Gibraltar indeed reflects her mother's "un-British view" of the outpost. Betsey does not lack convictions. She acknowledges that Antonia's seemingly simple claim of the old Spain could be extended to conflicts in which several different countries would be involved.

Betsey is not completely alienated from the world of politics. She becomes somewhat vocal about political issues. At one point, she states that she does not like the Right, although she apologizes right away for speaking about it (168). She also disapproves of the way Ernie calls his political opponents childish names like "dirty Fascists": "I think it's silly calling them that. They're not dirty just because we don't agree with them" (172). In addition, she does not remain silent when she finds self-contradiction in Ramón's statement. Ramón tries to justify the imprisonment of people who express opposing views and contends that "better half the people in prison than all of

the country torn up by revolution and war” (186). Betsey contradicts: “you’ve got them both in Spain, haven’t you—half the people in prison *and* the country torn by war” (186). Another occasion displays Betsey’s ability to recognize problems caused by Fascist government’s exploitation of religion. Her mother deplores the only type of a bathing suit allowed by a law: “Franco is really a most extraordinary man, all this attention to petty detail. When the military and the clergy get together they certainly do make the most depressing laws” (197). Betsey responds: “Like colonels who read the lessons in church . . . and clergymen who preach about war” (197). Her rather witty remarks, however, never develop into a serious commentary. They abruptly end with either her apologies or a shift to a new topic.

Betsey is well aware of political problems lingering in Spain even though the civil war is over. Her acknowledgment, however, does not mean that she will deal with politics in her writing. Betsey remains unchanged. Her exposure to regional, ideological struggles and social problems, such as poverty, in post-war Spain does not have any impact on her. Her refusal to go back to England discloses that Betsey remains an “unpolitically minded artist.” Dr. Marlowe apprehends that there will be a war and insists upon going back home since they now know that Guy is alive in Spain. While her mother insists on facing war and says that “there’ll be jobs to do at home,” Betsey makes a fuss: “Oh, do let’s stay here . . . London will be awful, everyone talking about the war and politics and the Nazis and horrid things like that. I do wish we could stay here and bathe and be happy and I’d finish my novel” (288). Betsey wishes to continue her novel which is about an adventure of parachute jumping in the middle of a herd of bulls that are “all malicious and all mad” (106). The novel certainly does not concern political struggle which she has observed across Fascist Spain. For Betsey, political issues are “raw materials” that she does not

dares to digest. Betsey's career as a writer does not seem to have good prospects. Even if Betsey finishes the novel, she may not be able to publish it not because her country is going to war but because it lacks elements that a novel is expected to have in a time of stern realities. The rejection of her story by a monthly magazine hints that the chance of her being a best-seller author is very slim.

Betsey shares few views with Macaulay, who was actively involved in politics of the 1930s. As often expressed in her weekly column of *The Spectator*, Macaulay was strongly against Fascism. Nevertheless, unlike many young writers of the time, she could not simply support the anti-Fascist forces. In her essay "Aping the Barbarians," she clearly states that "fighting Fascism by armed means implies becoming Fascist in order to fight Fascism" (14). Although she did not criticize the young British men who volunteered to fight for their ideological beliefs, she could not accept the justification of armed means to which the young men resorted. To a person who supported the use of force at the time, a war against Franco meant a war against barbarism which contrasted with civilization.²³ However, as demonstrated in her creation of Guy, the use of force brought reverse consequences. After participating in the war against Fascism, Guy becomes accustomed to barbarism, and he will continue to resort to violence in the name of saving humanity and civilization. Guy represents a group of people who believe that only armed means can solve conflicts. Guy's role as a fighter, however, does not indicate that Macaulay believes in men's militant nature. It is his gender role that keeps him militant even after his mission in the civil war is over.

In *And No Man's Wit*, Macaulay displays not only the ineffectiveness of force but also her own "gender-inflected" experience of the civil war. Similar to World War I literature, the literature of the Spanish Civil War mostly consists of works by young

writers who either directly or indirectly participated in the war and who generally supported the anti-Fascist forces. In Homage to Catalonia (1952), George Orwell, who joined the militia in 1937, compares his war experience with World War I combatants' trench warfare: "I was old enough to remember the Great War, though not old enough to have fought in it. War, to me, meant roaring projectiles and skipping shards of steel; above all it meant mud, lice, hunger, and cold" (18). Despite the differences between the combatants of World War I and the young men of the International Brigade of the Spanish Civil War, Orwell sets up a parallel between the two. By comparison, Macaulay's And No Man's Wit does not portray the trench warfare. Thematically, it has as negative a view of war as is expressed in Homage to Catalonia. Orwell believes that anyone who has seen the civil war would not think of it in a naive, idealistic manner: "I suppose there is no one who spent more than a few weeks in Spain without being in some degree disillusioned The fact is that every war suffers a kind of progressive degradation with every month that it continues, because such things as individual liberty and a truthful press are simply not compatible with military efficiency" (180). A great difference between Orwell's book and Macaulay's novel lies in the fact that in the latter Dr. Marlowe, a non-combatant, witnesses the continuing struggle in post-war Spain and becomes disillusioned concerning young men's participation in the civil war. Orwell suggests that only one who was in Spain is capable of understanding the war. Nevertheless, Macaulay's characterization of Dr. Marlowe reveals that a person who did not have first hand experience still can grasp the realities of the war. In And No Man's Wit, Macaulay intends to make the reader understand the Spanish Civil War, which is more than a conflict between opposing ideologies.

Despite the underlying pacifist theme, And No Man's Wit is not a propagandist novel. Because a good number of characters represent diverse and conflicting views of the Spanish Civil war, it is difficult to establish any one character's view as correct. Throughout the novel, Dr. Marlowe raises her voices concerning education, active participation against Fascism, and gender fixation; her views are similar to those of Daphne in Non-Combatants and Others. Nevertheless, Dr. Marlowe herself reveals her lack of understanding about the deep-seated conflicts in Spain. In addition, unlike Daphne, who helps her daughter face reality, Dr. Marlowe influences no one, as if reflecting the prevalent war mood, and her daughter, Betsey, remains indifferent to political conflicts. Since another war is about to break out, the world Dr. Marlowe faces is different from the world in which Daphne pursues peace. On October 20, 1939, Macaulay described the period of time as the time of "human deterioration" and said, "all we can do is to try to save some few frail strands from the rot, that they may in the end be woven into a cord which shall lift us to some sanity above the howling bear-pit."²⁴ And No Man's Wit is a product of a writer who attempted to "save some few frail strands" in a time when human deterioration deepened.

Notes

¹ In the year of 1935 Macaulay started writing the weekly column "Marginal Comments" of Spectator, and in the following year she did so rather irregularly after her comment on a trial led to a libel action against her and The Spectator. According to Constance Smith, the total of Macaulay's "Marginal Comments" is sixty-two. See Smith, Rose Macaulay 135. Some of them were contributed as late as the summer of 1937.

² Macaulay, "Introduction," All in a Maze 8.

³ Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 20 Nov. 1936: 892.

⁴ Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 23 July 1937: 141.

⁵ The invitation to a symposium which Macaulay discusses in her "Marginal Comments" column of July 23, 1937 contains the same kinds of anti-Fascist questions that the young writers asked many writers. Nevertheless, Macaulay does not specifically mention the young writers' questionnaire which was sent to her. She was one of writers who responded to the questionnaire.

⁶ "The Question," Authors Take sides on the Spanish Civil War (London: Left Review, 1937).

⁷ See Valentine Cunningham, British Writers of the Thirties (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988) 438-39.

⁸ As cited in Cunningham 437.

⁹ In Authors Take Sides on the Spanish Civil War, Macaulay's response was simply "AGAINST FRANCO" and was categorized as "For the Government." Unlike Vera Brittain, who was against Fascism yet denounced the use of force, Macaulay did not express her opposition to anti-Fascists' militarism. Nevertheless, her weekly columns of the time demonstrate that Macaulay's views were very similar to those of Brittain. Had she responded in more than the two words, "AGAINST FRANCO," Macaulay would have been put in the category of "Neutral?"

¹⁰ Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 23 July 1937: 141.

¹¹ Charles Loch Mowat, Britain Between the Wars, 1918-1940 (Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1955) 530.

¹² Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 19 July, 1935: 93.

¹³ As quoted in Hugh D. Ford, A Poets' War: British Poets and the Spanish Civil War (Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1965) 29.

¹⁴ John M. Muste, Say That We Saw Spain Die: Literary Consequences of the Spanish Civil War (Seattle: U of Washington P, 1966) 10.

¹⁵ Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 19 July, 1935: 93.

¹⁶ Ford 93.

¹⁷ Ford 94.

¹⁸ Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 6 Nov. 1936: 806.

¹⁹ Macaulay, "Aping the Barbarian" 15.

²⁰ Macaulay, "War and the B.B.C.," The Spectator 20 Oct. 1939: 538.

²¹ Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 20 Nov. 1936: 892.

²² Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 20 Nov. 1936: 892.

²³ Leonard Woolf's response as recorded in Authors Take Sides on the Spanish Civil War typifies many anti-Fascists' views on the Spanish Civil War. According to Woolf, the civil war signifies the confrontation between civilization and barbarism: "I AM FOR the legal Government and people of Republican Spain and civilization; I am against Franco, Fascism, and barbarism."

²⁴ Macaulay, "War and the B.B.C.," The Spectator 20 Oct. 1939: 538.

CHAPTER V

THE WORLD MY WILDERNESS: ‘I THINK
WE ARE IN RAT’S ALLEY’

Focusing on the problem of barbarism and its relation to civilization, this chapter will show that The World My Wilderness (1950) embodies the pacifism which had been consistent in Macaulay’s opposition to mass violence since the First World War. According to the writer herself, The World My Wilderness is “about the ruins of the city, and the general wreckage of the world that they seem to stand for. And about a rather lost and strayed and derelict girl who made them her spiritual home.”¹ The novel portrays a world of a seventeen-year-old girl, Barbary, who cannot conform to post-war life in a London which is again on the track toward civilization. During the war years, Barbary was a juvenile maquis in a small French Mediterranean coastal town. As her name hints, Barbary represents the type of barbarian who Macaulay believes is created by war. In her essay “Aping the Barbarians,” Macaulay contends that war “impels civilized and humane persons to ape the distasteful ferocity of the barbarians that we shall all, if we go on like this, extremely soon become” (17). Barbary is by no means ferocious, yet she is regarded as a barbarian, a product of war, because she continues her life as a maquis in a post-war society. She reflects her author’s definition of barbarism: “human deterioration seems part of the wastage of that vile barbarism which is war.”²

A passage from T. S. Eliot’s The Waste Land (1922) which serves as an epigraph of the novel alludes to the barbarous world engendered by war. Moreover, another

citation of lines from The Waste Land at the end of the novel implies that overpowering barbarism permeates a civilized society: “I think . . . we are in rats’ alley, where the dead men lost their bones” (244). Of course, The Waste Land does not directly deal with war, and it certainly has nothing to do with the Second World War. Nevertheless, Eliot’s early 1920s poem became a literary work which some combatants of World War II believed portrayed their battlefield. According to Paul Fussell, soon after the Second World War, The Waste Land “appears much more profoundly a ‘memory of the war’ than one had thought. Consider its archduke, its rats and canals and dead men, its focus on fear . . . and not least its settings of blasted landscape and ruins, suggestive of . . . ‘the confluent acne of the waste land under the walls of Ypres.’ It was common to identify ‘the waste land’ that modern life seemed to resemble with the battlefields of the war rather than with the landscape of Eliot’s poem” (325-26).

Because the predominant theme of The World My Wilderness echoes that of The Waste Land, Macaulay’s World War II novel may embody the literary tradition of the war. However, her novel does not participate in the dominant tradition in that it focuses on a non-combatant’s war experience. Neither does it concern the battlefield. Similar to her World War I novel, Non-Combatants and Others, Macaulay’s The World My Wilderness mainly deals with a domain far from the combat zone. The domain has been exposed to war, yet it is different from the front which becomes the central experience of androcentric literature. The novel describes “the waste land” which symbolizes the potency of barbarism and the civilization degraded by war.

The relation between barbarism and civilization is complicated. Although barbarism appears to be opposite to civilization, the former lurks in the latter. In An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist, Macaulay notes that barbarism and civilization have been closely

ted in many civilized people's viewpoints: "It has always been held so; our civilization, our barbarism, is built on that age-old, bloody, trampled ground; we have measured knives against knives, cannon against cannon, bombs against bombs, poison against poison, torture against torture, and may the biggest battalions win. And, so far, this competition has given us the world as we see it today" (4-5). War has been justified throughout history as if it should be always part of the progress of civilization. Despite its ostensible difference from barbarism, civilization itself cannot be relieved of the responsibility for creating the hopeless situation in which human beings act like barbarians.

Macaulay's view that civilization is partly accountable for the recurrence of war does not indicate a dismissal of the value of civilization. Macaulay recognizes that civilization distinguishes civilized human beings from barbarians. Her main point is that a human society in which barbarism has lodged itself should not be called civilization. A truly civilized society must acknowledge that war imperils it and must try to sever itself from war. As clearly expressed in her "Aping the Barbarians," Macaulay equates civilization with the absolute abolition of barbaric activities, such as war. Nevertheless, she also uses the term "civilization" satirically because of people's diverse views on the subject. In The World My Wilderness, this ironically named civilization is synonymous with hollow mannerisms or with clear divisions of class and sex. Moreover, it accepts war as justifiable. This civilization is not the true civilization that Macaulay implicitly defines in her essays while advocating peace efforts. The concept of civilization manifested in The World My Wilderness has been noted by a few critics yet often misunderstood.

A review of The World My Wilderness in the Times Literary Supplement in 1950 argues that the novel stresses the significance of civilization, which had been a main theme of Macaulay's novels since the First World War: "Miss Macaulay's voice was among those that broke the silence after the 1914-1918 war, and in the years that followed her books did much to reassert a firm sense of the values of civilization. Now that these values have once again been threatened, and seem more than ever in danger of disappearing, she raises her voice again to become the interpreter of the younger generation."³ Similarly, Jane Emery implies that the novel embodies Macaulay's idea of "the struggle between civilization and barbarism" (276). Emery interprets the struggle as "the eternal struggle of individual human beings with their own inner barbarism—battles constantly fought by men and women in times and societies which were sometimes more and sometimes less supportive of good against evil" (287). Emery's assessment is appropriate in that The World My Wilderness demonstrates the paradox of human civility and human barbarity, which Macaulay focuses on in the introduction to All in a Maze. However, Emery misses Macaulay's points that human beings' inner barbarism has been triggered by war and that civilization has regressed because of war. Macaulay's fundamental argument is that civilized societies should not permit barbaric acts such as mass violence, although efforts to establish such societies are likely to fail, just as efforts to eliminate war and poverty have been.

Civilization manifested in The World My Wilderness is not the true civilization that is absolutely opposite to barbarism; it only appears to be. This civilization is represented by Barbary's brother Richmond Deniston, a twenty-three-year-old veteran. The war is over, and he is "one of those returned warriors whose hangover was not toughness, but an ardent and delighted reaction towards the exquisite niceties of

civilization” (17). Richmond’s participation in barbaric acts during the war years does not hinder him from going back to the world of civilization, which focuses on “the exquisite niceties.” Unlike his sister, Barbary, Richmond seems to have no sign of war scars. The difference between Barbary and Richmond suggests that not all participants in a war will become barbarians. There may be some other factors, such as age, education, or gender roles during war, that possibly explain why Barbary remains a barbarian in post-war time. Nevertheless, there is little doubt that the world of Barbary is created by war, which Macaulay calls “vile barbarism.” In contrast to the world of Barbary, that of Richmond appears to proceed regardless of war. However, in her characterization of Richmond, Macaulay shows that the civilized world has been affected by war and that war only leads to the regression of civilization. The world of Richmond reflects Macaulay’s view of a post-war civilization as “a reign of contradictions, in which the barbarism of war was followed by a league of peace, in which great estates went under and great fortunes were amassed, in which the whole kaleidoscope of the social system was shaken and upset.”⁴

This chapter concentrates on the worlds of Barbary and Richmond, which represent barbarism and civilization respectively. Exploring aspects of barbarism and civilization, I intend to demonstrate that The World My Wilderness embodies Macaulay’s ambition to “keep the idea alive.” Because some critics have argued that Macaulay gave up being a pacifist in the early stage of the Second World War, I shall first study Macaulay’s reactions to the war. Moreover, I also shall examine her ideas concerning war around the time she published The World My Wilderness.

A Pacifist in the Time of World War II

The Second World War started as Britain and France declared war against Germany on September 3, 1939, two days after Germany's attack on Poland. Macaulay's initial reaction to the outbreak of the war was very different from her character Dr. Marlowe's determination to deal with the war near the end of And No Man's Wit. Macaulay seemed to be the "wholly pacifist" whom Dr. Marlowe criticized for being unrealistic. Macaulay sought a way to evade the military conflict even after Britain's official declaration of war. In a letter to her sister Jean, dated September 14, 1939, she expresses her repudiation of "the legitimacy of general war" and suggests that Britain should give in without fighting: "If Nazism *really* can't be defeated except by war, I say, let it win (for a time) in spite of all its horrors and cruelties."⁵ The government's decision to go to war, however legitimate it might be, clearly drove Macaulay to despair. A week later, listening to Arthur Greenwood, M.P., assert that Britain engaged in war in order to fight "against the 'arbitrament of force,'" Macaulay pointed out the self-contradiction in his argument: "Seems an odd way of doing it, using the methods we are fighting against."⁶ Her statement implies that Britain would descend to the level of the Nazis by fighting with them in the same manner. Another letter reveals that Macaulay's main concern was about the regression of civilization by responding to violence with counter-violence. On September 28, 1939, Macaulay wrote: "if we really have this one [war], the whole world will be thrown back for years. How *can* our rulers take it on themselves, all this killing?"⁷ Although Macaulay continued deploring war, she no longer insisted that Britain should try to avoid the military confrontation with the Nazis at all costs. She indeed became full of dread regarding Hitler, and in October 1939 she advocated the establishment of a League as a solution to "shutting him up."⁸

In the following year, Macaulay seemed determined to stop the Nazis' invasion, and this change in her led some to believe that Macaulay had given up her pacifist position. On June 29, 1940, Macaulay wrote to her sister: "we really *should* do something more about rubbing it in day and night what an awful England it would be under the Nazis. I hear that it is very common to hear people say it would be as good as it is now, so why not let them come quietly instead of bombing us first? If that spirit grows, we are done."⁹ Macaulay seems to have forgotten her own state of mind at the early stage of the war. Noting her change in attitude, Martin Ceadel argues that Macaulay "remained a pacifist until the summer of 1940, when the Nazi breakthrough convinced many humanitarian pacifists that they had been calculating the balance sheet of suffering on the false assumption that what should be weighed on the scales against the cost of war was the sacrifices that would have to be made in a 'reasonable' negotiated settlement rather than the price of submission to an unreasonable tyranny" (215). As Ceadel implies, Macaulay in the middle of 1940 was afraid that the Nazis might take over Britain. As frequently mentioned in Macaulay's letters from June 6, 1940, England was subjected to air raids. Macaulay herself had "burialphobia," and witnessed people injured by the German bombing. She also recognized that many of her friends were on the Nazi black-list.¹⁰ In the summer of the year, Macaulay clearly discarded her earlier idea of "let it (Nazism) win."

Nevertheless, Macaulay's dismissal of unconditional surrender to the Nazis does not indicate her complete abandonment of the pacifist position. As expressed through her characterizations of Daphne and Dr. Marlowe, Macaulay did not believe that a mere disapproval of war was enough. Her depictions of two different pacifists at the time illustrate her view of what is meant to be a pacifist in wartime. In two letters which were

both written in September 1940, Macaulay mentions two pacifists separately with no comparison between the two. The first is close to the “wholly pacifist” position that Dr. Marlowe of And No Man’s Wit criticizes for being impractical. This position only stresses the renunciation of war and has no suggestions concerning the ongoing war. Macaulay’s critical view of such a naive approach to war is revealed in a letter: “I am seeing Middleton Murray tomorrow, a pacifist who says stop the war; I shall get out of him his alternative to war or surrender, if he has one. But he is too snakey to be pinned down, I think.”¹¹ Right before this passage, Macaulay writes about the bombing victims who either have lost their homes or lain dead “in the streets there among the ruins like on a battlefield.” Although perhaps not intentionally, she exposes Murray’s position as ignorant of reality.

It is the second type that fits Macaulay’s definition of a proper pacifist, who has taken part in helping others affected by war and does not dwell on his personal distaste for war. Macaulay describes the type: “I know a pacifist who makes it his war work to go round the tubes spraying the shelters with disinfectant in the night—very brave.”¹² Macaulay’s complimentary description reveals her belief that a pacifist should make himself or herself useful in wartime. Doing war work as an ambulance driver at the age of 59, Macaulay might believe herself to be “very brave.” She describes herself at the time: “I went out with an ambulance from 10 till 4 a.m. . . . Bombing was v. bad all round that night; I attended an incident in Camden Town—two fallen houses, a great pile of ruins, with all the inhabitants buried deep . . . I drove to hospital another mother, who left two small children under the ruins. I told her they would be out very soon—but they never were, they were killed. The demolition men are splendid—we passed milk down to the

baby, and water for the others.”¹³ Although Macaulay called herself an amateur compared to the demolition men, she took pride in her humanitarian war work.

During the German air bombardment of England in the summer of 1940, Macaulay recognized the impracticality of a pacifist’s crying out for the abolition of war. Her state of mind at the time can be inferred from her letter to Reverend John Hamilton Cowper Johnson in 1951.

When do we get to the point of rejecting War? I have long felt that one great international gesture would be worth while; saying, just once, to potential aggressors, “Go ahead if you must and do your worst; *we* do not intend to behave like barbarians, whatever barbarians may do to us.” This might mean occupation and domination by some barbarian power . . . very unpleasant, pernicious and horrible; but could not be more so than waging war ourselves, with all its cruel atrocities. And it just *might* help to start a new era. But I fear there is no hope of any such civility in a barbaric world, at present, and we shall go murdering each other by radio-active bombs, and destroying all that’s left of beauty.¹⁴

Macaulay was aware that non-violent resistance was such an ideal that it would never be practiced to the extent that it would stop war. Nevertheless, she did not accept the justification of wars, even one waged against a barbaric aggressor. She only hoped that war and the means of war would be eradicated in a civilized society. For Macaulay, a war started in 1939 did not end even in 1951. Because a genocidal weapon—the atomic bomb—was ready to be used at any time, such conditions entailed “a barbaric world.” It is not surprising that Macaulay’s remaining letters do not mention the ending of the Second World War. The atomic bomb, which was generally believed to bring the war to

an end, probably contributed to fortifying Macaulay's idea of a paradox in the process of civilization, because it signified that war was latent.

In her essay "The First Impact of The Waste Land" (1958), Macaulay notes the continuation of the paradox throughout history. She highlights the complexity of humanity in the poem: "Here was the landscape one knew, had always known, sometimes without knowing it; here were the ruins in the soul The human soul is irrational and complex; the universe is desperately and crazily both. No more so than it always was; our generation has no monopoly, no increase, as has sometimes been proudly claimed, of complexity, or of waste lands. T. S. Eliot's poetry is not characteristic of our age, except insofar as it has shaped the age's poetic expression" (29-31). Macaulay does not make a connection between Eliot's poem and her novel in this essay, but the similarities between the two works—the ruined landscape, lost souls, a drowned man, sermons, and half-hearted relations—cannot be missed. Focusing on barbarism and civilization, The World My Wilderness renders humanities "irrational and complex," which is by no means confined to the post-World War II era.

Barbarism

At the beginning of the novel, the link between Barbary's aberrant behavior and the last war is disclosed in a conversation between Barbary's mother, Helen, and the mother of Helen's dead husband. Helen describes what Barbary and other youngsters do in a group in the post-war time: "Annoy the gendarmerie and the local authorities. Steal motorcars; molest their fellow citizens. The same activities, in fact, that they pursued from patriotism during the war, they still pursue now from inclination and force of habit" (8). Helen's use of the word "patriotism" is ironic in that there is nothing noble or

glorious about the youngsters' wartime activities. The "patriotic" children have caused regular citizens great distress. In addition, since Barbary is not French, her activities could not be founded on patriotism. Helen took Barbary to a villa at St. Tropez in 1939 and has remained in the land occupied by Nazi Germany after her marriage to Maurice Michel, who was falsely believed to be collaborating with the Nazis and was found drowned in the bay shortly after the Armistice. Nevertheless, as if she were French, during the war Barbary, along with her stepbrother Raoul, was involved with French fighters against the Nazis. She continues acting as a maquis in peacetime. Her untidy appearance, which Madame Michel describes using the adjective "égaré," symbolizes her uncivilized mind.

Barbary's group are a product of the conflict between the French and the Nazi Germans, yet the war alone did not engender the outrageous youngsters. Barbary represents a child who has been neglected by adults during the war years. She is like the dirty little boy, Percival Briggs, at the beginning of Macaulay's World War I novel, Non-Combatants and Others. The boy was given up by Alix's cousin, who quit Sunday-school teaching in order to devote herself to war duty in hospital. In some respects, Barbary's situation is worse than Percival's. Not only did her own mother neglect her, but she was also fully exposed to the disastrous aspects of war. Barbary's experience of the war involved stealing, hiding bombs, running away from Gestapo, and witnessing murder. Her brief recollection also betrays that she was beaten and raped by a German soldier, who was eventually killed by a maquis. Even though the war is over, Barbary remains uneducated, underdeveloped in mind and body. She is described as "a watchful little animal or savage" (10). According to her mother, Barbary is also an anarchist, a word she claims her ignorant daughter does not understand (21). Helen has recognized Barbary's problems, yet she has paid no special attention to Barbary. She even senses that Barbary

was to a certain extent implicated in the death of Maurice, but avoids probing into the matter.

As her ex-husband, Gulliver Deniston, recalls, Helen was not indifferent to Barbary before the war. Gulliver states that Helen “has always loved Barbary more than anyone else. When the child nearly died of meningitis, she slept in her room” (195). Gulliver’s view is supported by Helen herself near the end of the novel when she tries to explain why her affection for Barbary is stronger than her affection for her other children: “I loved Barbary for herself; from the first time she looked up at me with those queer, slaty eyes of hers and smiled at me. And partly, I suppose, because she was entirely mine and no one else’s” (238). The absence of Barbary’s real father, a Spanish artist Vicente Rodriguez, may be one reason for Helen’s deep love for Barbary. Helen admits that she always felt she had to protect Barbary against the world. However, she did not care to know what Barbary went through during the war years. Throughout the novel, Helen appears to have no maternal instinct in her relation to Barbary, indeed to all of her children. Macaulay’s portrayal of Helen implies that even women’s sex role as mother has been affected by war.

Helen is a great contrast to her underdeveloped, uneducated daughter and is capable to be a good mother. However, she is “too lazy and selfish and contented to bother” (238). The best description of Helen is that she is a woman with “a woman’s beauty and the mind, grasp and wit of a man” (33). Helen is compared with the Venus de Milo and the Greek-Iberian lady of Elche, although her disgruntled mother-in-law at one point sees her as “lithic and massive like a stretching animal” (15). She was educated at Cambridge. She likes classical literature and sometimes translates it. She is also a painter who studied in Paris. Whatever Helen does, her key motive is pleasure. She even forges

twelve-century Provençal poetry so that she can be entertained by the corrupt state French Provençal scholars' failure to catch her fraud. Helen has "no conscience of any kind" (86). It becomes clear that Helen's involvement with Maurice, a French man, led to the divorce between her and Gulliver Deniston, a British lawyer. In addition, Barbary was an offspring of her brief affair with a Spanish artist. Less than a year after Maurice's death, Helen is now having a love affair with Maurice's cousin, Lucien, who is married.

Because of her beauty and her unconventional way of life, Helen is considered "a stunning Ancient, as free of guilt as a Greek goddess" (Emery 289). Moreover, some favorable reviewers of the novel saw her as "a maternal and erotic Venus and as the modern descendant of a rakish, anti-authoritarian aristocrat—a woman with a man's freedom" (Emery 289). There is no question that Helen is a woman of free will. As the narrator describes, she is "one of the rare women who are almost as highly sexed as a man" (33). The generalization of woman based on the conventional division between the sexes does not suit Helen. Even the idea that she is maternal is disputable. Helen seems to be maternal only when she finally acknowledges her negligence and decides to give priority to taking care of Barbary, who has almost died from a fall. As a mother, Helen is very different from the mothers in Macaulay's earlier novels. She was unconcerned about her own daughter during the war, needless to say about her stepson, Raoul. Helen's image as indifferent mother coincides with the deterioration of humanity caused by war.

In beauty and intelligence Helen is on the same level as Daphne of Non-Combatants and Others. However, she is not a mother like Daphne, who encourages her daughter to confront the realities of war and to turn from self-centered concerns to helping others in need. Neither is Helen similar to Dr. Marlowe of And No Man's Wit, who urges her daughter to have an interest in politics and human affairs. Like two earlier

mothers, Helen is fully aware of the problems with humanity which have been disclosed by war. Nevertheless, she does not have any sense of duty to try to solve them. Her apathetic attitude toward humanity corresponds to her treatment with her children. She says to her civilized son, Richmond:

“We shall all go down and down into catastrophe and the abyss. We must snatch what good we can on the way. So I idle here in the sun and enjoy my chosen life and amusements while I can, and send away one child for her good, and keep another with me for my pleasure, and enjoy the third when he comes my way, and refuse to waste my time on people or occupations that bore me, and get along, on the whole, pretty well.” (89)

As Helen states, she may send Barbary to London “for her good.” She may hope that the new environment will change Barbary since England is considered to be less affected by the war than France. However, the main reason for her sending Barbary away is that she does not want her life to be interfered with by Barbary, who is desperate for her affection. She tries to avoid potential friction between Barbary and her lover, Lucien. She is not greatly concerned whether Barbary will adjust herself to life in London with Gulliver, who believes Barbary to be his own daughter, and his new wife, Pamela.

Helen consistently thinks that Barbary is unlikely to change. She seems to be convinced that Barbary’s aberrant behavior is linked to her genetic inheritance rather than to her environment. She recollects Barbary at the age of Roland, her infant son by Maurice. Compared with the cheerful and sound sleeper Roland, Barbary was “all nerves, waking in terror, screaming at shadows . . . a wild baby, a nervy, excited child” (16). As an infant in Helen’s memory, however, Barbary does not accord with the child that Helen’s ex-brother-in-law, Sir Angus Maxwell, a psychologist, recalls. According to Sir

Angus Maxwell, she “wasn’t sulky as a child . . . a high-spirited little girl, delighted with riding the pony, and with her first pocketknife” (108). The difference between the two fragmentary memories of her in the pre-war time indicates that Barbary may not be from birth a child of distracted mind. Nevertheless, Helen seemingly holds the strong belief that the difference between Barbary and Roland is “natural.” Additionally, based on her judgment concerning Barbary’s mental capacity, Helen believes Barbary will not learn anything except painting, for which she has shown a talent. When Richmond asks his mother whether Barbary will “learn to be a young lady,” she gives a simple answer: “Oh, dear no; quite impossible” (23). When Richmond is certain that Gulliver and Pamela will try to civilize Barbary, Helen’s implication is that their effort will not be rewarded: “they must all manage somehow as best they can” (24).

By expressing her opinions concerning Barbary, Helen indeed reveals her own self-centered attitude toward her daughter. As manifested in her further description of Barbary, the word “natural” does not necessarily indicate one’s innate qualities or aptitudes. Helen knows that Barbary was not born to be a barbarian, for she acknowledges the severe effect of the war on Barbary. She asserts that Barbary’s war activity as a *maquis* “seems to have become an instinct” (22). This expression implies that Barbary has been so influenced by her war experience that she seems to be born that way. Helen is not the only one who regards the effect of the war on Barbary’s behavior as innate, not environmental. Gulliver also states that Barbary’s war experience made her “a natural outlaw and criminal” (232). The impact of the war on Barbary is beyond dispute. However, Helen believes that Barbary’s behavior is more attributable to her innate aptitudes than her war experiences because not everybody, certainly not Richmond, acts the same way as Barbary does. This view justifies her neglect of duty as a mother.

Helen's assumption is that she does not have to even try to help her daughter because Barbary is unlikely to learn and change. Helen certainly does not share her author's idea that one must make an attempt to accomplish a task, even if impossible, for the good of others. Any effort to help Barbary face the realities of post-war life cannot be completely futile, but Helen does not make such an attempt until she regrets her negligence near the end of the novel.

Helen's gloomy view of Barbary's future ironically has something in common with the psychologist Sir Angus Maxwell's theory concerning women's mental condition, which reflects his belief in sex differences. According to Sir Angus Maxwell, everybody is apt to have mental illness. The only difference lies in whether the illness is "easily curable," "negligible," or "destructive, if neglected, of reason" (91). Sir Angus Maxwell considers environment an important factor that affects the human mind, yet he believes women to be genetically incapable of coping with problems. The narrator explains Sir Angus Maxwell's theory concerning women in general: "Women and girls . . . he regarded as seldom completely curable; their normal condition was that of nervous instability, and all he could do for them was to steady them to a point where, among other women and girls, they would pass muster. Secretly, though admitting degrees, he believed them practically all a little mad; you never knew when their nerves would suddenly break, and precipitate them into some kind of abyss" (91). Based on his theory of sex differences, Sir Angus Maxwell also anticipates that "his two girls could only with difficulty sustain without nervous deterioration the excitements, disappointments, triumphs and fatigues of their lives; the boys, on the other hand, went through these with the tough tranquility that distinguishes a large part of English male youth" (92). Sir Angus Maxwell does not disregard the significance of environmental contributions to

Barbary's behavior, such as living in France during the war and having an indifferent mother. He even emphasizes the consideration of the atmosphere Barbary was in during the war when Pamela criticizes Barbary for being sulky: "I think she's nervy, and not very happy, and has a good deal on her mind which she would like to forget and can't. I would like to help her, if I can. But one's got to understand her state of mind first, not just dismiss it as sulks" (109). Nevertheless, for Sir Angus Maxwell, Barbary is one case that supports his theory of girls' mental weakness.

A question is raised whether Barbary's lack of adaptability to a civilized society is attributed to her sex. The narrator notes the possible explanation of the differences between Barbary and Richmond: "Parents, unfortunately, sometimes had charm, and held sons and daughters (or was it only daughters, those unbalanced, prodigal beings?) in a net, like leaping fishes gasping in an alien air" (146). The narrator's answer here remains ambiguous. The concept of the sex distinction between men and women in coping with hardship is indirectly challenged by reversing the sex roles of the Oedipus complex. It is Barbary, not Richmond, who has the Oedipus complex. Richmond is "no more jealous of the man his mother loved than of the woman to whom his father was married" (146). By comparison, Barbary's affection for her mother and her jealousy of Maurice were believed to drive her to let other maquis drown Maurice. The difference between Richmond and Barbary in dealing with Lucien leads the Abbé Dinant, the late Maurice's friend and neighbor, to make a generalization about young girls: "As to the son, he [Lucien] was bland and civil and gay, and obviously was causing no trouble Daughters, jeunes filles, are a different affair altogether, even daughters as farouche, as wild, as peu demoisells, as the little Barbary" (137). The Abbé Dinant's view of Helen's two children supports the idea that Barbary, not Richmond, suffers from jealousy of her

mother's lover. It clearly contradicts the general understanding of the Oedipus complex. The reversal of sex roles suggests that any generalized view based on sex differences does not provide complete answers to an individual's state of mind or behavior. During the war the Abbé Dinant acted on the principle that "one must behave like a civilized being, even to victorious invaders" (25). He values human civility, yet his bias against young girls implies that one should not expect civility from young girls. Macaulay once expressed that "the Freudian interpretation of the subconscious mind . . . tried to reduce all its manifold and intricate complexities to two roots, sex and parent-trouble; 'the beginnings of religion, ethics, society and art meet in the Oedipus complex.'"¹⁵ For Macaulay, the human mind is far more complex than any generalized theory can explain. With regard to Maurice's death, the narrator inquires about the motives of Barbary's and Raoul's acts at the time: "Could they have saved him? Had he loved Raoul more, had Barbary felt no jealous resentment, Raoul no bitterness, would they have made the last desperate effort, have broken with their Resistance friends, if necessary betrayed them, and saved the collaborator?" (228). The questions are unanswerable. Nevertheless, the mistaken identification of Maurice as a collaborator, instead of father or stepfather, discloses that the war has been a greater environmental factor than anything else. Had there been no war, Barbary and Raoul would not have developed hostility toward collaborators and would not have confused the father figure Maurice with an enemy, a collaborator.

The link between the war and Barbary's uncivilized behavior becomes more overt as she is sent to stay with Gulliver in England, the land which people in France believe "was almost untouched by the war" (9). England is supposed to be a civilized land, compared to the barbaric France. The war is believed to be completely over in England,

while it still lingers in France. Gulliver describes France as a country “of the comfortable collaborators and the disreputable maquis . . . of the rich opportunists and of the lawless criminals” (231). Richmond notes that train traveling around the Hautes-Pyrénées is often ruined by local maquis who “still waged their war, resisting policemen, factories, rentiers, capitalists, collaborators, mayors and trains” (36). Lucien also points out the continuation of the war mood in France, which now obviously becomes a domestic conflict: “these everlasting quarrels and revenges, the Resistance hunting down collaborators, the collabos too busy vindicating themselves to get on with their business, everyone jealous and suspicious of everyone else” (135). Lucien also talks about the high crime rate in his home town, which he believes has its origin in the war. Listening to Lucien, Richmond expresses his opinion that Lucien’s home town sounds “extremely like London” (135). He implies that not all social evils are caused by the war. In response to Richmond, Lucien adds: “And yet in London . . . you have had no Resistance, no maquis, no foreign occupation, no defeat” (135-36). The war’s effect on London apparently is not as great as on the towns in France. As Richmond describes to Barbary, a year after the war London is as a city of “pictures, and music, and ballet and buildings and plays” (39). In the city that remains civilized, Barbary starts to attend an institute to learn painting, while Raoul goes to a commercial school under the supervision of his uncle and his aunt.

However, it turns out that, for Barbary, London is not much different from the small town in France where she lived during the war. She, along with Raoul, finds streets of vacant buildings, all of which were ruined by the bombing in the last war. The destroyed buildings are surrounded by uncultivated flowers, shrubs, and vines, which Barbary views as “nice” (48). For Barbary and Raoul, the ravaged part of the city is “fantastic,” while the streets flourishing with businesses are “very ugly and dull” (55; 46).

The ruined district becomes “their spiritual home” (53). However comfortable Barbary may feel, the ruined streets do not make “a strong city,” a spiritual place that provides one with the inward peace which Alix in Non-Combatants and Other looks for. The ruined city bears the marks of the war, and Barbary is drawn to it. It is the place where a person who is out of touch with civilization dwells:

The maze of little streets threading through the wilderness, the broken walls, the great pits with their dense forests of bracken and bramble Here, its cliffs and chasms and caves seemed to say, is your home; here you belong; you cannot get away, you do not wish to get away, for this is the maquis that lies about the margins of the wrecked world, and here your feet are set; here you find the irremediable barbarism that comes up from the depth of the earth, and that you have known elsewhere. (121-22)

As Barbary stays in the ruins longer and more frequently, the possibility of her becoming a civilized person evaporates. In addition, her British father’s neglect partly contributes to Barbary’s complete fall into the wrecked world.

This wilderness, Barbary comes across a girl and two young men, whom Barbary and Raoul take for maquis like themselves. They are Mavis, Horace, and Jock. All three are still haunted by the past, and the presence of them in the ruins reveals the scars of the last war on London. In particular, the two young men are products of war who are not welcome in post-war time. Mavis, who quit working after the city blazed one night, roams about the ruins reminiscing about the heyday of the streets before the bombing. Horace and Jock are runaways from authorities. They are deserters whom Mrs. Cox, a cook for the Denistons, defines as “young men who left the army before they should, and have been on the run ever since . . . that commit half the crimes” (154). Horace and Jock

represent young men who were not suitable to be combatants. They did not make good fighters in wartime, and they are criminals in peacetime. They often steal food or someone else's ration book because they can not get ration books issued by the ministry of food. For certain, they are not citizens who enjoy the "four footling freedoms . . . freedom to eat, freedom to speak, freedom to get about . . . Freedom from fear."¹⁶ Of the four freedoms, they suffer most from the last.

Without the war, Horace and Jock would not have been in this situation. As Horace meditates, his life would have been different if he had performed his war duty by joining the Civil Defense, instead of the Army. Horace, a well-educated young man, would have been honored for his heroic action and would have been a respected citizen. He has always been fond of reading Aristotle, but now can not stand Aristotle's Ethics. He even steals items from Barbary in order to get cash. Compared to Horace, Jock is not highly educated. Neither does he bully stolen goods out of Barbary. He is "a well-brought-up Catholic youth" (71). He is a young man without fighting spirit. In response to Barbary's question about whether he has killed people, he responds: "Only Jerries in France . . . not many of them ones either. I don't like killing, an' that's a fact" (71). Jock's tone reveals that killing German soldiers in a combat situation is not really killing, something that is understood by Barbary with no further explanation. The cause of Jock's desertion was not his distaste for killing the enemy but his fear of being captured and tortured by the Japanese when his battalion was ordered to fight the new enemy. Jock's bias against the Japanese is expressed by Raoul: "They are very dirty types, those yellow men. Civilized armies should not fight them; the risks are too great" (161). Raoul's use of the word "dirty" for the enemy is identical with that of Ernie for Fascists in And No Man's Wit. Such a view on the Japanese has been formed because of war propaganda.

Mavis remembers that there was a house of Japanese merchants in the ruined street, which indicates that the Japanese were considered to be civilized enough to trade with the English before the war (66). Jock, who feared to be a prisoner of the “barbarous” Japanese, now runs from the “civilized” British authorities.

Another person Barbary sees in the ruins is Father Roger. The war has had “a queer effect on a great many people, young and old” (114). Father Roger represents an old, religious person who has been mentally wrecked. He stops Barbary and Raoul, who hold an unorthodox ritual, singing a hymn and at the same time using a black kitten for their sacrificial offering in front of a faded Judgment Day painting. Father Roger starts to say mass as if Barbary and Raoul were his congregation. His sermon is about hell: “We are in hell now Hell is where I am, Lucifer and all his legions are in me. Fire creeps on me from all sides; I am trapped in the prison of my sins O yes, my sins; they run before me to fetch fire from hell. Trapped, trapped, trapped; there’s no hope” (158-59). Father Roger’s depiction of hell is based on his experience of war. In 1940 he lost his church and was trapped in the wreckage for two days when bombing took place. Since then, he has lived in hell, looking for his church in the ruins.

Hell is a subject in which Barbary shows a great interest. Barbary herself tries to deliver a sermon on hell in order to help Raoul repent. Mimicking Père Richaud, to whom she listened in France, she starts the sermon standing on an empty niche in a broken church’s wall, but stops before long when she falls from the niche. Annoyed by her fall, Raoul cries out: “I would rather hear no more of hell. It is not our affair” (62). Unlike Raoul, Barbary talks about redemption, although she does not believe that she can be saved. She says that Catholics like Raoul can repent, while heretics like herself “can’t undo what they’ve done” (61). To another Catholic Jock, Barbary also expresses her idea

of hell and repentance: "Oh, yes; there is [hell]. So you have to repent before you die. Of course there's no hurry, but you must make time just before you die. It's awful if you're killed suddenly, because then you're damned" (166). Barbary's fear of hell betrays her guilt concerning her actions during the war years.

Barbary is very religious-minded, although she does not belong to any church. She longs for salvation; nevertheless, she believes there is no hope for it. Based on her limited knowledge of redemption, she talks about two kinds of sin. One kind can be forgiven, while the other kind cannot be: "If you are a Christian, you just think how you have sinned against God, and God will forgive you if you repent. But we others can't be forgiven, because we sin only against people, and the people stay hurt or killed, or whatever it is we have done to them. It would be better to be a Christian and get forgiveness, and only mind about God and hell. Perhaps I shall myself turn devout, in that church" (54-55). Barbary's statement ironically implies that some people might do worse things against other fellow human beings yet could be saved after their repentance. In contrast, some others would be condemned forever even if their acts might not be seriously damaging. A religious person's sinful behavior may lead to salvation, while a non-religious person's sinful behavior never does, even though both of them have acted the same way.

Barbary's statement concerning the two kinds of sin seems to derive from the same polarity that underlies the Abbé Dinant's answer to Richmond's question about churchgoing and stealing. According to the Abbé Dinant, people who steal handbags in church are better than people who steal outside of church: "For those who steal in church can seek forgiveness at once, but those who pass by the doors without entering do not even know their need of repentance. To sin in our Father's house, that, though sacrilege,

has its own blessedness. To stray in the wilderness outside, that is to be lost indeed” (136). Barbary is one of the non-churchgoers who are spiritually lost in the wilderness. When the Abbé Dinant makes the comment about those who steal outside of church, the Abbé Dinant has in mind the children of the Resistance and Helen’s children—Barbary and Raoul. He compliments Helen on her decision to send the children to London, so he may see the possibility of their redemption. However, Father Roger, a priest who is deranged in mind because of war, is the only person who has the potential to save Barbary and Raoul in the wrecked world. Of course, he can not help them to repent.

Barbary continues her outlaw behavior on a vacation with her father and stepmother. In the neighborhood of the Maxwell’s lodge, she steals eggs from a farmer’s hen. When she is caught by the farmer, she acts like a maquis under investigation: “Barbary said nothing: one did not give information of that kind when caught; not a word, whatever they did to one; that was the first principle of the maquis. Not that most people were able to obey it to the end But silence under questioning became a habit” (97-98). For Barbary, the farmer is not different from French farmers that she and Raoul were in conflict with during the war. She also lies to the farmer that she does not know Sir Angus Maxwell when he guesses her to be a visitor with the Maxwells. Moreover, it is not just the farmer that Barbary identifies with the enemy. Confronted with Sir Angus Maxwell, who asks her about stealing and her life in France, Barbary associates his questioning with the enemy’s “questioning, demanding answers, trying persuasion before threats, before pain” (101-02). Barbary certainly does not understand Sir Angus Maxwell’s professional curiosity. Because she does not want to talk to him about her war experience, Barbary is determined to go back to “where she belonged, to the waste margins of civilization that she knew, where other outcasts lurked, and questions were not

asked” (104). Before she leaves the lodge, she steals from Lady Maxwell’s drawer a purse containing fifteen pounds.

Because of stealing Lady Maxwell’s purse, Barbary has to face another investigation. Gulliver, who has come back to London in order to find out Barbary’s stealing, questions her in a “cold, sharp, precise lawyer’s voice” (124). At first Barbary denies stealing the money and then says that she only steals out of necessity. Since it was justified during the war, she does not understand why it can be bad now: “We all stole from the Germans and from the collabos, to get things for the Resistance. They steal here too, don’t they?” (126). Gulliver agrees that there are people who live on stealing in London, but notes that “it’s something rather new for people brought up like you to steal” (126). He realizes the absurdity in his expression “brought up like you.” It implies that Barbary’s stealing is inconsistent with her upper-class upbringing, yet it also confirms that stealing is consistent with Barbary’s wartime upbringing. Thus Gulliver stresses Barbary’s need to “learn sometime to fit into the society about you” (128). Since he realizes that Barbary likes painting, he further suggests that she may focus on “learning to paint . . . and learning to behave like a properly brought up young woman” (128). Gulliver’s suggests that painting is a civilized person’s work.

Painting is Barbary’s only activity that is acceptable in a civilized society. Nonetheless, it is very much tied to her world of wilderness. Since Barbary found the ruined city site, she has painted its image on postcards for the purpose of selling them. The narrator says: “She painted rapidly, impressionistically: out of the flowering jungle shells of towered churches sprang, shells of flats soared skyward on twisting stairs, staring empty-eyed at desolation” (152). Barbary’s postcards are sold to people who have come to see the ruins of the city. Some foreigners who are to a certain degree

disappointed that the city did not suffer heavier damage than they had expected also buy Barbary's postcards "to convince their friends . . . that they had really seen the scars of war" (162). The postcards betray Barbary's obsession with the ruined streets that are far from the civilized world. Although Barbary is not an artist, she is very much like some soldier poets of World War I who are mentioned in Non-Combatants and Others. Similar to the soldier-poets who can not digest the horrors of war and instead produce works that disclose their mental breakdown, Barbary expresses the image of the war that she has experienced in her painting of the desolated landscape.

Barbary's painting contrasts with her mother's, which has been done only for pleasure. Helen compares her painting with the young men's writing which has become the latest fad: "So many young men want to take up writing. Of course it must be charming to sit and write, and be supported by one's parents or someone else while one writes; I remember how charming I found it to sit and paint in Paris, on an allowance from my father in Ireland. But in the end one only adds to the mass of mediocre writing and mediocre painting that litters the world" (191). When Richmond disagrees that her paintings are mediocre, Helen also gives her opinion that her paintings would have been good if she had worked. She has spent time and energy seeking pleasures, such as wine, men, song, gambling, and traveling around the world. Stressing that she does not work, Helen hints that she is not so civilized as Richmond will be. Talking about her son's traveling as a diplomat, she says: "That's seeing the world in style, and the pleasures offer themselves by the way, and you're paid for it. I shall be proud of you, Richie. You'll be so unlike me. At least I shall have produced *one* civilized child" (192). Applying Helen's view of painting and civility to Barbary, painting would help Barbary to be a civilized person only when it becomes her work, not her tool for presenting the ruined landscape.

When Barbary says to Gulliver that she is going to spend time painting, she does not intend to devote herself to drawing pictures. Since she found the ruins, she has cut drawing lessons and has spent most of her time in the wrecked streets. Her painting takes place in the wilderness, which Gulliver does not know about. While Gulliver resumes his vacation at the Maxwell's lodge, Barbary is transformed into a young woman who learns how to paint and how to behave in a civilized society. The transformation, however, is not exactly what Gulliver has expected. Barbary is enticed by Mavis to steal merchandise from shops. She also takes Mavis' advice that she should change her ragamuffin look in order to be treated as "a respectable woman" (164). She tells Raoul about her plan: "I am going shop-stealing tomorrow afternoon With the large bag. First it is necessary, Mavis says, that I have my hair curled and my face painted and my best clothes, as shop stealers have to be respectable" (169). The word "respectable" is paradoxical because stealing is by no means proper conduct in a civilized society. Nevertheless, the idea that a woman can be viewed as "respectable" by keeping up appearances betrays the superficiality of the civilized world. As symbolized in Barbary's new look, the difference between barbarity and civility may not be as great as civilized people think. Mrs. Cox warns Barbary that if she wants to keep looking nice, she has "to keep out of those nasty ruins" (170). Her implication is that such civilized young girl's looks are not compatible with the ruins.

Since Barbary's purpose in dressing up like a civilized girl is to steal, she comes back to the ruined area after accomplishing her goal. Her stealing goods from stores in business streets eventually leads to her fall in the world of wilderness. After Barbary has lifted shops with Raoul for the second time, Horace again comes to take the stolen goods to cash in. Their unpleasant encounter, however, does not last long because of two

policemen. For Barbary, policemen are the Gestapo and hunters. Because one of the policemen is Mrs. Cox's nephew, Barbary feels betrayed and considers Mr. Cox an informant for the enemy. When interrogated by the police, Horace runs away, and Barbary successfully escapes inside a church bell. However, she does not stay there for long. In order to free Raoul, Barbary lets herself be seen by the police, runs across the waste land, and falls "into the stony ruins of a deep cellar" (187).

The intrusion of the police causes the dwellers of the wilderness to leave their world. Horace, Jock and Mavis all "deserted the ruins with the total flitting of startled animals" (227). As Raoul predicts, they will likely continue their "savage" life somewhere else. By comparison, the possibility of Raoul's becoming "civilized" is good. Raoul swears not to go back to the wrecked streets. Since he is currently under police surveillance, he employs the word "collaborate" to describe his future plan. He defines the word: "That is to say, I shall observe the laws, go daily to school, obey my uncles and aunt, attend mass on Sundays, keep out of the way of the police" (228). Although Raoul feels that he is forced to do all these things, he will be educated and will get adults' care. He will also be religious in the way a civilized society expects.

Compared to Raoul's promising future as a civilized being, the possibility of Barbary's conforming to a civilized world is not so good. However, there is hope that Barbary may change primarily because her mother, Helen, who has come to take care of Barbary, decides to take her out of London, which she finds out is very much like the French small town where Barbary had her war experiences. She also suggests taking Barbary to Paris and staying with her while her daughter learns to paint. Barbary will not return to the ruined world in London, and she will not associate with outlaws if she concentrates on painting in Paris. This new environment will help Barbary to create art.

Moreover, Barbary now seems to win the affection from her mother for which she has longed. Helen, who has not cared about Barbary, is now determined to give priority to Barbary over anyone, including her infant son, Roland: “Whatever other relationships I may have, she will come first. Before my little Roly . . . and before everyone” (238).

Furthermore, Helen plays the role of a spiritual guide for Barbary. Unlike Raoul, Barbary will not be sent to church since Helen is against orthodox churches. However, talking to her mother about Maurice’s death and listening to her, Barbary gets a sense of relief from guilt as if she has repented. Helen is understanding and forgiving:

“I know that your friends drowned Maurice; I’ve always known it. And that you and Raoul knew something about it. I don’t want to know exactly how much you knew, or whether you could have stopped it, or saved him by warning him. I know you didn’t want to give your friends away. But perhaps you hoped to save him somehow, and failed. Perhaps you left it till too late—I don’t know what happened Nothing could bring him back. So I left it alone. I shall still leave it alone. I would rather not know more. It mattered between us once; but I don’t mean it to matter any more You and your friends thought Maurice was a collaborateur, didn’t you. What a stupid word that is. He never betrayed anyone; all he did was to make the best of things and live in the world as it was, on terms with everyone round him, German and French. You all felt this was betrayal; perhaps it was; and God knows what else you thought he had done. So Maurice died. Poor Maurice But life goes on, and you are . . . important to me . . . and I’m not going to let you grow up without a mother. And now we won’t ever talk of it again. We’ll talk about Maurice,

but not about his death. Stop crying, Barbary So we shall all be happy, and there's nothing to cry about." (222-23)

Helen's words disclose that Maurice's death was the cause of the estrangement between herself and Barbary. Because Maurice's death was a tragic result of war, the estrangement was certainly attributable to war. Without the war, there would not have been the friction between collaborators and the Resistance; Barbary would not have been a maquis who misunderstood Maurice's peaceful attitude toward all people; Helen would not have been indifferent to Barbary, who she believed was involved with Maurice's death. There is no question that Helen herself has been haunted by the war as much as Barbary has been.

Barbary's final conversation with Raoul hints that Barbary will dispel the unpleasant memory of war. She is looking forward to going back to France and learning to paint in Paris. More important, she feels redeemed. As her mother has consoled her, so Barbary soothes Raoul, who cries thinking about Maurice: "one must not cry If one had been able to save him then . . . he might still have been assassinated later, one must remember. Poor Papa Maurice. I have cried too for him, and for Maman; but now it is over and forgiven, and one must not cry any more" (228). Barbary recognizes that Maurice was a victim of the war whose fate they could not prevent. She is now convinced that not only Helen but also Maurice has forgiven her and Raoul. In addition, she is willing to accept her mother's new man: "Maman must have always a man . . . and one must accept this Lucien" (228). Like Richmond, Barbary may treat Lucien in impersonal manners. Nevertheless, her acceptance of Lucien confirms that the alienation between her and Maurice was fundamentally caused by the war.

Civilization

Throughout the novel, Richmond is repeatedly described as a civilized person. Such a description creates irony, for Richmond is not the type of civilized person Macaulay believes one should be. Richmond only appears to be perfectly civilized. Jane Emery points out that in this novel “all the characters have been found humanly lacking in some way, but their flaws have been exacerbated and exposed by the post-war chaos” (286). Emery interprets Richmond’s “unashamed post-war dishonesties” as “genteel” and views him as “the character who seeks order and beauty throughout the novel” (289). It is indisputable that Richmond represents a civilized world that seems to be the opposite of the barbaric world that Barbary represents. Richmond’s cheating customs is surely different from Barbary’s shoplifting. However, the only great difference between Richmond and Barbary may lie in the flexibility which the first shows as a member of a civilized society and which the second certainly lacks. Richmond’s world has been degraded by war. Moreover, Richmond represents a civilized person who is willing to join the barbarian game once a war is declared, although he longs for order and beauty and dislikes barbarism. The world Richmond represents is analogous to the world of the Potterites as described in Macaulay’s post-World War I novel Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract. The nicety of Richmond’s manners is superficial and indeed is tarnished with vulgarity, selfishness, and snobbery—the traits of humanity which tend to be transformed into jingoism and heroism in wartime.

From the beginning, Richmond is presented as an embodiment of civilization regardless of his war experience as a combatant: “He was slim, elegant and twenty-three, now in his first year at Cambridge after three years of messy, noisy and barbaric war, imprisonment, escape, adventure and victory He liked luxury, the amenities of

wealth and comfort, mulled claret drunk in decorative rooms lit by tall candles, the sparkle and glitter of good talk and good glass, the savor of delicate food” (17-18).

Richmond’s war experience is like a story of heroic adventure. He was a war prisoner in a German camp, escaped from it in 1943, hid for three days at the Villa Fraises, and with Maurice’s help successfully crossed over the mountains into Spain. Now Richmond is a civilian who is treated as a war hero in the post-war society. He calls himself one of the “returned warriors” (21). However, he never speaks about his patriotic duty in wartime or disillusionment resulting from his war experiences. He only concentrates on his life as a respectable citizen.

Richmond appears to have no physical or mental scars of war. The only apparent effect of the war on Richmond is shown in his intelligence. He has forgotten some of his pre-war education. Nevertheless, he feels confident that he will graduate with honors without working hard. For Richmond, education is not significant itself. He wants to get an honors degree in order to have a successful future. He even quotes from Edmund Burke: “Learning will be cast into the mire and trodden down under the hoofs of a swinish multitude” (21). What he pursues after coming back to a civilized society is to be a man of high social standing, which involves being a Catholic and a Tory. As he states, he now goes “in for snobbism in a big way” (21). What Richmond tries to do is to make a complete about-face. Unlike other undergraduates, he sleeps only in bed because he “slept out too much in the war” (28).

Richmond’s behavior is the opposite of Barbary’s. A few characters who are considered to be civilized suggest that discipline is correlated with civility, which accounts for Richmond’s civilized quality or Barbary’s lack of such a quality. However, each of them has different ideas of discipline. Comparing himself with Barbary,

Richmond says: “The way you were reared, my child, explains why you are as we see you today. I remember often thinking how differently I should have been treated at school for conduct such as yours. So I have grown up a civilized being, and you, so far, have not. It is to be doubted if you ever will” (29-30). Richmond’s idea is twofold. First, discipline is absolutely necessary for a child to grow up to be a civilized being. Second, a child would be unlikely to be civilized if he or she has not been disciplined at an early age. For Richmond, discipline means corporal punishment for which he uses the term “physical violence” (29). Richmond remembers that his father once wanted to give Barbary the rod during the time when Barbary made her parents worry to death by hiding in a pile on a barge. Barbary was not given the rod. Instead, she “was sent to bed at six for a week, with only bread and milk all day” (29). Even that punishment was not carried out because of Helen. Although Richmond does not directly criticize his mother, he implies that Helen is responsible for Barbary’s uncivilized manners.

Such ideas contradict Helen’s association of a nervy teenager Barbary with a nervy infant Barbary. Nevertheless, the conclusion is the same: it is impossible for Barbary to become civilized. Annoyed by Barbary’s lack of civility, Barbary’s young stepmother, Pamela, also expresses a similar view while talking to Sir Angus Maxwell: “it’s an awful pity she isn’t a year or two younger; then she could have gone away to school and learned to behave like other people instead of like a guttersnipe” (107). Since Barbary was not properly taught by her mother and is now over school age, Pamela believes that Barbary will not be civilized. Thus she cannot understand why her husband wants to keep Barbary in London. When Sir Angus Maxwell says that Gulliver was devoted to Barbary when she was little, Pamela responds: “I dare say. He’s fond of children. He *adores* David. And, if he wants a little girl to pet, perhaps this next one will

be that; I think he hopes so. Whichever it is, it will give him much less trouble than Barbary does" (110). Stressing Gulliver's affection for their infant son, David, Pamela discriminates between boy and girl. For her, a girl who is hopeless can be replaced by another child. Her attitude toward Barbary is symbolically represented in her cutting a blooming rose, an action the narrator describes as an "execution" (107). This action reveals that in this civilized world, someone who is considered a misfit is not accepted.

Another person who believes in the correlation between lack of discipline and aberrant behavior is Mrs. Cox. For Mrs. Cox, discipline means corporal punishment. In order to stop Barbary's unusual behavior, Mrs. Cox thinks about writing a letter to each of Barbary's parents and suggesting the necessity of parental exercise of corporal punishment: "when I hear her creeping in and out by night what she needs is a parent's care and well I remember how my husband used to take his belt to our Alice to keep her straight but straight was what our Alice never would grow to be" (180). Because her husband's means of discipline did not bring a successful result, Mrs. Cox quits pondering the content of her letter. She indeed fails to write either of Barbary's parents. The difference between a belt and a rod may easily explain the difference between the ill-behaved Alice and the disciplined Richmond. However humane Richmond's concept of corporal punishment may be, it is paradoxical that a child should be treated with "physical violence" in order to grow up to be a civilized human being.

In some respects, the corporal punishment given to Richmond failed, too. The conversation between Richmond and Helen demonstrates that he, like a number of people, cheats within certain limits. After Helen has justified her fabrication of poems by comparing it to the dishonesty and plagiarism of scholars throughout history, Richmond talks about a generalized view of people's dishonesty: "Someone was saying the other

day that it's the people under forty who've taken to swindling and lying in a big way, and that the middle-aged people, if they were well brought up, remain more or less incorrupt" (87). Richmond admits that he is a crook, as nearly all his friends are. Describing his friends' acts as uncivilized, he implies that discipline has failed in the case of young people: "they cheat the customs and lie and black market and buy petrol and clothes coupons; but their parents say they can't throw off their early training, which taught them that, whatever else gentlemen and ladies might do, they mustn't cheat" (87). Richmond himself cheats customs freely. He has certainly contributed to the black market, which the Abbé Dinant says poisons the springs of French economy (133). Richmond's cheating reveals that he is not such a civilized being as he presents himself to be. He certainly has been affected by his war experience.

Richmond's question about whether Helen cheats customs leads to a discussion of the differences among Richmond and Barbary and Raoul. In response to her son's presumptuous question, Helen says that she should cheat customs. She makes a connection between cheating in post-war time and the lying that "became the right thing to do" during the German occupation (87). She also gives her opinion concerning Richmond's generalization about the old and the young with regard to the issue of cheating. She says: "Children like Barbary and Raoul will never recover from it After all, when you're up against torturers and tyrants, you have to adapt yourself" (87). According to this generalization, Richmond, Barbary, and Raoul all are crooks. However, while Barbary and Raoul remain barbaric crooks exactly as they were during the occupation, Richmond is "a gentle, civilized, swindling crook" (89). Helen comes up with her own generalization of young crooks: "It's a world of crooks now The crook in all of us is bursting out and taking possession, like Hyde, while Jekyll slowly dies of

attrition. I dare say you and your spiv friends will be cat-burgling soon” (88). Richmond agrees with Helen and then wonders whether cat-burgling will develop into murder: “Murdering too, would you say, or is that another line of development? I don’t really feel violent, even after my four years’ training in dreadful deeds” (88). Since they have been arguing that the younger generation’s various unlawful acts have their origin in war, it is not surprising that Richmond questions the possible link between killing and training as a combatant. Helen asserts: “Oh, murder comes too. Not to you, I think; you’re much more likely to react from violence into gentleness and an elegant dolce far niente civilization. But to those who don’t react from violence, murder comes too” (88). Helen’s response reveals that the difference between Richmond and Barbary lies in her son’s and her daughter’s different reaction to violence. Stressing the impossibility of Richmond’s killing, Helen suggests that Barbary’s war experience would develop into a killing mind. Ironically, she does not consider Richmond’s combat activities as killing. She seems to accept that the male gender role in war time is justified. For Helen, Barbary, who did not play the role of combatant, represents a youngster who does not “react from violence.” Helen shows gender bias toward her son, although her direct implication is that Barbary was involved with Maurice’s death. Of course, she misjudges Barbary. As later disclosed, her daughter was not implicated in the death of Maurice.

Despite his cheating, Richmond is a fine example of a civilized human being. He is believed to be a civilized being because he takes an impersonal attitude toward his mother’s affair with Lucien, which is generally viewed as immoral and improper. Lucien describes Richmond as “a charming boy” who is “civilized, agreeable, intelligent, elegantly mannered” (133). Richmond suits the description of “civilized people” that Gulliver has described with a hope for less antagonism between Barbary and Pamela:

“Civilized people can manage to get on together, even when not naturally particularly compatible” (129). Gulliver certainly did not imply the courteous relationship between Lucien, his ex-wife’s lover, and his son. Richmond is one of those civilized people who are tolerant of unpleasant situations. Because of Richmond’s courtesy, the Abbé Dinant, who is deeply concerned with demoralization in the post-war society, ironically believes that he can discuss Helen’s immoral actions with Richmond. He remembers Barbary’s jealousy and forecasts an awkward meeting between Barbary and Lucien. But Richmond is not like Barbary. When the Abbé Dinant asks him whether he can influence his mother, Richmond replies: “I have no influence. And if I had I should not use it to try and alter my mother’s way of life. It’s not my business, how she chooses to live” (139-40).

Embarrassed by the Abbé Dinant’s question and his statement that a Catholic should not overlook such immoral behavior, Richmond now does not want to be a Catholic.

Nevertheless, he is not angry with the Abbé. He does not forget his manners, so he responds to the Abbé’s apology civilly.

Another characteristic of Richmond’s civility is manifested in his view of the church. As he has told Helen, Richmond is not religious but worldly (26). Nevertheless, as a civilized being, he is going to choose a church. After his mild conflict with the Abbé, Richmond ponders religion. When he thinks about being a Catholic, he reaches “toward this stronghold against which it was possible that the gates of hell might not prevail, though they clanged with their iron clamor on all else” (142-43). Unlike Barbary, Richmond finds no difficulty being a Catholic and being delivered from hell, even though he was not brought up as Catholic. His father is Anglo-agnostic, while his mother is an atheist. However, Richmond changes his mind and decides to be an Anglican. Richmond believes that his being Anglican will be close to a middle ground between his father and

his mother, although it certainly would please his father because Anglican suggests “to him college chapels, good glass windows, Byrd anthems, Gothic cathedrals, the Temple church, the benchers at lunch on Sundays at Lincoln’s Inn” (143). The church in the world of Richmond is far from the ideal church as defined in Macaulay’s essay “What I believe,” where she states that the church should “be on the side of the poor and the oppressed; of virtue, freedom, courage, intelligence, unselfishness, ethical process, and peace; of learning, culture, decency, and civilization.”¹⁷ According to Macaulay the church should provide “the tonic medicine for the world” which suffers from barbarous human nature. In contrast, Richmond’s church only provides a pretentious activity for a civilized person.

Since he is no longer a combatant, Richmond tries to conform to the canons of upper class life. The narrator describes his transition: “Richie, himself trapped into barbarism for three long, unbelievable years, shrank back from it, reacted towards gentleness, towards bland tolerance, towards an excessive civility” (141). His strong feelings against barbarism suggest that Richmond is a civilized being, yet his dislike for war does not indicate that he is peace-loving. Richmond is not the type of civilized person Macaulay esteems. For Richmond, war means destruction of the aristocratic culture that he deeply appreciates. Looking at the land located between Spain and France, Richmond ponders the war’s impact on the values he espouses.

The rich elegances of life, now so little probable, the fine decoration, the exquisite glow of color and grace of structure, the beauty that wealth and knowledge can bring, the fineness, the ivory tower of aristocratic culture, that war and peace had undermined, had set tottering, had all but brought down with a crash, to replace by pre-fabs for the multitude, by a thin,

weak, tainted mass culture—it was towards these obsolescent things that Richie nostalgically turned In this pursuit he was impelled sometimes beyond his reasoning self, to grasp at the rich, trailing panoplies, the swinging censurs, of churches from whose creeds and uses he was alien, because at least they embodied some continuance, some tradition, while cities and buildings, lovely emblems of history, fell shattered, or lost shape and line in a sprawl of common mass newness, while pastoral beauty was overrun and spoiled, while ancient communities were engulfed in the gaping maw of the beast of prey, and Europe dissolved into wavering anonymities. (141-42)

Richmond represents a civilized being who Macaulay describes as “impelled . . . to join the barbarian game” for fear of letting his values become destroyed once a war breaks out.¹⁸ Ironically, his joining the barbarian game only has led to his falling into the level of barbarism. His values have been eroded by war. Furthermore, barbarism prevails even after peace has come, as illustrated in the landscape of the boundary between France and Spain.

Looking at the landscape, Richmond observes that peace is “a mask, lying thinly over terror, over hate, over cruel deeds done” (141). He thinks about various regional, ethnical, national divisions and conflicts in Europe, which still remain unresolved in the post-war time. He fears that the thin layer of peace will be broken before long and the present civilization will be ruined as other past civilizations have been: “Savagery waited so close on the margins of life; one day it would engulf all No civilization had lasted more than a few thousand years; this present one, called Western culture, had had its day and was due for wreckage . . . already the margins of the present broke crumbling and

dissolved before the invading chaos that pressed on” (144). Civilization is symbolized as a beauty that Richmond wishes to keep, yet cannot help but see it disappear. However vivid the gloomy picture of the present civilization has been in his mind, Richmond does not brood over its fate for long. He does not think about how to save the civilization from the barbaric forces.

Richmond’s choice of a woman for his wife reveals that Richmond will be very much like his father, who represents the world of tradition. It also implies that civility is nothing more than one’s acceptance of the gender roles imposed by a society. While talking to his mother, Richmond reveals his prejudice against women in general. He says that “women *are* mostly rather stupid It’s so much better than being pompous” (189). Since almost all women have poor brains, he prefers “something more graceful, adaptable, conventional, ladylike . . . a gentle, merry slip of a girl . . . exquisite bud of some ancient tree, the prettiest deb of her year, never bawdy, perhaps a little High Church” (191). For Richmond, a woman who has high-class manners will be qualified to be his wife. His ladylike woman is similar to that of Ramón’s mother in And No Man’s Wit. Richmond certainly does not want to marry a woman like his mother, who often neglected her duty as a respected lawyer’s wife. He does not agree with his mother, who asserts that she always enjoys keeping company with intelligent women friends and often did not stay at her own dinner parties with other lawyers’ wives who mostly lacked the qualities that she found important. Richmond considers his mother’s unconventional behavior “mannerless,” “unfair to his father,” and “lacking in all civility” (190). The woman Richmond will take as his wife will be a great contrast to his mother. She will be a good daughter-in-law and be close to his father’s wife, Pamela, who thinks much of propriety.

The civilized society that Gulliver represents and Richmond wants to be part of is typified in the Maxwells' shooting lodge, the well-planned garden of which is distinctively different from the uncultivated garden in the world of Barbary's wilderness. As its location—Highlands—hints, it is a society of the upper class in which everybody, as a civilized being, is expected to have manners. They disdain anyone that does not fit in their society and any behavior that seems to be against their high moral standards. Pamela is critical of Barbary. Lady Maxwell suspects her young maid of stealing money that Barbary has taken on the grounds that people in need of money have become dishonest since the last war. The family in the Highlands are supposed to be civil and morally superior, yet they are in fact superficial and impersonal.

The activities of the family disclose the barbarity of the upper class in a very subtle way. The narrator describes a hunting and fishing trip as barbaric by stating that "the rest of the party were gone out to kill animals" (105). The family's return from the trip is portrayed as if they were primitive hunters: "Through the afternoon and evening the family drifted home, laden heavily or lightly with trophies of the chase" (110). Most of their trophies are fish; Lady Maxwell's cuttings are ranged with their chase: "Sir Gulliver had a large salmon, which he had played for two hours in the Long Pool; Kenneth had hooked a sea trout in the burn, which had finally broken his line and got away; Molly and Joan had a creel full of small trout from Loch Dubh; Hugh had two rabbits; Lady Maxwell a basket full of cuttings from the garden of the friends with whom she had lunched" (110). Even their late tea time is full of the hunters' spirit: "Over a large late tea they all recounted to one another their triumphs and their disappointments, the creatures they had captured and the creatures who had escaped them" (111). Despite their

civilized manners and their cultivated landscape, the upper class at the lodge are not much different from their primitive ancestors.

Civilized people generally do not like barbarism. They loathe war. Nevertheless, they do not accept the few people who truly dislike violence so much that they may refuse to join the barbarian game—war. Maurice, who was mistaken for a collaborator, was one of a few people who were truly civilized beings under the German occupation, “even to victorious invaders, not lurk round them like savages in a jungle, plotting and executing futile vengeance” (25). His act was grounded on the Abbé Dinant’s idea of a “pacific and Christian attitude” (25). Maurice was one of the Abbé Dinant’s flock who believed “though these Nazis were barbarians and interlopers and the enemies of France, they were at least fighting the worst enemies of religion, civilization and the true France, those impossible Bolsheviks” (25). Maurice’s truly civilized approach to the war was reflected in the Abbé Dinant’s activities: the Abbé Dinant during the occupation “did his best to keep the peace, and preached against the violence of the hot-heads of the Resistance, as the poor old Marshal bade him . . . never betrayed a soul to Vichy or the Germans Since the liberation he has protected many from mob vengeance” (147). What Maurice did during the occupation was similar to what the Abbé Dinant did, although preaching was not part of his activities. Maurice’s peaceable nature is explained by Helen, who finally regrets her own negligent attitude toward war. To her ex-husband, who accuses Maurice of being a collaborator, Helen says: “Maurice never collaborated . . . never betrayed anyone to the Germans or the Vichy police. He even sheltered escaped Allied prisoners. All he did was to live in an occupied country and keep up amicable terms with its occupiers” (231). Maurice could be one of the civilized people who, according to Gulliver’s earlier definition, “can manage to get on together, even when not naturally

particularly compatible" (129). Of course, Maurice could not be. For Gulliver, Maurice's death is a case of "one crime avenged by another" (232). As a layman, Maurice could not be spared in the world of this civilization which despises barbarism yet not only accepts war as justifiable means to resolve conflicts among nations but also impells people to take a side in the name of patriotism.

This world of civilization, which accepts war, always has a potential for the clash between human civility and human barbarity. Although it appears to be opposite of the world of barbarism, it regresses whenever such a clash takes place. On the last day of his vacation, Richmond visits the ruins where Barbary fell. He senses "irremediable barbarism," which is "a symbol of loathsome things, war, destruction, savagery; an earnest, perhaps, of the universal doom that stalked, somber and menacing, on its way" (242-43). The scars of war will be removed, since plans to rebuild the area are under way. The human dwellers have already left the ruined world. The time when birds will desert the wilderness will come soon. Nevertheless, the change in the ruins will not completely erase the wilderness: "So men's will to recovery strove against the drifting wilderness to halt and tame it; but the wilderness might slip from their hands, from their spades and trowels and measuring rods, slip darkly away from them, seeking the primeval chaos and old night which had been before Londinium was, which would be when cities were ghosts haunting the ancestral dreams of memory" (244). Richmond has a vision of another clash between civilization and barbarism, but he is not concerned about it. He simply walks toward the civilized district leaving the world of wilderness behind, as if he completely severed his connections with barbarism.

Through the characterization of Richmond, Macaulay presents war's impact on the civilized world. Since he is not a misfit like Barbary, the world of Richmond seems to

be untarnished even after war. Like the characters of this novel, people in a civilized society recognize war's effect only when they note immoral or unlawful behaviors of others. Nevertheless, according to Macaulay, the human race is not civilized as much as one wants to believe and will continually suffer from degradation as long as it accepts the barbaric human nature. In her essay "What I Believe," Macaulay contends that human beings are still cruel, and she defines cruelty as not confined to physical force: "the cruelty . . . which stares and smiles at physical or mental oddity; the cruelty of the strong to the helpless, the man to the beast, the adult to the child, the rich to the poor; the cruelty of negligence, no less than that of deliberation."¹⁹ Macaulay also mentions that cruelty, along with vulgarity and ignorance, is the source of the human condition in which "the sword of war ever hangs on a thread above our heads, and ignorantly and wantonly, we cut the thread."²⁰ Despite civilized people's proper manners and neat attire, the difference between them and their primitive ancestors may be very delicate, as ironically implied in Richmond's view of the thin layer of peace covering the latent barbarism of war.

The World My Wilderness displays Macaulay's concern about the effect of war on humanity, which became the predominant theme of her war novels. Unlike her World War I novel, Non-Combatants and Others, this novel, however, does not represent a strong voice for permanent peace. It implies that barbarism eventually prevails over civilization, yet it still reflects the author's beliefs that one day the human race will be so civilized that it may denounce war and may establish permanent peace. Even after the development of the atomic weapon, Macaulay believed that humanity inclined toward progress. In a letter to her sister, she expresses her opinion of such progress:

When people keep saying that we are more cruel than our ancestors because of bombing, there seems a fallacy in it, considering the appalling

tortures they too perpetrated, both in war and peace; I mean, they did what they could, and I think were *more* cruel. I wonder if the atom-bombing *has* made us more cruel. Some people, perhaps; but in others there was a great horror of a revulsion from it, after Hiroshima when its human effects were described. I think if I had ever been for it (of course, I wasn't) it would have changed my mind. I think I agree with you about various moral improvements and declines, on the whole²¹

Macaulay's main point is that the description of the atomic bomb's impact will help people to reject the use of such weapons. This belief seems to underlie her writing of The World My Wilderness. The novel is a product of Macaulay's intention to let the reader see the truth about war by portraying a girl who led a horrid life during war time and a young man who seemingly adapts himself to "civilized" post-war society. Despite the ostensible differences between them, Macaulay's characterization of both the young girl and the young man aims to demonstrate war's impact on humanity.

Notes

¹ Macaulay, Letters to a Friend, 1950-1952, ed. Constance Babington-Smith (New York: Murray, 1961) 27.

² Macaulay, "War and the B.B.C.," The Spectator 20 Oct. 1939: 538.

³ As quoted by Robert Earl Kuehn, "The Pleasures of Rose Macaulay: An Introduction to Her Novels," diss., of U of Wisconsin, 1962, 258.

⁴ Macaulay, "Marginal Comments," The Spectator 31 Jan. 1936: 169.

⁵ Macaulay, Letters to a Sister, ed. Constance Babington-Smith (New York: Murray, 1964) 86.

⁶ Letters to a Sister 88.

⁷ Letters to a Sister 89.

⁸ Letters to a Sister 98.

⁹ Letters to a Sister 104.

¹⁰ In a letter to her sister, Macaulay expresses her sympathy with the people who were on the black-list. See Letters to a Sister 99. According to Jane Emery, Macaulay was “on the German list of writers to be exterminated after their invasion of Britain.” Emery describes Macaulay’s reaction to that: “She was delighted to be included with E. M. Forster on this roster of proscription and called him to announce happily that they could be punished together.” See Rose Macaulay: A Writer’s Life 278-79.

¹¹ Letters to a Sister 110.

¹² Letters to a Sister 112.

¹³ Letters to a Sister 114.

¹⁴ Letters to a Friend, 1950-1952 77.

¹⁵ Macaulay, “The First Impact of The Waste Land,” T. S. Eliot: A Symposium for His Seventieth Birthday, ed. Neville Braybrooke (New York: Books for Libraries, 1958) 30.

¹⁶ In the novel, the four freedoms are mentioned twice. Horace, a deserter, states that soldiers do not have such freedoms; the psychologist Sir Angus Maxwell notes Barbary’s lack of the freedoms without specifying them. Although the “freedom to get about” is not included, the four freedoms seem to refer to ones that Franklin Roosevelt mentioned in a Presidential address to Congress in 1941. The four freedoms are “freedom of speech,” “freedom of worship,” “freedom from want,” and “freedom from fear.”

¹⁷ Macaulay, “What I Believe,” The Nation 16 Dec. 1931: 666.

¹⁸ Macaulay, "Aping the Barbarians" 12.

¹⁹ "What I Believe" 665.

²⁰ "What I Believe" 665.

²¹ Letters to a Sister 157.

CONCLUSION

Until her death on 30 October 1958, Macaulay continued expressing her concern about war and stressing peace efforts. As far as her novels are concerned, The World My Wilderness is the last novel in which she focuses on the issue of war. Macaulay's subsequent pacifist position is revealed mostly in her letters to her sister. In the letters, Macaulay gave her opinions concerning regional and international conflicts in the world, which often involved Britain. One of her letters mentions Britain's involvement in the Korean War: "what *are* we to do to get out of Korea with dignity? It is too awful I say, let Russia take anything, rather than send people to join in these barbarian wars"¹ Her idea of "let[ting] Russia take anything" is similar to her suggestion to "let it [Nazism] win" in 1939. Macaulay also disapproved of government policies which reflected militarism, such as maintaining a military base in Cyprus. Another letter of this time shows that Macaulay reaffirmed her view of the 1930s peace efforts tied to the founder of the Peace Pledge Union, Dick Sheppard. In 1957, after listening to a special radio program in memory of Dick Sheppard, Macaulay confided to her sister her understanding of his pacifism: "He hadn't a lot of common sense, tho' more than one might think His pacifist program was firmly based on what he kept repeating, 'I must not kill my brother,' and the consequences of it had all, however terrible they might be, to be subordinate to that. I thought at the time, and still think, he was right, whatever the outcome might have been, and might be now. But he was quite often ill-judged in his methods He was unique."² Macaulay's outline of Dick Sheppard's pacifism

discloses her own position in the era of nuclear weapons: she believes that a pacifist must continue engaging in peace efforts without thinking about the outcome. Macaulay could well believe that she too was “unique.”

Because of competitive armament among nations, Macaulay’s major interest became inclined toward nuclear disarmament. As illustrated in her novels and essays of earlier years, her anti-war argument again focused on the effort itself. Macaulay was not optimistic about the results of such efforts. She was appalled by people’s belief that the use of the atomic bomb would be justifiable “in case of a just war.”³ Although she did not believe that the abolition of any weapon would lead to ending war permanently, she stressed the necessity of making any effort to reverse the trend toward armament. After praising a Labor parliament member’s protest against the party’s approval of hydrogen-bomb manufacture in 1955, Macaulay wrote that “if I were him I would have said that it very likely wouldn’t bring peace or non-aggression at all, why should it but in any case we mustn’t commit so dreadful a cruelty.”⁴ This letter reflects Macaulay’s idea that any effort against war must be pursued even if it can not guarantee peace. In the same letter, Macaulay further expressed her view on some pacifists’ naivety by drawing an analogy between that politician and the peace advocates during the Second World War. Macaulay stated that she did not agree with many pacifists who believed that passive resistance would lead to peace: “I complained of the same thing in the pacifists of the war and before the war; they would go on saying that non-fighting would make Hitler not fight too, as he would be so touched, instead of simply that fighting was a barbarity not to be committed in any case, which is a strong position.”⁵ Macaulay’s disapproval of “the same thing in the pacifists” indicates that she did not criticize the pacifists but rather their

optimistic projections about their actions. Macaulay implied that pacifists should not be naive about what they may achieve, but instead they should focus on peace efforts.

A letter to the editor of The Times also shows that Macaulay remained unchanged in her pacifist stand. In response to the Bishop of Rochester's sermon⁶ in which he criticized people who supported unilateral nuclear disarmament, she wrote that the bishop's statement was "an exact reversal of the fact." She also defended the supporters by describing the use of nuclear weapons as uncivilized: "They believe that to assault, torture, and murder with these unfortunate contrivances millions of our fellow creatures . . . would be a piece of barbarously uncivilized brutality . . . Like burning alive, it surely should not be envisaged on any grounds whatever by any State which calls itself civilized, and its mere possession, like the stake in the back-ground, is uncivilizing."⁷ Macaulay makes a point that a civilized society should not be equipped with nuclear weapons.

Macaulay's argument for nuclear disarmament also reveals that she was consistently against the division between the sexes in the peace movement. For her, war is a threat to humanity, and the elimination of nuclear weapons should not be addressed as either women's or men's issue. Nevertheless, Macaulay recognizes the differences between the sexes in their exposure to the issue. In a letter, Macaulay expresses her opposition to the sex-divided effort for disarmament: "I promised to attend a Women's anti-bomb meeting. I refused at first, as I don't approve of sex segregation on public questions, but later said I would, as it is important to stir up ordinary women about it."⁸ Despite her dismissal of such segregation, Macaulay realizes that "ordinary women" have been deprived of the education which would help them to understand the truth about atomic bombs, although she certainly does not imply that "ordinary women" are too stupid to grasp it. The idea of "stir[ring] up ordinary women" is echoed by Daphne in

Non-Combatants and Others, who argues that education would help the public, especially women, to understand political situations which create war. Dr. Marlowe of And No Man's Wit also stresses the education of women. Macaulay herself spoke for women's education, which she believed would contribute to human progress. In her essay "What I Believe," she argues: "let it be admitted that the female sex in humanity is the less tough and robust, mentally, nervously, and physically, the less fitted to endure strain and hardness, to create, to initiate, to organize, and to perform. The stupidity of such women as have received little learning is a heavy retarding weight on the world's progress."⁹ Macaulay implies that women's stupidity does not have its origin in their sex identity. She certainly does not believe in the validity of women's gender identity, which is often defined by a society. In a letter, Macaulay ridicules the concept of women's "feminine role": "Do you know what 'the feminine role' is? I am accused of rejecting it, by a correspondent (a psychologist) who disagrees with me She perceives evidence of this rejection in my novels. And what *is* it? Except being a wife & mother (as the masculine role is that of husband & father) I don't know what it is."¹⁰ Although Macaulay does not use the terms "gender" and "sex," she seems to acknowledge that only sex roles—wife, mother, husband, father—are uniformly defined. She refutes the common concept of different roles for men and women other than their sex roles. In addition, as expressed through her male characters (Hugh of And No Man's Wit and Richmond of The World My Wilderness), such an argument about sex differences often has been used against the education of women. Macaulay sees such view as a hindrance to human progress.

Macaulay's dismissal of "feminine roles" does not indicate that she ignored gender differences between the sexes. As demonstrated in the creation of her first heroine

in Non-Combatants and Others, Macaulay since World War I acknowledged her own gender identity. Since then, she emphatically presented women's perspectives on war, although she never believed that only women had innate interests in peace. Her focus on women's perspectives indeed reflects her idea that one's writing should be grounded on one's firsthand experience if it aims to present reality. Macaulay was aware of her own gender identity which she viewed as essential to the creation of realistic women characters. A letter written in 1952 reveals Macaulay's idea of the correlation between one's gender identity and one's creation of realistic characters: "in the evening I give an address to the University Lit[erary] Society on the creation of men by women, women by men, in fiction, drama and poetry. I think both sexes have tended to make their heroes and heroines rather their ideals for what they would like a man or a woman to be, whereas their own sex they often draw more from within, and achieve more realism. Not, of course, always."¹¹ Since war deepens the gender gap, Macaulay probably concludes that she would create realistic heroines by presenting women's perspectives on war.

After World War I, Macaulay consistently opposed war on the grounds that war is wrong and that it is caused by the uncivilized aspects of humanity. Nevertheless, as a writer she made a conscious choice not to use her novels as propaganda for peace. Macaulay's fundamental belief is that a novelist should not preach about what is right and what is wrong. Some of her letters of the 1950s display her idea of a good novelist who deals with moral conflicts. In a letter, Macaulay writes: "I think what one misses in most novels is a sense of right and wrong and the conflict between them The people in so much fiction now seldom appear to be this [at perpetual war with themselves]. Yet every one, almost, must be, I suppose, anyhow at intervals, however subconsciously and weakly. A good novel can be written without this, but the people in it seem to lack one

dimension. One doesn't want preaching, but just a hint of that motive in life, to make it a true record of the "*condition humaine*."¹² Macaulay seems to be clear about her position as a novelist. She intends to make only implicit suggestions about what is right. In another letter, she also states that a novelist should present conflicts between right and wrong "with detachment, in its right perspective against the standards of right and wrong that are really the ultimate thing and the eternal thing."¹³ The antagonism between peace and war is not easily recognized as one between right and wrong. In Macaulay's words, "everything else pales in its light, and it seems its own justifications."¹⁴ Even though most of the human race is against war, war has been often justified as right in the name of patriotism or paradoxically on the pretext of bringing peace. As a novelist, Macaulay feels that she should lead the reader to see this faulty justification without delivering explicit messages.

In her pacifist novels, Macaulay displays a variety of opinions concerning war and peace and exposes their shortcomings by making her characters counterattack one another. She seems to believe that the reader can grasp the "thing seen" concerning war and peace in the midst of diverse opinions represented by various characters. However, whether the reader comprehends the "thing seen" is uncertain. By presenting such diversity and complexity, Macaulay's novels successfully demonstrate that all divisions—of age, sex, religion, ideology, nation—are foolish. They also subtly emphasize the writer's belief that the entire human race should make an effort to advance humanity. Macaulay once wrote that she never believed pacifism was "*simple*," yet she also viewed the peace effort as "a question of human decency."¹⁵ Despite all the diverse approaches to peace, including the use of force, she has suggested that the human race would be against war if all of us only focused on civilized humanity, which is completely

opposite to barbaric humanity. Nonetheless, she has never believed that the human race would be so civilized that it might be free from war. Any peace effort is analogous with Isis' endless work to put pieces of truth together. As a writer and pacifist, Macaulay simply tried to contribute to improving human decency by writing novels which present some "fragments of truth" about war and peace.

Notes

¹ Rose Macaulay, Letters to a Sister 143.

² Letters to a Sister 239.

³ Letters to a Sister 170.

⁴ Letters to a Sister 170.

⁵ Letters to a Sister 170.

⁶ Macaulay also wrote a letter to her sister concerning the sermon. In the letter, she refutes the Bishop's accusation that "the Peace Pledge Union caused the 1940 war." She calls the Bishop's statement the "angry abuse of pacifists." She describes the cause of World War II as "Hitler's mad aggression and our desire to stop them." Moreover, she expresses her concern about a number of bishops' support for the hydrogen bomb. See Letters to a Sister 278-79.

⁷ Macaulay, "To the Editor of the Times," The Times 15 July 1958.

⁸ Letters to a Sister 277.

⁹ Macaulay, "What I Believe" 665.

¹⁰ Letters to a Sister 159.

¹¹ Last Letters to a Friend, 1952-1958 50.

¹² Letters to a Friend, 1950-1952 101-02.

¹³ Letters to a Friend, 1950-1952 172.

¹⁴ Letters to a Friend, 1950-1952 172.

¹⁵ Letters to a Sister 165.

WORKS CITED

- Authors Take Sides on the Spanish War. London: Left Review, 1937.
- Beauman, Nichola. "'It Is Not the Place of Women to Talk of Mud': Some Responses by British Women Novelists to World War I." Women and World War I: The Written Response. Ed. Dorothy Goldman. New York: St. Martin's 1993. 128-49.
- . A Very Great Profession: The Woman's Novel, 1914-39. London: Virago, 1983.
- Bell, Cilve. Peace at Once. Manchester, National Labor, 1915.
- Bensen, Alice R. Rose Macaulay. New York: Twayne, 1969.
- Boxwell, D. A. "The (M)Other Battle of World War One: The Maternal Politics of Pacifism in Rose Macaulay's Non-Combatants and Others." Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature 12 (1993): 85-101.
- Brittain, Vera. Honorable Estate: A Novel of Transition. New York: Macmillan, 1936.
- . Testament of Youth: An Autobiographical Study of the Years, 1900-1925. New York: Macmillan, 1938.
- . "Why I Stand for Peace." Let Us Honor Peace. London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1937. 53-64.
- Byles, Joan Montgomery. "Women's Experience of World War One: Suffragists, Pacifists and Poets." Women's Studies 8 (1985): 473-87.
- Ceadel, Martin. Pacifism in Britain, 1914-1945: The Defining of a Faith. Oxford: Clarendon, 1980.

- Cunningham, Valentine. British Writers of the Thirties. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Emery, Jane. Rose Macaulay: A Writer's Life. London: Murray, 1991.
- Evans, Richard J. Comrades and Sisters: Feminism, Socialism and Pacifism in Europe, 1870-1945. New York: St. Martin's, 1987.
- Ford, Hugh D. A Poets' War: British Poets and the Spanish Civil War. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1965.
- Foster, Catherine. Women for All Seasons: The Study of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1989.
- Fussell, Paul. The Great War and Modern Memory. London: Oxford UP, 1975.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. "Soldier's Heart: Literary Men, Literary Women, and the Great War." Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars. Eds. Margaret Randolph Higgonet. New Haven: Yale UP, 1987. 197-226.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins. The Man-Made World or Our Androcentric Culture. New York: Charlton, 1911.
- Goldman, Dorothy, ed. Women and World War I: The Written Response. New York: St. Martin's, 1993.
- Graves, Robert. Good-Bye to All That: An Autobiography. London: Jonathan, 1931.
- Hamilton, Mary Agnes. Dead Yesterday. George H. Doran: New York, 1916.
- . Remembering My Good Friends. London: Jonathan, 1944.
- Hanley, Lynne. Writing War: Fiction, Gender, and Memory. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1991.
- Hastings, Michael. The Handsomest Young Man in England: Rupert Brooke. London: Joseph, 1967.
- Huxley, Aldous, ed. An Encyclopedia of Pacifism. 1937 New York: Garland, 1972.

- Kennard, Jean E. "Feminism, Pacifism, and World War I." Turn-of-the-Century Women 2.2 (1985): 10-21.
- Khan, Nosheen. Women' Poetry of the First World War. Lexington: U of Kentucky P, 1988.
- Kuehn, Robert Earl. "The Pleasures of Rose Macaulay: An Introduction to Her Novels." Diss. U of Wisconsin, 1962.
- Liddington, Jill. The Road to Greenham Common: Feminism and Anti-Militarism in Britain since 1820. Syracuse UP, 1991.
- Macaulay, Rose. And No Man's Wit. London: Collins, 1940.
- . "Aping the Barbarians." Let Us Honor Peace. London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1937. 9-17.
- . Catchwords and Claptrap. London: Hogarth, 1926.
- . "The First Impact of The Waste Land." T. S. Eliot: A Symposium for His Seventieth Birthday. Ed. Neville Braybrooke. New York: Libraries, 1958. 29-33.
- . Introduction. All In a Maze. Ed. Daniel George. London: Collins, 1938. 7-15.
- . Letter. The Times 15 July 1958.
- . Letters to a Friend, 1950-1952. Ed. Constance Babington Smith. New York: Atheneum, 1961.
- . Last Letters to a Friend, 1952-1958. Ed. Constance Babington Smith. New York: Atheneum, 1962.
- . Letters to a Sister. Ed. Constance Babington Smith. New York: Atheneum, 1964.
- . Life Among the English. London: Collins, 1942.
- . "Marginal Comments." The Spectator. 19 July 1935 to 23 July 1937.
- . Milton. New York: Harper, 1935.

- . Mystery at Geneva. London: Collins, 1922.
 - . Non-Combatants and Others. 1916. London: Methuen, 1986.
 - . An Open Letter to a Non-Pacifist. London: Collins, 1937.
 - . Personal Pleasures. London: Gollancz, 1935.
 - . Potterism: A Tragi-Farcical Tract. London: Collins, 1920.
 - . "The Return to Horridness in Literature." The Spectator 10 Mar. 1933: 329.
 - . Told by an Idiot. London: Collins, 1923.
 - . The Valley Captives. New York: Holt, 1911.
 - . They Were Defeated. 1932. London: Collins, 1960.
 - . Three Days. London: Constable, 1919.
 - . "War and the B.B.C." The Spectator. 20 Oct. 1939: 538-39.
 - . "What I Believe." The Nation 6 Dec. 1931: 664-66.
 - . What Not: A Prophetic Comedy. London: Constable, 1919.
 - . The World My Wilderness. London: Collins, 1950.
 - . The Writings of E. M. Forster. London: Hogarth, 1938.
- Moorehead, Caroline. Troublesome People: The Warriors of Pacifism. Bethesda, Maryland: Adler, 1987.
- Montefiore, Janet. "'Shining Pins and Wailing Shells': Women Poets and the Great War." Women and World War I: The Written Response. Ed. Dorothy Goldman. New York: St. Martin's, 1993. 51-72.
- Mowat, Charles Loch. Britain Between the Wars, 1918-1940. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1955.
- Muste, John M. Say That We Saw Spain Die: Literary Consequences of the Spanish Civil War. Seattle: U of Washington P, 196.

- O'Brien, Sharon. "Combat Envy and Survivor Guilt: Willa Cather's 'Manly Battle Yarn'." Arms and the Woman: War, Gender, and Literary Representation. Eds. Helen M. Cooper, Adrienne Auslander Munich, and Susan Merrill Squier. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1989. 184-204.
- Rev. of The Old Huntsman and Other Poems, by Siegfried Sassoon. Times Literary Supplement 31 May 1917: 259.
- Orwell, George. The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell: As I Please 1943-1945. Vol. 3. Eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. New York: Harcourt, 1968.
- . Homage to Catalonia. San Diego, Harcourt, 1952.
- Ouditt, Sharon. Fighting Forces, Writing Women: Identity and Ideology in the First World War. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Pierson, Ruth Roach. "'Did Your Mother Wear Army Boots?' Feminist Theory and Women's Relation to War, Peace and Revolution." Images of Women in Peace and War. Eds. Sharon Macdonald, Pat Holden, and Shirley Ardener. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1988. 205-27.
- Reilly, Catherine W. Scars Upon My Heart: Women's Poetry and Verse of the First World War. London: Virgo, 1981.
- Schreiner, Olive. Woman and Labor. New York: Stokes, 1911.
- Schweik, Susan. A Gulf So Deeply Cut: American Women Poets and the Second World War. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1991.
- Scott, Bonnie Kime, ed. Introduction. The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology. Bloomington, Indiana UP, 1990.

- Showalter, Elaine. The New Feminist Criticism: Essays on Women, Literature, and Theory. New York: Pantheon, 1985.
- Smith, Constance Babington. Rose Macaulay. London: Collins, 1972.
- Squier, Susan M. "Rose Macaulay (1881-1958)." The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology. Ed. Bonnie Kime Scott. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990. 252-60.
- Swanwick, Helena. The War in Its Effect Upon Women and Women and War. 1915; 1916. New York: Garland, 1971.
- Tylee, Clair M. The Great War and Women's Consciousness: Images of Militarism and Womanhood in Women's Writings, 1914-64. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1990.
- Woolf, Virginia. The Diary of Virginia Woolf. Ed. Anne Olivier Bell. 5 vols. New York: Harcourt, 1978.
- . Jacob's Room. New York: Harcourt, 1922.
- . Mrs. Dalloway. New York: Harcourt, 1925.
- . Three Guineas. New York: Harcourt, 1938.

2

VITA

Seonae Ha-Birdsong

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: "TO SEIZE FRAGMENTS OF TRUTH": A STUDY OF ROSE
MACAULAY'S PACIFIST NOVELS

Major Field: English

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Taegu, South Korea, on March 1, 1959, the daughter of the late Tae-Yoon Ha and Gyl-Yun Cho.

Education: Graduated from Kyungpook Girls' High School, Taegu, South Korea, in 1977; received a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master of Arts degree in English Language and Literature from Kyungpook National University, Taegu, South Korea in 1981 and 1983, respectively. Completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree with a major in English at Oklahoma State University in December 1995.

Experience: Taught English at Kyungpook National University, Taegu, South Korea, from 1981 to 1986; worked as a graduate associate at Oklahoma State University in 1991.