



2001

The Political Katherine Mansfield

Lee Garver

Butler University, lgarver@butler.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Garver, Lee, "The Political Katherine Mansfield" *Modernism/Modernity* / (2001): 225-243.

Available at https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers/765

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences at Digital Commons @ Butler University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholarship and Professional Work - LAS by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Butler University. For more information, please contact digitalscholarship@butler.edu.



The Political Katherine Mansfield

Lee Garver

Ideologies that have been superseded by more enduring political discourses and literary figures who have been succeeded by greater authors are frequently relegated to the footnotes of cultural scholarship. But sometimes these lesser-known subjects of literary history, properly attended to, provide unique opportunities for a richer understanding of aesthetic developments. The study of British modernism, in particular, can benefit from a willingness to examine forgotten political-cultural relationships. Indeed, the period's extreme ideological complexity and cross-fertilization has served to mask the important political roles played by less celebrated artists in the formulation of modernist aesthetic doctrine. This is particularly true of Katherine Mansfield.

Most studies either neglect to include Mansfield in their accounts of modernism's emergence, or else try to correct this oversight by addressing her influence on Virginia Woolf.¹ She is largely thought of as someone who was "unaffected by contemporary literary trends and divorced from the great social, political and cultural events of her time."² Even those who contend that she participated in the development of a "female modernism" that gave literary voice to "an emerging feminist consciousness," as well as those who acknowledge that her stories explore "the theme of the exploitation of women," claim that Mansfield failed to do so in a perceptibly ideological manner.³

Mansfield's earliest collected short stories, those published in the years 1910–11, have been particularly ill-served by prevailing views of her indifference to political and social controversy. These are frequently dismissed as aesthetically unaccomplished and politically naïve. By 1920, Mansfield herself regarded them

MODERNISM / *modernity*
VOLUME EIGHT, NUMBER
TWO, PP 225–243.
© 2001 THE JOHNS
HOPKINS UNIVERSITY PRESS

Lee Garver is
Assistant Professor of
English at Butler
University. He is
currently editing
volume eight of Brown
University's online
edition of *The New Age*
and working on a book
titled *Lost Politics: The
New Age and the
Edwardian Socialist Roots
of British Modernism*.



226 as “immature,” “juvenile,” and “a lie.”⁴ Scholars have generally drawn upon these comments to argue that the stories simply mirror popular fears of German invasion or offer an unbalanced reflection upon her lonely confinement at a German spa in 1909, where she gave birth to a stillborn child.⁵ Antony Alpers suggests that the stories, most of which were later republished in the volume *In a German Pension* (1911), were influenced by the 1909 box office sensation *An Englishman’s Home*, a “clumsy melodrama” that “gave crude expression to the warnings by General Roberts of German readiness for war.”⁶ Patricia Moran argues that the stories are lamentable instances of feminine “revulsion and self-loathing” for “the female body’s materiality,” that they “demonstrate how deeply devaluations of women cripple and deform women’s estimation of themselves, even when women consciously resist and revise those demeaning cultural scripts.”⁷

Despite their lowly critical status, however, these works have a great deal to teach us about Mansfield’s politically engaged role in the development of early British modernism. Originally published in the British socialist magazine *The New Age*, these stories—viewed in proper historical context—reveal that she contributed to one of the least acknowledged, but nevertheless most important, shifts in political outlook and literary taste of her time. Though not as fully achieved (or even as modernist) as her later fiction, their occasional stridency and callowness only serve to emphasize their transitional literary-historical nature. Through their criticisms of German imperial culture and maternity and formal rejection of plot and discourse, these stories served dual political and cultural purposes. First, they undermined the authority of the dominant Edwardian currents of state-governed socialism and suffragist feminism while encouraging alternative forms of worker-governed socialism and individualist feminism. Second, they initiated a closely related shift from an influential Edwardian aesthetics of materiality and discursivity toward a new modernist aesthetics of spiritual liberation and perceptual immediacy.

The New Age (1907–22) is of great relevance to an understanding of the early politics of British modernism. From 1907–14, this weekly magazine, which had a large and diverse circulation base of more than 3,000 readers was not only the most significant clearinghouse of anticapitalist thought in Britain, but it was also a site of culturally pivotal debate about socialism, feminism, and the arts.⁸ Due to the fierce commitment to freedom of expression of the magazine’s gifted editor, A. R. Orage, the publication secured contributions from many of the most influential intellectuals and artists of the Edwardian era, including George Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Walter Sickert, G. K. Chesterton, Arnold Bennett, and Hilaire Belloc. In addition, Orage’s no less pronounced editorial flexibility, love of controversy, and gifted eye for young talent, allowed the pages of *The New Age* to accommodate several important political and cultural movements that increasingly defined British intellectual life in the years leading to World War I.

Politically, *The New Age* was the birthplace of guild socialism, a short-lived political theory that combined an anarcho-libertarian hostility to state authority with a socialist commitment to communal ownership of the means of production. At the time of its

founding in 1907, most of the magazine's contributors belonged to the Fabian Society, a small organization of prominent socialist intellectuals who wished to transfer property from individuals to the state through gradual parliamentary reform. However, beginning in 1908, Orage began soliciting articles from a range of dissenting strains of anticapitalist opinion, most notably from well-known men of letters Chesterton and Belloc. Out of the heated discussions which ensued, the contributors to *The New Age* eventually formulated guild socialism as an alternative socialist ideology. Unlike the Edwardian Fabians, who sought to redress capitalist ills through state regulated control of industry, employment, and social welfare, guild socialism encouraged workers to reject the systems of elected government, reject state interference in their lives, and seize control of industry through strikes.

The New Age was also the birthplace of an important strain of individualist feminism with close ties to both guild socialism and the anarcho-libertarian thought of Dora Marsden's magazines *The Freewoman* (1911–2), *The New Freewoman* (1913), and *The Egoist* (1914–20), the latter two of which later served as equally important sites of modernist literary activity. When *The New Age* was rethinking its allegiance to Fabian state socialism, many of its contributors were simultaneously reexamining their support for women's suffrage and the organizations that promoted it. These contributors attacked what they perceived as suffragists' misdirected focus on celebrating motherhood, a stance they believed kept women intellectually crippled. And they also demanded that suffragists—like striking laborers—desist from placing all their hopes in the vote and take full responsibility for their own liberation.

Most significantly, *The New Age* was a key birthplace of British modernism. In conjunction with the magazine's efforts to combine a tenacious commitment to individual liberty with a larger project of collective political liberation, a related aesthetic shift took place. Initially, the magazine championed the writings of Fabian-affiliated authors Shaw, Wells, and Bennett, whose work was widely thought to be (however counterintuitive this may sound today) the most revolutionary and avant-garde of the period. But as Fabianism lost favor in the magazine, so did these authors, whose plays and novels were thought to share state socialism's indifference to matters of spirit and individual freedom. Increasingly embracing the work of younger and, at the time, relatively unknown literary figures such as Katherine Mansfield, T. E. Hulme, and Ezra Pound, these artists' contributions to *The New Age* offered an attractive alternative to the work of Shaw, Wells, and Bennett and an equally attractive ideological basis for an antistatist political culture.

Mansfield's earliest published stories in *The New Age*, those that appeared between February and August 1910, participated in this political and cultural ferment through their prominent and forcefully negative portrayals of German imperial culture and maternity. By criticizing Germans and motherhood, they castigated a tendency among Fabian socialists, suffragists, and their respective fellow-travelers, to regard citizens as physical specimens and national commodities. As critics have often noted, these stories highlight the supposedly abhorrent corporeality of German culture. For example, "Germans at Meat" (3 March 1910) depicts a group of German diners at a rest cure

228 pension as crudely voracious creatures obsessed with consumption, excretion, and conquest. When not dripping soup on their clothing or remarking on how well their digestive tracts “retain” certain foods, they make hostile sexual comments to the story’s English narrator and unambiguously threaten her homeland with attack. At the beginning of the tale, while describing his prowess at consuming large English breakfasts, the aptly named Herr Rat boasts, “I have had all I wanted from women without marriage” (SS 37). Then, reinforcing the close relation of his unconstrained appetites for women and English cuisine, he stares at the young narrator in a manner that suggests a desire not just to rape her but to conquer England. “He fixed his cold blue eyes on me with an expression which suggested a thousand premeditated invasions” (SS 38). Later, another guest at the pension makes the link between sexual violence and German military attack even more explicit by casting the relationship between Germany and England as one between a powerful male and a defenseless woman: “‘Don’t be afraid,’ Herr Hoffmann said, ‘We don’t want England. If we did we would have had her long ago’” (SS 40).⁹

Mansfield’s earliest *New Age* stories are also, as has often been recognized, fiercely antimaternal. They express anger and disgust with the physical traumas and disfigurements of pregnancy. The “Frau” in “The Child-Who-Was-Tired” (24 February 1910) complains that her “insides are all twisted up from having children too quickly” (SS 97).¹⁰ The young waitress in “At ‘Lehmann’s’” (7 July 1910) can hardly bear the sight of the pregnant wife of her employer, regarding the woman’s enormous swollen belly as “ugly—ugly—ugly” (ibid. 76).¹¹ And the narrator of “Frau Fischer” (18 August 1910) boldly declares, “I consider child-bearing the most ignominious of professions” (ibid. 55).¹²

While some scholars have perceived that Mansfield’s early fiction is anti-German and antimaternal, however, none has recognized the extent to which these aspects of her work are ideologically intertwined. In the context of prewar British cultural discourse Germany was not only regarded as an immediate military threat to Britain, but also considered a nation whose dynamic birthrate and economy posed long-term questions about the status of Britain as a great power. For many of Mansfield’s contemporaries, Germany’s military ambitions and birthrate were obverse sides of a single coin: if left unchallenged, they would together spell doom for Britain’s imperial aspirations. These widely held cultural anxieties were of enormous concern to the milieu of Edwardian intellectual debate out of which Mansfield’s stories emerged.

Although neither Shaw nor Wells expressed animosity towards Germany, they and other Fabian-affiliated intellectuals in *The New Age* believed that the nation represented a challenge to Britain. Shaw had long been concerned with preserving British imperial hegemony in the face of increasing foreign competition. As early as *Fabianism and the Empire* (1900), he sought to stem national decline by laying plans for the “effective social organisation of the whole Empire.”¹³ And by the time he published *Getting Married* (1911) at the height of Britain’s naval arms race with Germany, he expressed great concern at the “alarming rapidity” with which British marriage practices were “beginning to depopulate the country.”¹⁴ Wells, too, regarded German industry and population growth as threats to British imperial ambitions. In his novel *The*

New Machiavelli (1911), the protagonist direly warns that “Germany is beating England in every matter upon which competition is possible”: “Germany, with a much larger population, a vigorous and irreconcilable proletariat, a bolder intellectual training, a harsher spirit, can scarcely fail to drive us at last to a realization of intolerable strain.”¹⁵

In fact, Germany was in many ways the model upon which Edwardian socialists sought to base their proposed reforms. Questions of “national efficiency” and racial fitness, of which Germany was considered a leader, became prominent concerns of the Fabian Society.¹⁶ The Society, actively seeking to influence British governmental policy, quickly proposed a program of state regulatory control of industry, employment, housing, health, and sanitation.¹⁷ It was thought that such interference with the free market would not only secure greater social justice, but also enable “the Englishman,” in Shaw’s words, to do what “the German can do in social organization.”¹⁸ In a less official context, Shaw and Wells promoted the role of eugenics in raising the birth-rate and improving the nation’s racial stock.¹⁹ In *Man and Superman* (1903), Shaw called for “the socialization of the selective breeding of man,” and in *The New Machiavelli*, Wells’s protagonist proposed to “biologize imperialism”: “Women . . . must become more and more subordinated as individually independent citizens to the collective purpose” of “bearing and rearing good children.”²⁰ Although these were more radical proposals than either man was willing to subscribe to in his more strictly political writings, they reflect a belief that biology and breeding were vital national concerns.

Mansfield was keenly aware of the perceived link between the German military threat and presumed British racial decline. In “Germans at Meat,” the same uncouth Germans who blatantly threaten invasion make much of the fact that England’s birth-rate is declining.

“Is it true asked the Widow, picking her teeth with a hairpin as she spoke, “that you are a vegetarian?”

“Why, yes; I have not eaten meat for three years.”

“Im—possible! Have you any family?”

“No.”

“There now, you see, that’s what you’re coming to! Whoever heard of having children upon vegetables? It is not possible. But you never have large families in England now; I suppose you are too busy with your suffragetteing. Now I have had nine babies—though after the first one was born I had to—”

“How *wonderful!*” I cried.

“Wonderful,” said the Widow contemptuously, replacing the hairpin in the knob on the top of her head. “Not at all! A friend of mine had four at the same time. Her husband was so pleased he gave a supper-party and had them placed on the table. Of course she was very proud.”

“Germany,” boomed the Traveller, biting round a potato which he had speared with his knife, “is the home of the Family.” [SS 38–9]

These same Germans further suggest that England’s soldiers are physically unprepared to counter a German attack. After the narrator assures her fellow diners that neither she nor her countrymen are afraid of invasion, Herr Rat responds, “Well, then,

230 you ought to be. . . . You have got no army at all—a few little boys with their veins full of nicotine poisoning” (SS 40).²¹

While Mansfield clearly regarded Germany as a military threat, she flatly rejected the idea that Britain needed to compete with Germany on its own terms. Not only are her stories unrepentantly antimaternal, they are also deeply critical of what she perceives as the Germans’ obsession with the physical and the sexual. They suggest that Germans’ preoccupation with bodily concerns makes them willing participants in their own spiritual debasement and social commodification. This is particularly evident in the case of the Widow in “Germans at Meat.” By having this character pick her teeth with a hairpin while criticizing the narrator’s vegetarianism and childlessness, Mansfield demonstrates that Germans’ concern with carnality and breeding is inherently coarse and degrading. In addition, by having her blithely speak about babies being placed on a supper-table amidst a wealth of foodstuffs, Mansfield insinuates that Germans regard themselves and their children as little more than national and familial resources, a point confirmed by the jingoistic Traveller, who loudly proclaims Germany to be “the home of the family” while biting into his potato.

It is too infrequently noted that Mansfield regularly celebrated the efforts of women to escape this demeaning social model in her fiction. The same semiautobiographical narrator who fends off the slights and insults of her fellow diners in “Germans at Meat” equally vigorously defends her spiritual integrity and intellectual independence in other tales. In “The Luft Bad” (24 March 1910), she resists strong social pressure to define herself in physical terms. The story is set in an open-air German spa where men on one side of an enclosure are “chopping down trees and sawing through planks, dashing heavy weights to the ground, and singing part songs,” and women on the other are encouraging the narrator to dress in “nothing larger than a handkerchief” and join them in sunbathing and talking about the “ailments and measurements and ills that flesh is heir to” (SS 79). However, after watching a young woman speak pantingly of how she is “perspiring so splendidly” and listening to “the brownest woman” she had ever seen talk of the benefits of eating only raw fruit, nuts, and vegetables, the narrator refuses to be shamed into parading around half naked or focusing exclusively on her weight or physical conditioning (SS 80). Turning her back on these women, she climbs on a swing and, in a brief moment of psychological and emotional freedom, ascends towards “white clouds trail[ing] delicately through the blue sky” (SS 81).²²

In “Frau Fischer,” Mansfield’s narrator similarly resists social pressure to define herself in terms of sex and childbearing. Throughout the story, the title character, a loud and overbearing widow, takes an intrusive interest in the marital status and sex lives of all the young women she encounters. When she first arrives at the pension where the narrator is staying, Frau Fischer upbraids a widowed pension employee for not having married off any of her eligible young daughters. Although Frau Hartmann, “in an ashamed and apologetic voice,” explains, “We are such a happy family since my dear man died,” Frau Fischer is decidedly unsympathetic to the idea that her daughters might be happier free of husbands (SS 50). “But these marriages—one must have courage; and after all, give them time, they all make the happy family bigger—thank

God for that. . .” (SS 51). In keeping with the replacement of a picture of Jesus Christ by that of the Kaiser in Frau Fischer’s room, the intrusive widow is concerned only that these daughters have lots of children. When she attempts to impose her views on the story’s wedded but childless narrator, however, she meets with far more spirited opposition. Far from being intimidated by Frau Fischer’s criticisms of her childlessness or the fact that she is staying at the pension without her husband, Mansfield’s narrator boldly declares childrearing, as already indicated, “the most ignominious of all professions,” casually claims to “like empty beds,” and stiffly rebuffs the widow’s efforts to draw her into further conversation (SS 55).²³

By thus repudiating the idea that citizens should be regarded as physical specimens, sexual vessels, and national commodities, Mansfield did more than criticize a purportedly German social ideal; she played a crucial and heretofore unacknowledged role in the discrediting and redirection of those Edwardian currents in *The New Age* that subscribed to this ideal. For example, she implicitly cast doubt on the wisdom of addressing capitalist inequities through the Fabian model of state regulatory control. This is particularly apparent when one compares her fiction with the contemporaneous political criticisms of Chesterton and Belloc, who did more than anyone else in *The New Age* to stir indignation against the Fabians. In his criticisms of the 1909 Minority Report of the Poor Law Commission (the Fabian Society’s most detailed blueprint for the formation of a socialist welfare state) Belloc argued that this ostensibly humanitarian reform proposal sought to organize “the poor like a flock of sheep” (557). He revealed that clause 29 granted governmental committees control over “that province of enquiry that is most offensive to the poor (cross-examination upon their physical condition, interfering with domestic arrangements, the enforcing of compulsory vaccinations, etc.)” (ibid. 556). He also bitterly disclosed that clause 82 provided for “management” of “the able-bodied unemployed.” Quoting from the report itself, he pointed out that if unemployed members of the proletariat could not find work through one of the proposed labor exchanges designed to eliminate unemployment, this clause “granted” these unfortunate members of society assistance in a labor “colony” where they were “‘to receive’ (by force of course) ‘such physical and mental training’ as the politician ‘may think fit.’” (SS 557)²⁴ While Mansfield’s stories were not so pointedly political, they no less vehemently rejected the idea that men and women should be regarded as material resources.

Mansfield’s stories also undermined faith in Shavian and Wellsian eugenics, which enjoyed considerable popularity at the time among socialist intellectuals. By revealing the brutalizing and debasing effects of excessive interest in birth and sex in her stories, she added her voice to those of a variety of essayists in *The New Age* who sought to show that eugenicists were leading Britain down a path to barbarism. Like M. D. Eder, who in 1909 had described eugenics as a “criminal doctrine” that would lead to “slaughter” and the oligarchic division of humanity into two unequal classes—“leaders on one side, hewers of wood and drawers of water on the other”—she decried the application of principles of animal husbandry and slaveholding to free citizens.²⁵ She also echoed Francis Grierson, who in 1910 talked of the dangers of “‘progressive’ thinkers”

232 denying “the psychic part of man.” Pointing, like Mansfield, apprehensively toward Germany, “the hot-bed of modern materialism,” he asserted, “Nothing but a hatch now separates us from primitive barbarity. Underneath is the lair of the wild beast, whose growls are as audible and menacing as were those of the old Roman arena when Rome thirsted for blood.”²⁶

Mansfield even aligned her fiction with *The New Age*’s growing tendency to regard the spiritual liberation of rank-and-file laborers as the proper focus of socialist revolution. Her stories’ celebration of female spirit and identity amidst demeaning social circumstances clearly paralleled the magazine’s valorization of working class efforts to defend their industrialism and integrity in the face of capitalist exploitation and state socialist meddling. This is especially evident in Orage’s commentary on the era’s many wildcat strikes and work stoppages. If it was not yet clear that these spontaneous demonstrations of discontent could provide the basis for a worker-led reorganization of industry along guild lines, it was nevertheless obvious to him that they were an important sign of “social progress,” the necessary precondition for the dawn of a “new age” of human freedom.²⁷ As he wrote in 1910 of one particularly unexpected strike,

We would have it observed that the material interest was completely lacking. Nothing save a point of honour was at stake. The humble excuse for all the trouble was neither to be dismissed, reduced or bullied; he was to be simply moved a distance of a few yards in the same station. What an almost aristocratic (in the real sense) occasion for a dispute! What noble pride! Almost the oligarchy might be persuaded that these brutes are men.²⁸

In short, the editor and contributors to *The New Age*—Mansfield in particular—regarded women’s and workers’ growing awareness of their innate psychological worth as offering an amplified scope for human endeavor, a model for social reconstruction not predicated on the brutish management of one’s fellow citizens.

In addition to participating in the refashioning of Edwardian socialism, Mansfield’s anti-German stories played a pivotal if still unrecognized part in the reformulation of mainstream Edwardian feminism, one that preceded the more celebrated contributions of Marsden by over a year. By suggesting that women who willingly embraced the “ignominious profession” of childbearing demeaned themselves and inhibited the development of untapped spiritual and mental faculties, she identified her writings with a combative new strain of individualist feminism. This is especially clear when one situates her fiction in relation to contemporaneous critical polemics by her friend Beatrice Hastings. Like Mansfield, Hastings and her feminist allies in *The New Age* mocked the idea that motherhood was an ideal that feminists should encourage or pursue, all well before Marsden raised the same issues in her magazines.²⁹ One contributor to the magazine found it appalling that suffragists claimed that they would use the “Power of the Vote” to “protect the mother and help the child,” indeed to do their “duty to the race.” “We wax very hot over the question of the mother and the child at our meetings,” she commented in 1909, “and we pat ourselves on the back and tell ourselves we are doing something very heroic in getting so hot in so noble a cause.” In her view, the physical experience of motherhood was far from ennobling: “It is a very pleasant sensation to suckle a child,

if one can; so pleasant that the mother's sensuous enjoyment is frequently reflected in . . . the vacuous smile of one whose brain is empty and whose body is at ease."³⁰

Hastings was no less critical of feminist idealizations of maternity. Indeed she found it unconscionable that international feminist author Olive Schreiner could encourage women in her study *Women and Labour* (1911) to discover "the joy of giving life, the glory and beatitude of a virile womanhood." "The choice before the majority of women," commented Hastings in 1911,

is to enter the professions, arts, and crafts by force and in force or to degenerate. Olive Schreiner, however, is not content to give this plain and sensible piece of advice, but she must needs spoil it entirely by an unnecessary, a reactionary, and, indeed, an inconsistent addition. It is a great truth, she declares, "and one on which I should not fear to challenge the verdict of long future generations," that the endeavour of women should be "towards a higher appreciation of the sacredness of all sex relations." If that is to be the case then farewell to any hope of women taking all labour for their province and competing with men in professions, arts, and crafts. For the truth must be told that it is precisely by *lowering* his appreciation of the sacredness of all sex relations that intellectual man at any rate has won his position. Nor should we fear to challenge the verdict of long future generations that the same deflation of the importance of sex will prove necessary to women if they are to enter the intellectual spheres where men now labour.

In Hastings's opinion, by "exaggerat[ing] the importance of sex and parentage," Schreiner encouraged women to enter the professions with a crippling "mother-hunger still in their hearts," in short to be, as Mansfield's fiction suggested, insufficiently intellectual and serious in their pursuit of individual fulfillment.³¹

The most important and lasting contribution that Mansfield's stories made was to the reconceptualization of what it meant to be aesthetically innovative. As her anti-German stories came to occupy an ever more prominent place in the magazine, Orage and other contributors increasingly accused the widely esteemed literature of Shaw, Wells, and Bennett—as Mansfield indirectly did—of being guilty of the "tendency . . . to deny the existence of [the] soul and to regard it as, at best, only a compound of the appetites, desires, and experiences of the mind."³² *The New Age's* drama critic, Ashley Dukes, denounced Shaw for treating his plays' characters as the Fabians treated the working classes—that is, as little more than objects of national appropriation and maintenance. Excoriating Shaw's materialism in 1911, he remarked,

His eye is always on the commonwealth. He carries Socialism to its furthest extreme. He nationalizes his men and women the instant they are created. He expropriates their imagination. He municipalizes their emotion. He confiscates their surplus value. And he renders compensation to each by the gift of a flickering cloud-halo of wit which sometimes illumines, sometimes obscures, the individual figure and the eminently social purpose.³³

In a close echo of Mansfield's "Germans at Meat," Orage criticized Wells in the same year for glorifying sexual experiences "no more fraught with meaning than eating or drinking or sweating."³⁴ An anonymous reviewer of Bennett's *Hilda Lessways* (1911) reproached the novelist for creating a female protagonist whose only intense feelings

234 were for sex.³⁵ And in a column on “Modern Novels” from 1910, Orage implicitly denounced both authors for losing contact with the “soul” and the “atmosphere of men’s minds, for focusing solely on surfaces and the “merely reproductive.”³⁶

Mansfield’s fiction also served as the leading edge of an effort to reconceive the early twentieth-century aesthetic avant-garde in psychological and spiritual terms. Although she is not generally discussed in relation to Hulme and Pound, who also wrote extensively for *The New Age*, she shared their desire to break with widely held materialistic conceptions of human nature. Like their groundbreaking Imagist poetry, which in Hulme’s words sought through the expression of “individual idiosyncrasy” to give form to evanescent moments of consciousness that revealed the world to be a place of “freedom and chance,” Mansfield’s stories attempted to disclose vistas of intellectual and spiritual freedom that existed outside materially defined boundaries of identity.³⁷ What is more, her tales also set the oppositional terms by which Virginia Woolf and other major modern novelists would later lay claim to cultural authority. Long before Woolf’s celebrated 1921 essay “Modern Fiction” took Bennett and Wells to task for being “materialists” concerned more with the “body” than the “soul,” Mansfield’s tales offered a comparable critique in more specifically political terms.³⁸

The other means by which Mansfield facilitated the emergence of new variants of socialism, feminism, and modern literature was more strictly formalistic. By rejecting plot and discourse and foregrounding the dangers of abstract conceptual language in her more self-consciously modernist stories of late fall, she criticized a widespread tendency among Edwardian socialists and feminists to encourage the political delegation of agency. In addition, she aligned her fiction with a contrasting movement to advocate self-government in politics and perceptual immediacy in aesthetics.

The two stories that best exemplify these concerns are the companion pieces “The Journey to Bruges” (24 August 1911) and “Being a Truthful Adventure” (7 September 1911). Like most of Mansfield’s finest work, neither provides obvious plot development or conceptual focus. In paradigmatic modernist fashion, each story unfolds in an apparently random manner, without the benefit of the kind of orienting authorial comment that was so prominent in Edwardian and late Victorian fiction. In “The Journey to Bruges,” for example, the semiautobiographical first-person narrator encounters a range of more or less ordinary individuals during her travels, none of whom becomes the subject of thematic scrutiny or plays a significant part in subsequent events. At the beginning of the story, the attention she directs towards two young men in her train compartment suggests that they will go on to play prominent roles. Their dialogue, which is reported almost entirely without comment, gives every indication of building towards a conflict that will require resolution. Playfully dubbed “the Enthusiast” and “the Mole” by the narrator—the former for his excited talk and the latter for his neutral, gray clothing—a tension almost immediately manifests itself between them upon their taking their seats:

“Look here, old man,” said the Enthusiast, “I want to change all our places. You know those arrangements you’ve made—I want to cut them out altogether. Do you mind?”

"No," said the Mole, faintly. "But why?" "Well, I was thinking it over in bed last night, and I'm hanged if I can see the good of us paying fifteen bob if we don't want to. You see what I mean?" The Mole took off his pince-nez and breathed on them. "Now I don't want to unsettle you," went on the Enthusiast, "because, after all, it's your party—you asked me. I wouldn't upset it for anything, but—there you are—you see—what?" Suggested the Mole: "I'm afraid people will look down on me for taking you abroad" [SS 14].

Despite the fact that the narrator tells us, "My heart yearned over the Mole's immediate future," this plot thread and potential source of thematic focus cuts off almost as abruptly as it begins (*ibid.* 15). After the Enthusiast denies the Mole's last statement, insisting on "how sought after he had been," the two companions nap the remainder of the journey, only waking to disembark from the train and leave narrator and reader forever ignorant as to how they will sort out their differences (*ibid.*).³⁹

Other portions of "The Journey to Bruges" refuse equally forcefully to cohere into a linear narrative. Although readers today would not find the story particularly disorienting, it would have challenged the expectations of readers of Shaw's, Wells's, and Bennett's works, which even at their most unconventional remained concerned with viewing life through an organizing lens of ideas. The story begins:

"You got three-quarters of an hour," said the porter. "You got an hour mostly. Put it in the cloak-room, lady."

A German family, their luggage neatly buttoned into what appeared to be odd canvas trouser legs, filled the entire space before the counter, and a homeopathic young clergyman, his black dicky flapping over his shirt, stood at my elbow. We waited and waited, for the cloak-room porter could not get rid of the German family, who appeared to be explaining to him by their enthusiasm and gestures the virtue of so many buttons. At last the wife of the party seized her particular packet and started to undo it. Shrugging his shoulders, the porter turned to me. "Where for?" he asked. [SS 13]

The tale commences in *medias res*, without any omniscient narrative voice to contextualize the porter's remarks or even to identify their intended recipient. Are the porter's words directed at a member of the German family that is introduced in the second paragraph? The tale's first-person narrator? The answer is not at first apparent or unequivocally ascertainable. Even after reference is made to the German "wife," ambiguity remains as to whether she is absolutely the "lady" in question. Likewise, it is not at first evident what causes the German family to frustrate the porter. The fact that there is a language barrier must be inferred from their impassioned "gestures" and baffling behavior.

Mansfield gives readers no more conceptual overview of events than her first-person narrator possesses at the time they take place. Like Hulme and Pound—her modernist compatriots in *The New Age*—she exhibits a close affinity with such turn of the century philosophers as Friedrich Nietzsche, Henri Bergson, William James, and F. H. Bradley, who argued that reality lay in the immediate flux of sensory appearance and not in a rational, conceptual order beyond it. The disclosure of information in "The Journey to Bruges" is rigorously sensory and retains much of the unexplained

236 and aleatory flavor of raw perception. No one's name is disclosed, the specific cause of the German family's agitation is never identified, and the "odd canvas trouser legs" that hold the family's luggage remain mysteriously foreign. Despite the fact that the narrator later remarks of the clergyman, "My sensitiveness glimpsed a symbol in his eye," we are never told the nature of this symbol (SS 13).⁴⁰ Nor does he or the German family play any subsequent role in the tale. Like the Enthusiast and the Mole, who also remain nameless, these figures simply join a host of randomly encountered individuals in the story who enable Mansfield to represent the fragmentary and discontinuous quality of immediate, quotidian experience.

Although "Being a Truthful Adventure" is less rigorously antidiscursive than "The Journey to Bruges," it is much more overtly polemical. From the very beginning, the story dramatizes the false lures and perils of ideational language and thought. At the commencement of the tale, which picks up where "The Journey to Bruges" leaves off, the exhausted narrator has arrived in Bruges and is consulting a guidebook while awaiting a room at a hotel.

"The little town lies spread before the gaze of the eager traveler like a faded tapestry threaded with the silver of its canals, made musical by the great chiming belfry. Life is long since asleep in Bruges; fantastic dreams alone breathe over tower and medieval house front, enchanting the eye, inspiring the soul and filling the mind with the great beauty of contemplation." I read this sentence from a guide-book while waiting for "Madame" in the hotel sitting-room. It sounded extremely comforting, and my tired heart, tucked away under a thousand and one grey city wrappings, woke and exulted within me . . . I wondered if I had enough clothes with me to last for at least a month. [SS 18]

The gaping distance between the high-flown abstractions of the guidebook promising beauty, dreams, and comfort, and the more palpable realities of Bruges—which have already left the narrator's "tired heart" dampened under "a thousand and one grey city wrappings"—establishes the oppositional thrust of the story. As the narrative unfolds, she discovers that the "fantastic dreams" promised by the guidebook are nowhere to be found and that to entrust her "gaze" to this seductive verbal intermediary is not to achieve a swifter and more authoritative knowledge of her surroundings, but rather to keep herself ignorant, dependent, and perpetually disappointed. Instead of spending her stay, as the guidebook pledges, "filling [her] mind with the great beauty of contemplation," the narrator finds herself, while following its instructions, contending with a succession of insensitive and overbearing service employees whose efforts to "assist" her are more intrusive than helpful. This culminates with her taking on the services a surly boatman who insists, against her express wishes, on talking constantly, taking on unwanted passengers, and, worst of all, mechanically directing her attention to all the sights along the canals, "Turn your head this way—to the left—to the right—now, wait one moment—look up at the bridge (ibid. 22)."⁴¹

What makes this critique political, and not simply the sour musings of a disillusioned aesthete or tourist, is the story's ending. There Mansfield links the perils of ideational language with the illusory promises of the vote. After escaping the obnox-

ious boatman's clutches, the narrator retreats to a meadow where she hopes finally to view Bruges through her own unaided eyes. No sooner does she start to examine the landscape around her, however, than an old school acquaintance, Betty Sinclair, and her recently wed husband—both of whom have their heads bent over the very same guidebook she has just abandoned—impose themselves on her:

"Katherine! How extraordinary! How incredible after all these years!" cried she. . . . "Where are you staying; have you been here long? Oh you haven't changed a day—not a day. I'd have known you anywhere." She beckoned to the young man, and said, blushing as though she were ashamed of the fact, but it had to be faced, "This is my husband." We shook hands. He sat down and chewed a grass twig. Silence fell while Betty recovered breath and squeezed my hand. "I didn't know you were married," I said stupidly. "Oh, my dear—got a baby!" said Betty. "We live in England now. We're frightfully keen on the Suffrage, you know." Guy removed the straw. "Are you with us?" he asked, intensely. I shook my head. He put the straw back again and narrowed his eyes. "Then here's the opportunity," said Betty. "My dear, how long are you going to stay? We must go about together and have long talks. Guy and I aren't a honeymoon couple, you know. We love to have other people with us sometimes." [. . .] "Unfortunately I have to go home quite soon. I've had an urgent letter." [. . .] "But the quaint streets and the Continental smells, and the lace makers—if we could just wander about—we three—and absorb it all." I sighed and bit my underlip. "What's your objection to the vote?" asked Guy. [. . .] "I always had the idea that you were so frightfully keen on the future of women," said Betty. "Come to dinner with us to-night. Let's thrash the whole subject out. You know, after the strenuous life in London, one does seem to see things in such a different light in this old-world city." "Oh, a very different light indeed," I answered, shaking my head at the familiar guide-book emerging from Guy's pocket. [SS 23–4]⁴²

Although it might seem surprising at first that the story's independent young narrator, who travels by herself across Europe, should be so cool towards Betty and "the suffrage," she makes the grounds of her contempt clear by linking both with the discredited guidebook. Whereas the narrator has come to distrust the abstract language of the guidebook—regarding as specious its promise to provide a more satisfying and authoritative knowledge of her surroundings than she can achieve on her own—Betty remains its dupe, just as she also remains the gull of a woman's suffrage movement that makes equally abstract pledges on behalf of the vote. She has naïvely entrusted her gaze to this seductive text and gushes blithely about "quaint streets" and "Continental smells" of which she obviously has no first-hand knowledge.

This disabling delegation of authority to the guidebook parallels Betty's equally crippling delegation of feminist agency to women's suffrage organizations. Betty clearly believes that in order to be "keen on the future of women" one need only place one's trust in the suffrage cause, that voicing support for the vote will cure gender inequality and other feminist concerns far more quickly and effectively than any individual acts of her own. But as Mansfield is at pains to demonstrate, just as the abstract language of the guidebook leaves its readers fundamentally ignorant of Bruges, so too does Betty's voluble talk about the vote leave her unenlightened as to her own continued enslavement to gender conventions and male dominance. Excepting her attachment to the

238 suffrage cause, she could not be more captive to custom. She has a young child, enthuses about lace, and bubbles over with sentimental prattle of a stereotyped “feminine” nature. Above all, she remains unable to imagine a role for herself outside her marriage. When Betty proposes that she and the narrator “go about together and have long talks,” it never occurs to her not to include her husband Guy. She ironically takes pride in the fact that she and Guy “love to have other people with [them] sometimes,” not realizing just how much such a comment reveals about her lack of independence. Similarly, when she talks about her enthusiasm for “the Suffrage,” she always does so using the pronoun “we,” as he uses “us,” as if the cause were as much her husband’s as her own.

The contrast between Betty and the narrator is particularly instructive in outlining the grounds of Mansfield’s critique. The story ends by establishing a sharp contrast between two kinds of feminism, each shaped by a different approach to language. The first is of the type espoused by Betty. It is more a matter of talk than deeds, of having “long talks” about the vote and “thrash[ing] the whole subject out” over dinner. The second is quietly exemplified by the narrator, who has rejected not only mediated knowledge and agency, but also all idle speech. The narrator may never identify herself as a feminist, but it is clear from Betty’s shock that she does not support the vote and by her fiercely independent actions that the narrator not only has a well-established reputation for feminism but that she also acts on her beliefs. By traveling alone, rejecting the authority of the guidebook, and refusing to be intimidated by Guy’s “intense” questioning, she demonstrates that she will cede her autonomy to no one. What is more, her reluctance to give expression to her views or idly engage Betty in conversation attests to the deep seriousness of her commitments. In contrast to Betty’s ceaseless shallow conversation, which is regularly punctuated by such empty phrases as “you know” and “my dear,” the narrator’s silent nods and terse statements bespeak a refusal to trivialize her feminist principles, to substitute talk for action.

By criticizing women’s suffrage in these terms, Mansfield contributed in fundamental and heretofore unrecognized ways to the development of a new antistatist political culture. As with her criticisms of the German social ideal, her antidiscursive stories are an aesthetic elaboration of the political commentary of unlikely modernist forebears Chesterton and Belloc, whose criticisms of representative government, like their critiques of state regulation, played a key role in fostering a climate of hostility to Fabian socialism. In 1909, two years before “The Journey to Bruges” and “Being a Truthful Adventure” appeared in *The New Age*, Chesterton criticized parliamentary politics—in terms later taken up by Mansfield—for being overly abstract, insufficiently grounded in immediate experience. As someone who believed that property was the foundation of all power, he contended that Fabian faith in the efficacy of democratic political reform was fundamentally misguided. In his view, electing a socialist majority to Parliament would not lead (as many Fabians supposed) to the “taking away of the private fortunes” of capitalists. Instead, it would result in these same financial oligarchs, through the influence of their wealth, continuing under a socialist guise “to manage our yet more concentrated affairs.” He wrote, “A small, rich, and generally

trusted class . . . are the masters of England; they will probably be the masters of any big political reform, including Socialism; they will be the masters, because they will be the paymasters."⁴³ Later, in 1911, Belloc expanded these arguments in *The Party System*, a book he coauthored with Chesterton's disaffected Fabian socialist brother Cecil. By affirming in her fiction that the vote was largely substanceless, Mansfield lent support to Chesterton and Belloc's arguments that, until socialists, laborers, and other enemies of plutocracy directed their attention to the foundation of capitalist power (property and money), any electoral victory won by Fabians or laborers would be purely illusory—the victory of “inapplicable theoretic abstraction.”⁴⁴

In a similar manner, Mansfield implicitly supported Orage's calls for greater labor emphasis on strikes. Her rejection of the vote and encouragement of the direct seizure of sociopolitical independence by women was an extension of his efforts to encourage greater self-reliance among the working classes. As early as 1910, Orage had argued that organized labor did not have “anything whatever to gain by being in politics at all.” He wrote,

All these late years we have been assuring the wretched wage-slaves that their votes were worth their weight in progress. It has been pretended that it mattered vitally and enormously to them, their children, their country, their king and their God, that they should vote for the right man. Well, they now begin to learn that it doesn't matter to any one of these things.⁴⁵

Calling attention to the steep decline in wages that had coincided with organized labor's entrance into party politics—much as Mansfield would later call attention to the feminist backsliding that attended women's involvement in suffrage politics—he advocated direct action in the form of strikes. “The governing classes are infinitely less afraid of the working-man's vote than of his strike,” he declared, a point that would only grow in significance over the next year as wildcat work stoppages rocked Britain, terrifying capitalists and revealing fault lines between government and rank-and-file laborers that *The New Age* regarded as the promising beginning of a new, worker-led form of socialism and industrial reorganization.⁴⁶

As important a role as Mansfield's antidiscursive stories played in the early foundation of guild socialism, they performed an even more pronounced part in the continued propagation of individualist feminism. Like her critique of the German social ideal, Mansfield's critique of the vote is inextricably linked to the now critically underappreciated but at the time path-clearing model of feminist politics practiced by Hastings, who in conjunction with Mansfield's fictional endeavors, developed a modernist and libertarian-tinged strain of feminism that has mistakenly been thought to have been the sole creation of Dora Marsden. Beginning in 1909, when Marsden was still a loyal member of the Women's Social and Political Union, Hastings criticized suffrage politics—in a manner that Mansfield later embraced—for being every bit as disconnected from immediate, individual experience as conventional party politics. Under the pseudonym D. Triformis, one of several names under which Hastings wrote to give the illusion that her views were held by a critical mass of contributors, she

240 mocked the leaders of the W.S.P.U. for promising, “in an orgie of chimerical benevolence,” that the vote could protect “married women from rivalry” and provide for a “regular lien on the wages” of their husbands. While she admitted that “the position of all women would be improved by the removal of the sex disability in politics and that the vote [was] a symbol of the moral restoration of womanhood,” she denied that the vote was anything more than a symbol. “Decidedly we object to the illusory hopes held out to the married woman that when such women as pay taxes shall have the vote the conditions of marriage will change for the better,” she asserted. “The million and a half future women electors could not honestly promise any change at all, even if this million and a half were all bent in the same direction.”⁴⁷

Like Mansfield, Hastings criticized suffrage politics for leaving its adherents fundamentally unaware of their own continued submission to gender conventions and male dominance. In a 1909 letter to the magazine under the pseudonym “Beatrice Tina,” the name she used to publish her notorious feminist polemic *Woman’s Worst Enemy—Woman* (1909), she argued, “Some of the leading suffragists who hail Mary Wollstonecraft as their model would cut that free-living woman dead if they could meet her to-day in a social gathering.”⁴⁸ Later, in 1910, she claimed that the leaders of the W.S.P.U. were more concerned with the reactionary strengthening of the bonds of marriage than they were with freeing women from custom and convention. In her view, the “payment of wives by individual men,” the most ill-considered and unrealistic of the organization’s promised reforms, was “a revolting idea.” Far from being a possible step towards greater liberty for women, it was merely “a further scheme for protection.” Until women took it upon themselves to assert their independence—a point emphasized by Mansfield in her fiction—the vote would accomplish nothing for them. To the plea that “the world is hard upon woman,” she responded,

The world is not hard upon women: women are. Women make the conventions which are more cruel and rigid than any man-made laws. . . . Until domestic women themselves perceive their folly, their degradation, and the ill-effects of their home-made rules against each other, the more intellectual suffrage societies had better avoid them and their plaintive petitions and charters.⁴⁹

Finally, in order to gauge the full extent of Mansfield’s identification of her early fiction with individualist feminism, the formerly unremarked parallels between her fiction and the feminist polemics of Women’s Freedom League founder Teresa Billington-Greig must be disclosed. In January 1911, in a major coup for Hastings and Orage, “Truculent Teresa” quit the W.F.L., a splinter group of the W.S.P.U., and published in *The New Age* the first fruits of her long-simmering discontent with the women’s suffrage movement. These scathing articles, which later formed the basis of her celebrated treatise *The Militant Suffrage Movement—Emancipation in a Hurry* (1911), lent authority to Hastings’s longstanding criticisms. Billington-Greig claimed, as Mansfield shortly would, that the W.S.P.U. had betrayed the cause of feminism, that in its exclusive pursuit of the vote it had forsaken more fundamental fields of feminist endeavor. She also contended that “feminist rebels” had initially rallied to the W.S.P.U.

because they found in the organization's "abandonment of the worship of propriety" an "aggressive proclamation" of "the right of insurrection" and "the right of self-government." But now that the W.S.P.U., in its haste to acquire the vote, had reached out for the support of those respectable, tax-paying women who would be most likely to benefit from any initial reform of the franchise, the organization had succeeded only in reducing itself to something "quite commonplace and conventional"—"a movement of political revivalism." In commentary that could almost have served as a blueprint for Mansfield's criticism of Betty in "Being a Truthful Adventure," Billington-Greig argued that the W.S.P.U. sought to "impose a yoke of emotional control" and "mental and spiritual slavery" on its members that corrupted the entire suffrage cause.⁵⁰ "The women who succumb" to this yoke, she declared,

exhibit a type of self-subjection not less objectionable than the more ordinary self-subjection of women to men, to which it bears a close relation. The yoke is imposed by a mingling of deliberately worked up emotion, by the exercise of affectational and personal charm. . . . As with all emotional degradation its victims glory in it. Every woman snared ensnares her fellow and adds the weight of her obsession to the burden upon the minds of the rest.⁵¹

In sum, her comments confirm that Mansfield's criticism of suffrage politics does not stem solely from personal experience—as the very title of "Being a Truthful Adventure" might suggest—but arises within and belongs to the most important antisuffrage critiques of the period.

Prewar British modernism poses a dilemma to those who wish to link its multifarious aesthetic experiments to a readily identifiable set of political affiliations. While it is not obviously conservative in outlook, neither is it identifiably leftist, liberal, or of the radical right. Scholars who attempt to place early modernists in any one of these camps are usually compelled to ignore evidence to the contrary. Mansfield poses particular problems in this respect. Not only is she often not properly admitted to be a modernist at all, but the tensions that are manifest in her fiction rarely seem ideological in any familiar sense. If one views Mansfield's fiction in the critically neglected intellectual context of *The New Age*, however, it is possible to begin to resolve this long-standing conundrum of modernist scholarship. Doing so demonstrates that prewar British politics frequently directed different lines of division than we are accustomed to encountering today. Socialism itself was more fluid and open to definition at the beginning of this century than our Cold War derived notions of "left" and "right" have led us to believe—or even enabled us to acknowledge. In short, her fiction discloses that modernist literary culture was antistatist more importantly than it was "left" or "right" in contemporary terms. In addition to including variants that envisioned a powerful role for the state, there also developed out of debates in *The New Age* an interest in formulating an antistatist variant of labor politics. And feminism was no less various. Thus, out of the debates in the magazine, there emerged a variant of radical feminism surprisingly hostile to the vote.

Analyzing Mansfield's stories in the context of *The New Age* provides strong, fresh evidence of the role that she played in the politically charged formulation of modernist aesthetic doctrine. It uncovers the crucial part her fiction played in the critical overturning of the politics and aesthetics of Fabian-affiliated literary titans Shaw, Wells, and Bennett and its anticipation of later arguments of Woolf and Marsden. Revealing that her fiction was at the center of heated discussions about labor organization, women's suffrage, imperial policy, and the role of the state in modern government also exposes her previously unanalyzed affinities with Chesterton, Belloc, Hastings, and Billington-Greig. Above all, it demonstrates that Mansfield is an insufficiently appreciated modernist pioneer.

Notes

1. See in particular Sydney Janet Kaplan's *Katherine Mansfield and the Origins of Modernist Fiction* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991). Kaplan persuasively argues that "Her innovations in the short-fiction genre (especially the 'plotless' story, the incorporation of the 'stream of consciousness' into the content of fiction, and the emphasis on the psychological 'moment') preceded Virginia Woolf's use of them, and they have been absorbed and assimilated—often unconsciously—by writers and readers of the short story" (3).

2. Pamela Dunbar, *Radical Mansfield: Double Discourse in Katherine Mansfield's Short Stories* (Ipswich, Suffolk: Ipswich, 1997), x. Dunbar rightly argues that this attitude has been further reinforced by "the formation of an unofficial Mansfield canon which favours apparently tranquil pieces like 'Prelude,' 'The Garden-Party,' and 'The Doll's House' while neglecting other, more patently disturbing works" (ibid.).

3. Kaplan, *Katherine Mansfield*, 7; Kate Fullbrook, *Katherine Mansfield* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), 38. Kaplan contends that Mansfield "did not connect her understanding of alienation and victimization with either a Marxist or a feminist political analysis. . . . She did not articulate her social critique of human suffering in recognizably political terms" (16–7).

4. Katherine Mansfield, *Katherine Mansfield's Letters to John Middleton Murry*, ed. John Middleton Murry (London: Constable, 1951), 467.

5. See C. A. Hankin, *Katherine Mansfield and her Confessional Stories* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1983), 62–3.

6. Katherine Mansfield, *The Stories of Katherine Mansfield*, ed. Antony Alpers (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984), 547.

7. Patricia Moran, *Word of Mouth: Body Language in Katherine Mansfield and Virginia Woolf* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1996), 4, 3.

8. Wallace Martin, *The New Age under Orage: Chapters in English Cultural History* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1967), 10.

9. "Germans at Meat," *The New Age* VI (3 March 1910), 419; *The New Age* will be hereafter abbreviated in the notes as NA followed by the volume number in roman numerals. Reprinted in Katherine Mansfield, *The Short Stories of Katherine Mansfield*, ed. John Middleton Murry (New York: Ecco, 1983), 38, 37, 40; hereafter abbreviated in the text as SS.

10. "Bavarian Babies. The Child-Who-Was-Tired," NA VI (24 February 1910), 397. Subsequently shortened to simply "The Child-Who-Was-Tired" in *In a German Pension* (1911).

11. "At 'Lehmann's,'" NA VII (7 July 1910), 226. Subsequently retitled "At Lehmann's" in *In a German Pension*.

12. "Pension Sketches. Frau Fischer," NA VII (18 August 1910), 368. Subsequently shortened to simply "Frau Fischer" in *In a German Pension*.

13. *Fabianism and the Empire: A Manifesto by the Fabian Society*, ed. George Bernard Shaw (London: Grant Richards, 1900), 6.

14. From the preface to *Getting Married. Getting Married / Press Cuttings* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1986), 20.

15. H. G. Wells, *The New Machiavelli* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin, 1985), 266, 267.
16. The term "national efficiency" was introduced into public discussion by Fabian leader Sidney Webb in his widely read article "Lord Rosebery's escape from Houndsditch," *Nineteenth Century* 50 (September 1901): 366–86.
17. See Webb's article "Lord Rosebery's escape from Houndsditch" and his tract *Twentieth Century Politics: A Policy of National Efficiency* (London: The Fabian Society, 1901).
18. *Fabianism and the Empire*, 11.
19. This is not to say that the Fabian Society was unconcerned with the nation's birthrate. Although the organization never endorsed a eugenics program, it shared many of the same worries as its more outspoken members and allies. For details, see Webb's *The Decline in the Birth-Rate* (London: The Fabian Society, 1907), 6–7.
20. George Bernard Shaw, *Man and Superman* (London: Penguin, 1946), 245; Wells, *The New Machiavelli*, 310, 308, 309.
21. "Germans at Meat," 419.
22. "The Luft Bad," NA VI (24 March 1910), 493.
23. "Pension Sketches. Frau Fischer," NA VII (18 August 1910), 367, 368.
24. Hilaire Belloc, "The Prevention of Destitution Bill," NA VI (14 April 1910), 556, 557.
25. M. D. Eder, "Eugenics and Human Sacrifice," NA V (9 September 1909), 359.
26. Francis Grierson, "Materialism and Crime," NA VII (11 August 1911), 341, 342.
27. A. R. Orage, Notes of the Week, NA VII (11 August 1910), 337.
28. Ibid.
29. Although maternity was not a primary focus of Marsden's editorials, she did recognize, as Les Garner has pointed out, that "there could be few Freewomen if they were continually pregnant." *A Brave and Beautiful Spirit: Dora Marsden, 1882–1960* (Aldershot, Great Britain: Avebury 1990), 68.
30. Helen George, "Maternitis," NA IV (11 February 1909), 322.
31. Beatrice Hastings, "'Olive Schreiner's *Women and Labour*,'" NA VIII (2 March 1911), 413.
32. A. R. Orage, "The Selection of Experience," NA VIII (9 March 1911), 444.
33. Ashley Dukes, review of *The Doctor's Dilemma, Getting Married, and The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet*, by G. B. Shaw, NA VIII (23 March 1911), 497.
34. "On Sexual Idealism," NA VIII (16 February 1911), 372.
35. Review of *Hilda Lessways*, by Arnold Bennett, NA IX (28 September 1911), 520.
36. A. R. Orage, "Modern Novels," NA VII (29 December 1910), 204.
37. "Searchers after Reality. Jules De Gaultier.—I. Philosophy is a Sign of the Times," NA VI (2 December 1909), 108. Reprinted in *Further Speculations*, ed. Samuel Hynes (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1962), 17, 16.
38. Virginia Woolf, *Collected Essays*, vol. 2 (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967), 104, 105.
39. Katherine Mansfield, "The Journey to Bruges," NA IX (24 August 1911), 401.
40. "The Journey to Bruges," 401.
41. "Being a Truthful Adventure," NA IX (7 September 1911), 450.
42. Ibid., 451–2.
43. G. K. Chesterton, "A Shriek of Warning. Part II," NA V (29 April 1909), 9, 8.
44. Chesterton, "A Shriek of Warning. Part II," 8.
45. A. R. Orage, Notes of the Week, NA VIII (9 February 1911), 339.
46. A. R. Orage, Notes of the Week, NA VII (1 September 1910), 409.
47. D. Triformis [Beatrice Hastings], "Feminism and the Franchise," NA VI (3 March 1910), 415, 416.
48. Beatrice Tina [Beatrice Hastings], letter, NA V (27 May 1909), 103.
49. "Lady McLaren's Charter," NA VI (7 April 1910), 533, 532.
50. Teresa Billington-Grieg, "Emancipation in a Hurry. I.," NA VIII (12 January 1911), 246, 247.
51. Ibid., 247.