

LEONARD WOOLF AS AN ARCHITECT OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS

by Janet M. Manson

© 2007 Clemson University

Leonard S. Woolf began his political and literary activities on behalf of the League of Nations as a result of his friendships, associations, membership in the Bloomsbury Group,¹ and work with socialists (especially the Fabians) and other intellectuals. In fact, members of the Bloomsbury Group and their associates worked so closely with one another in many ways that it is not really possible to examine the activities of one member without exploring his or her work with fellow members, their friends, and associates. This is especially true of Woolf's work on the League. Bloomsbury Group members and many of their friends first met when most of them were students at Cambridge University between 1897 and 1902. Former students who were members include Leonard Woolf, art critic Clive Bell, economist John Maynard Keynes, the writer E. M. (Edward Morgan) Forster, and the biographer Lytton Strachey. These friends became even closer when Clive Bell and Leonard Woolf married the sisters of their Cambridge classmate, Thoby Stephen. Clive married Vanessa, who was an artist, and Leonard married Virginia, who was a literary critic and, at that time, yet a budding novelist. Other Cambridge associates, especially classics professor Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson and Sydney Waterlow, a former student who became a diplomat, worked to make the League a reality. Moreover, Leonard's Cambridge friends became activists for various causes, and they, and/or their relatives and friends, participated in a wide range of literary, political, and social activities with Woolf. In 1923, for example, Leonard became the literary editor of the *Nation and Athenaeum*, which was owned by Keynes.²

Prominent Fabian Socialists Sidney and Beatrice Webb, who had helped forge the Labour Party from socialist and working-class elements in 1900, recruited Leonard in late 1914 to early 1915 to write a report on international government for the Labour Party. Even before then, he had put his talents as a political writer and liberal activist to good use working alongside Margaret Llewelyn Davies in the Women's Cooperative Guild.³ As Sybil Oldfield points out, Leonard favorably impressed the Webbs with an article for the Guild about the working conditions of female mill workers that appeared in *The New Statesman* in 1913. Indeed, Llewelyn Davies not only became an important mentor to Leonard by introducing him to Labour Party leaders such as James Keir Hardie and James Ramsay MacDonald, but she also cared for both Woolfs during Virginia's first breakdown after their marriage.⁴

Leonard notes in *Beginning Again* that the Webbs also liked another piece that he wrote for the *Manchester Guardian*. They "thought as well of me as they had thought of my article [on the Newcastle Congress of the Women's Guild] and they got me to join the Fabian Society" in early 1913. "This led . . . to my doing work for the Fabians and for the *New Statesman*. . . ."⁵ As Leonard observes in retrospect, his work on the causes of World War I and ways to prevent future war began with a report for the Fabians. He says: "What started me on this was that in 1915 Sidney Webb asked me whether I would undertake



a research into this vast question for the Fabian Society and write a report on it, which might or might not be published as a book⁶ Despite the advice of friends, including John Maynard Keynes who thought that the project was pointless and who joined others in arguing that arbitration alone could preserve international peace, Leonard agreed to write the report. He wrote it in conformity with Fabian Society procedure which required that the report be submitted to a committee for review.⁷ Thus, Woolf began his work with the Fabian Society Research Bureau, which was established under the guidance of Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and with the Bureau's organ the *New Statesman*, which was created under the auspices of the Webbs and George Bernard Shaw in 1912-13. Sidney Webb oversaw Woolf's report as committee chair, and G. B. Shaw, who was the chairman of the Research Department, joined by John C. Squire and other committee members, contributed.⁸ However, Leonard was given assurances by the committee that it "would be a mere formality; [he] should be completely free to proceed in [his] own way, say exactly what [he] liked, and, if the book were published, it would be over [his] name."⁹ Moreover, the Fabians agreed to pay Leonard 100 for his work—a sum donated for the study by a Quaker businessman, Joseph Rowntree, at the request of Beatrice Webb. It is obvious from Duncan Wilson's account of Woolf's work on the report that the Fabian committee members, especially the Webbs, took their work very seriously, too.¹⁰ Both Webbs wrote letters of instruction about the project to Leonard over several months. Sidney Webb worked most directly with Woolf, however.¹¹ Woolf recalled that he "worked like a fanatical or dedicated mole" on the report;¹² these efforts were rewarded with the committee's acceptance of the first draft in April 1915.¹³

Furthermore, the Research Department's satisfaction with the report was such that in May it hosted a conference near Keswick to examine an international judicial system based on Woolf's blueprint. Among the numerous attendees were leaders in the new League of Nations movement such as Leonard's Cambridge University mentor G. Lowes Dickinson, John A. Hobson, E. Richard Cross (a Quaker and business manager for the *Nation*), and Raymond Unwin who were members of the Bryce Group.¹⁴ Sidney Webb passed on to Woolf suggestions for revising the blueprint along with the news that "[w]e have just ended a most successful, and I think, fruitful conference, in which your Memo, and the draft scheme has been very generally approved."¹⁵ Leonard would have been guided by these suggestions as he revised the first report for the Fabian Society entitled "An International Authority and the Prevention of War."¹⁶ He then collaborated with Sidney Webb in writing another commissioned report for the Fabians, a draft treaty designed to prevent war. As was the case with many projects from the Fabian Society Research Department, these reports were destined to become Special Supplements of the *New Statesman*, and they were published as such by about mid July 1915.¹⁷ According to Henry Winkler, G. B. Shaw edited the supplements.¹⁸ After minor revisions, both reports were transformed into parts I and III of Woolf's book *International Government* which was published by the Fabians in 1916. Part II of the book covered a wide range of international issues including health, labor, and commerce. Indeed, his wife Virginia assisted with the project by gathering material on labor and commerce.¹⁹

When on July 23, 1915, Clifford Sharp, the editor of the *New Statesman* contacted Woolf to request that he write an article on foreign affairs for the journal, Woolf realized that this meant that he had become recognized as an authority on the subject, which was,

in fact, the case.²⁰ *International Government* emphasizes the importance of cooperation within the international community to prevent war—a fundamental goal of human society since antiquity. Woolf’s proposal for international government uses the long-established history of cooperation within the international community, especially in matters of trade and finance, to make the point that this tradition cannot be preserved unless nation states adopt an international collective security organization to deal with rogue states that use force as an instrument of foreign policy and thereby threaten world peace. However, the proposal is a pragmatic one in that it acknowledges the sovereignty of member states and does not address the question of disarmament because nation states would not easily surrender either sovereignty or arms, let alone both. Moreover, defensive war is permissible.²¹ Law, particularly law implemented through international government, would maintain peace. “The alternative to war is law,” Woolf states.²² The major organs of this international government are the Secretariat, which would administer and coordinate government functions; the International Council of member states, which would codify international law, seek ways to resolve international disputes, and appoint officials to the Secretariat and the International High Court; and the International High Court, which would adjudicate a wide variety of international disputes. The organization would maintain international peace, in part, by referring all justiciable disputes to the High Court, a permanent international court of justice that would have the authority to enforce its decisions through a range of penalties, including economic and political sanctions and, as a last resort, the use of military force by member states against a “recalcitrant state.” It is clear that Woolf intended the court to have far-reaching powers because a majority of member states could refer cases to the court, and it would decide the scope of its own jurisdiction.²³

As an extensive proposal for an international collective security organization, *International Government* was the first work of this kind to be widely read and to receive the close attention of the British Foreign Office. Woolf was surprised and upset to learn that Fabian Research Department Chairman G. B. Shaw, on his own initiative, had written a preface for the American edition of the book. Leonard wanted to establish himself as a political writer without being cast in the shadow of Shaw’s literary reputation, so the book was published in England without the preface. Still, Shaw not only had his American publisher, Brentano, print this edition with his own preface, praising Woolf’s work, but Shaw had even paid for some of the production expenses. Because of its importance at the time, *International Government* quickly appeared in French and German editions, too.²⁴ In fact, the book is recognized as an important and influential study of the feasibility of international government.²⁵

Leonard’s political activism during this period also included his work in various organizations committed to developing and promoting the League concept. In early 1915, Woolf worked with G. Lowes Dickinson, John A. Hobson, Willoughby H. Dickinson, Raymond Unwin, and H. N. (Henry Noel) Brailsford to establish the League of Nations Society in order to publicize the importance and need for a League. An early proponent of the League of Nations, Lowes Dickinson possibly gave the organization its name.²⁶ League of Nations Society members included pacifists Lowes Dickinson, Woolf, Hobson, Willoughby H. Dickinson, and H. G. (Herbert George) Wells, as well as Lord Shaw of Dunfermline (Thomas Shaw, a lawyer who served in various judicial appointments, in-



cluding appointments in the House of Lords and the Privy Council).

Indeed, pacifism was such an important element in the Liberal Party when the war broke out that it split Prime Minister Herbert H. Asquith's coalition government to the point where radical Liberals, particularly Sir Charles P. Trevelyn, Arthur Ponsonby and Edmund Dene Morel (the editor of *Foreign Affairs*), took the lead in establishing the Union of Democratic Control (UDC). They worked alongside another Liberal and UDC member, Norman Angell, who became the intellectual nucleus of *War and Peace*, which was established to promote the UDC agenda. Labour Party member Ramsay MacDonald, Hobson (a pacifist) and Brailsford (an International Labour Party member) were other founding members of the UDC. Thus, UDC founders were primarily Liberals and Labourites. Although Woolf did not support all aspects of the UDC agenda, his political activism included membership in the organization, which adopted a peace program that provided for a post-war collective security organization to maintain peace and boundary settlements determined by popular sovereignty. The organization's guiding principle was that Parliament should control the direction of foreign policy. Although the UDC never did gain broad support for its objectives through its public education campaign, its members helped lay the groundwork for subsequent peace proposals that provided for a League of Nations.²⁷

Shortly after he joined the UDC, Lowes Dickinson decided to build broad support for a League by forming a study group that not only included UDC members such as Ponsonby and Hobson, but others including educators, journalists, and politicians, most notably the well-known diplomat, Lord James Bryce who had served as ambassador to the U.S. And, thus, the group became the Bryce Group in order to lend prestige to the cause. Lowes Dickinson, who was affectionately called "Goldie" by close friends, was the most active member of the group. He conferred frequently with his good friend Leonard Woolf on issues discussed by its members, and so this information proved useful to him as he drew his own League blueprint.²⁸

As a member of these various organizations, particularly the Fabian Society and the League of Nations Society (LNS), which promoted the league concept, Woolf participated in crucial discussions and conferences with intellectual and political leaders to hammer out what became the British position on the League of Nations. Leonard reports that he served on the executive committee of the League of Nations Society with the other founding members.²⁹ He also corresponded with Theodore Marburg, a former U.S. minister to Belgium and member of the League to Enforce Peace (LEP) which was the American counterpart of the League of Nations Society. Both organizations were particularly effective pressure groups because they successfully impressed their agenda on their respective governments. And the organizations consulted and conferred with one another to coordinate their proposals at critical points. (LEP members included Hamilton Holt and William Short of the New York Peace Society, Marburg, former U.S. President William Howard Taft, and professors Theodore Woolsey and George Grafton Wilson.)

Woolf's papers contain a couple of letters from Marburg with LEP draft proposals for the League organization and the definition of its powers. It is clear from this correspondence that Marburg and Woolf conferred on these subjects. For example, in his letter of September 28, 1917, Marburg requested that Woolf and the Fabians provide the LEP with suggestions for revising a tentative plan for the League organization; the LEP would



then submit the plan to the British Foreign Office (F.O.) with the assurance that Foreign Office experts would examine it closely and provide the LEP with comments on it. Marburg noted that the Foreign Office had also solicited League plans from other governments.³⁰ Woolf responded within a couple of months. And on January 28, 1918, Marburg thanked him for his suggestions and noted, in particular, that Section 81 of the revised plan “meets the defect that you point out in the old Convention by empowering both the Council of Conciliation and the International Court to summon a State to appear and answer a complaint.”³¹ Obviously, the Foreign Office did receive this revised plan because similar language appears in Section 81 of the “Tentative Draft for a League of Nations Based on the program of the League to Enforce Peace,” which the F.O. received in January 1918: “The Council of Conciliation and the International Court shall have power to summon a State of the League to appear and answer any complaint which has been filed.”³²

Undoubtedly, Leonard’s close friendship with key officials in the British Foreign Office brought his book, *International Government*, to the attention of the Undersecretary of Foreign Affairs during the war, Robert Cecil, a Conservative Party member who was a close friend of the Stephen family. Virginia affectionately dubs him “Lord Bob” in her letters.³³ Lord Bob and his wife, Nelly, were close friends of the Woolfs as were Cecil’s close associates—for example, his long-time friend Philip Noel-Baker, who served on Cecil’s secretarial staff at the Versailles Peace Conference in 1919, and Sydney Waterlow, who attended the peace conference as a Foreign Office staff member, not to mention their wives.³⁴

Cecil and other members of the British government were in contact with American officials, including Colonel Edward M. House, who served as special advisor to President Woodrow Wilson. Moreover, House was charged with drafting postwar policy in line with Wilson’s views.³⁵ By early 1918, Cecil and House began a discussion about the British plans for the League. Cecil informed House that the Phillmore Committee, named for its chair, the noted jurist Sir Walter Phillmore, had been formed to study plans to establish a League to maintain peace after the war and also invited the U.S. to collaborate with Britain on a League blueprint. Cecil closed the letter with this invitation: “I do not know whether your staff is also engaged on a similar task [like that of the Phillmore Committee], but if they are it has occurred to me that if we could establish cooperation, it would be a mutual benefit to us. If you share this view would you be inclined to let me know, for our confidential information, the lines on which you are working, and I will undertake to keep you similarly informed?”³⁶ According to Foreign Office records, the Phillmore Report was completed by July 3 and circulated to the Imperial War Cabinet later that month. In a handwritten note initialed “R.C.,” Robert Cecil suggested that the interim and final version of the Phillmore Report also be sent to France, Italy, Japan, and the U.S. “as soon as possible.” He added, “I think a conference of the chief allies should be called to consider this question & frame a policy.”³⁷ President Wilson notified the Foreign Office that his response to the Phillmore Report would be more extensive than Colonel House’s letter of June 24.³⁸

In the letter of June 24, House shared his personal views on the league with Cecil. House emphasized the importance of resolving international disputes through arbitration and recommended that nations that were “dissatisfied” with the arbitration settlement should appeal to the League. He also stated that League could use economic and political



sanctions against a state that resorted to war; force could also be used to maintain peace.³⁹ The brief notes that the two men exchanged in the next few days apparently convinced House that the U.S. and Britain were drawing closer to agreement on the League. He confided to Cecil that “I feel the only way in which we can avoid misunderstanding is by [a] frank interchange of views. I think you will find that the situation is now altered and we have arrived at a policy on which we are both agreed. I wrote you last week regarding [the] Phillimore report on [the] League of Nations. This is a subject to which I am personally devoting a good deal of attention and shall be happy exchanging views with you.”⁴⁰ Cecil responded at some length to House’s letter of June 24 by first acknowledging the merits of arbitration as a means of resolving international disputes; then he deftly reminded House of the key points of the Phillimore Report, which required nation states to submit their disputes to an international conference. Cecil closed with this handwritten endorsement of the Report: “I am in hopes that this Government will adopt the Phillimore Report as a basis of discussion with the allies.”⁴¹

During the summer and fall, Cecil continued to argue in favor of publishing the Phillimore Report in communications with the American government and in Imperial War Cabinet meetings. Lord Reading (Daniel Rufus Isaacs), who was the British High Commissioner and Ambassador on Special Mission to Washington, D.C., presented President Wilson’s position against publication to War Cabinet members in August and October. Wilson proposed that the British and American governments first craft a League plan to present to their allies, the Entente Powers, so that they could reach agreement on such a plan before the peace conference took place. He believed that if the Phillimore Report were published, it would “be regarded as having been issued under the aegis of the British Government” and would become the basis for discussion of the League. Prime Minister David Lloyd George opposed publication partly because of Wilson’s objections and partly because he feared that it would distract the people from the importance of winning the war. In conferences with Reading, President Wilson also had emphasized the importance of prosecuting the war first.⁴² In the meantime, Lord Reading was authorized to enter into discussions with Wilson so that both governments could resolve their differences on the League. Lord Cecil agreed to draft a memorandum outlining British policies as reflected in the Phillimore Report and identifying which points of the French Committee Report were acceptable to the British government and which were not. Cecil’s memorandum would guide Reading in the discussions.⁴³ Although the mission was later cancelled, both governments clearly wanted to reach an agreement on a League despite differences on form and substance.⁴⁴

Interestingly enough, Cecil’s correspondence with Colonel House and the Phillimore Report also served as the basis of the American plan for the League. Because President Wilson was occupied with the war, he instructed House in July to “rewrite the ‘constitution’ contained in that [i.e., the Phillimore] report: as you think it ought to be rewritten, along the lines of your recent letter [June 25] to Lord Robert Cecil.”⁴⁵ House worked with David Hunter Miller, who served on the Inquiry as a League expert, and consulted with Sir William Wiseman, who was the Chief of British Intelligence and was assigned as liaison officer to work with House, in drafting the League blueprint.⁴⁶ (Wiseman and House were also friends.) House reported to Wilson that, although the draft did not mention the Phillimore Report, “the two were compared and several of the Articles of the British were



incorporated as a whole.⁴⁷ Wilson then used most of the material from House's draft for his own blueprint, which he took to the peace conference. There are, however, some major differences between House's and Wilson's drafts.⁴⁸

The Phillimore Committee examined League proposals by a number of groups—namely, the Bryce Group, the British League of Nations Society, the American League to Enforce Peace, the Fabian Society, the Union of Democratic Control, and L'Organisation Centrale pour une Paix Durable (the Hague), as well as the writings of individuals, including G. Lowes Dickinson, John A. Hobson, and H. N. Brailsford. In the Interim Report, the Committee made general recommendations for international peace-keeping duties by a League of Nations that would prevent war. These recommendations relied on the established mechanisms for resolving international disputes, primarily arbitration, consultation among member states, and the use of economic sanctions and unspecified military measures against a member state that violates League articles on the avoidance of war. However, the Committee was reluctant to recommend any specific international, governmental structure.⁴⁹

Lord Phillimore wrote the sixteen-page appendix to the Phillimore Committee's Final Report, which is entitled "Recent Schemes of Federation." This section of the report discusses some of the major features of League plans circulated by the organizations and individuals that the Committee examined. As noted previously, Leonard Woolf worked in collaboration with friends and fellow political activists on League plans for the Fabian Society, the Union of Democratic Control, and the League of Nations Society—plans that were studied by the Phillimore Committee. Moreover, two of Woolf's works, *International Government* (1916) and *The Framework for a Lasting Peace* (1917), are cited in the appendix.⁵⁰ The three and a half pages that are devoted to a discussion of the Fabian Society plan are introduced with the following credit: "A work of some importance entitled *International Government* has been published by this Society. It contains two reports (Parts I and II) by Mr. L. S. Woolf, and a project (Part III) by a Fabian committee 'for a Supernational Authority that will Prevent War.'"⁵¹ This section of the appendix describes some of the most important features of the proposal set forth in *International Government*, including a brief description of the organs of government: the Secretariat, International Council of states, and the International High Court. Lord Phillimore focused primarily on Woolf's conceptions of international law and government and the structure and authority of the International Council and the International High Court. In fact, this is the only plan the structure of which is examined in some detail in the appendix. In his discussion of the other League plans, Lord Phillimore primarily chose to focus on mechanisms that would prevent international disputes from occurring and on an international judicial system.⁵²

Various accounts of negotiations in January 1919 over the League Covenant at Versailles describe Robert Cecil's meetings with members of the American delegation, particularly Colonel House, President Wilson, David Hunter Miller, and Secretary of State Robert Lansing. Cecil brought a League blueprint with him. William Wiseman, a member of the British delegation, delivered the blueprint to Colonel House, who then passed it on to President Wilson so that he could discuss it with Cecil.⁵³ The blueprint that he discussed with American representatives provided for a secretariat, an international council of states, and an international court of justice. Moreover, David Hunter Miller reports that "[t]he basis for the provisions of the Cecil draft regarding the settlement of interna-



tional disputes was the Phillimore Plan, which, as I have shown, had also been taken over in substance by [South African Prime Minister, General Jan C.] Smuts in his draft and by [President] Wilson in his latest draft.”⁵⁴ Clearly, British study groups with which Leonard Woolf had closely worked influenced the League Covenant as it took shape.

Colonel House was also supplied with a copy of Woolf’s *International Government* by the U.S. Naval Headquarters in London with this note on the book’s usefulness: “Mr. L. S. Woolf has collated in a most scholarly way, a mass of data carefully sifted of experiences and precedents for international government which may prove of use to you as a scaffolding.”⁵⁵ Indeed, the most recent in-depth study of Woolf’s work notes that *International Government* “bears a close resemblance to the League Covenant.”⁵⁶

In *Beginning Again*, Leonard provides his own account of how the British Foreign Office “discovered” *International Government*:

The two reports which I had written and our draft treaty were published by me in a book, *International Government*, in 1916. It had, I think, some effect; it was used extensively by the government committee which produced the British proposals for a League of Nations laid before the Peace Conference, and also by the British delegation to the Versailles Conference. My authority for this statement comes from Sir Sydney Waterlow, Philip Noel-Baker, who was secretary, and Lord Cecil, who was head of the League of Nations Section of the British Delegation. Sydney Waterlow was in the Foreign Office and in 1918 he was instructed to draw up a confidential paper on “International Government under the League of Nations” for use by the British Delegation at Versailles. He gave me a copy. In the prefatory note he said: “The facts contained in Part I are taken almost entirely from “International Government,” by L. S. Woolf (1916). Where a mass of facts has been collected and sifted with great ability, as is the case with Mr. Woolf’s work, it would be folly to attempt to do the work over again, especially as time presses. My detailed descriptions of the various existing organs of international government are therefore for the most part lifted almost verbatim, with slight abridgements, from Mr. Woolf’s book.”⁵⁷

Waterlow’s Prefatory Note and his condensation of some of the main points of *International Government* are in the Leonard Woolf Papers at the University of Sussex Library. Waterlow’s confidential paper primarily outlines the League structure as set forth by Woolf in his book.⁵⁸ In a special obituary for Woolf that was published in *The Times* (London), Philip Noel-Baker pays tribute to his friend’s contribution to the birth of the League and corroborates Waterlow’s account of events:

Waterlow’s enthusiasm [for *International Government*] was aroused; he condensed the book into a brilliant F.O. “print” laying emphasis on Woolf’s vision of the scope for international cooperation over labour conditions, public health, transport, economic and social policy, etc. Lord (Robert) Cecil, the head of the section, was deeply impressed by the “print,” and incorporated virtually the whole of Woolf’s ideas into the British Draft Covenant which he gave to [American president] Woodrow Wilson in Paris. Woolf thus played an important part



in giving concrete form to the general ideas about a League then current, and in particular in launching the conception of the League's technical, social, economic and financial work, which has developed into a dozen U.N. Agencies, from the I.L.O. [International Labor Organization] and the International Bank to the World Meteorological Organisation.⁵⁹

Noel-Baker also mentions the influence that Woolf's work had on the formation of the United Nations partly because he knew that Woolf supported the creation of that organization.

In sum, Leonard Woolf's early political activities with Margaret Llewelyn Davies and with Sidney and Beatrice Webb drew him into work that ultimately led him into Labour Party politics; and this is particularly true of his role in the creation of the League of Nations and a new world order after World War I. Woolf acknowledges that his entry to Labour Party politics resulted, in part, from an invitation, in the latter years of World War I, to join the editorial board of Norman Angell's monthly magazine *War and Peace*.⁶⁰ Woolf also joined forces with Lowes Dickinson and others to establish the League of Nations Union, an influential organization formed across party lines in 1918; Robert Cecil became the chairman of the organization.⁶¹ And when the Seven Universities Democratic Association invited Leonard to represent that constituency in the parliamentary elections of 1918-22, he agreed to do so once Sidney Webb assured him of Labour Party support.⁶² Woolf was also pleased that his candidacy was sure to annoy the incumbent Herbert (H.A.L.) Fisher, who was first cousin to Woolf's wife but also, as Leonard declared, "the kind of respectable Liberal who made respectable liberalism stink in the nostrils of so many of my generation who began their political lives as liberals."⁶³ At this point, Leonard began his twenty-five-year-plus tenure as the secretary of the Labour Party Advisory Committee on International Questions, a key position that assured that he would continue to be an important force in shaping Labour Party foreign policy in the postwar world.⁶⁴

Notes

1. See S. P. Rosenbaum, ed., *The Bloomsbury Group: A Collection of Memoirs, Commentary and Criticism* (1975; reprint, Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1977), ix-xi, for information about the group that came together in 1920 as a discussion group, initially known as the Memoir Club, and its makeup. Clearly, this group of friends included some of the most influential men and women of the late 19th to early 20th centuries in diverse fields such as art, literature, and politics.
2. Wayne K. Chapman, "'Ls Dame Secretaire': Alix Strachey, the Hogarth Press and Bloomsbury Pacifism, 1917-1960," in *Women in the Milieu of Leonard and Virginia Woolf: Peace, Politics, and Education*, eds. Wayne K. Chapman and Janet M. Manson (New York: Pace University Press, 1998), 46.
3. Leonard Sidney Woolf to Beatrice Webb, 21 December 1914. Leonard Woolf, *Letters of Leonard Woolf*, ed. Frederic Spotts (New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1989), 384. See also Duncan Wilson, *Leonard Woolf: A Political Biography* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1978), 62-3; Henry R. Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement in Great Britain* (1952; reprint, New Jersey: Scarecrow Reprint Corporation, 1967), 7.
4. Sybil Oldfield, "Margaret Llewelyn Davies and Leonard Woolf," in *Women in the Milieu of Leonard and Virginia Woolf: Peace, Politics, and Education*, eds. Wayne K. Chapman and Janet M. Manson (New York: Pace University Press, 1998), especially 5-6. See also Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 50-54 on Leonard Woolf's work for the Women's Cooperative Guild. Keith Laybourn, *A Century of Labour: A History of the Labour*

- Party* (Sparkford, England: Sutton Publishing Limited, 2000), 1-2.
5. Leonard Woolf, *Beginning Again: An Autobiography of the Years 1911-1918* (1964; reprint, London: The Hogarth Press, 1972), 114.
 6. *Ibid.*, 183.
 7. *Ibid.*, 184.
 8. Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 58, 62; Patricia Pugh, *Educate, Agitate, Organize: 100 Years of Fabian Socialism* (1984; reprint, London: Methuen, 1987), 124-27; Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 184; Leonard Sidney Woolf to Lytton Strachey, 8 February 1915, *Letters of Leonard Woolf*, 384-5.
 9. Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 184; Beatrice Webb to Leonard Sidney Woolf, 21 January 1915, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, *The Letters of Sidney and Beatrice Webb*. ed. Norman Mackenzie. Vol. III, *Pilgrimage 1912-1947* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), 48-9.
 10. Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 60-3; Pugh, *Educate*, 129. See also Beatrice Webb to Leonard Sidney Woolf, 16 December 1914, Webb, *Letters*, 3: 45-6. Joseph Rowntree owned a confectionery business that produced candy and beverages. Rowntree family members tended to be Liberals who supported pacifist causes. Marvin Swartz, *The Union of Democratic Control in British Politics During the First World War* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), 22, 93-4, 186-7. See Wayne K. Chapman, "Leonard Woolf and the Rowntree Political Monthlies, 1916-1922: With the Irish Rebellion as a Case in Point," *The South Carolina Review* 34 (Fall 2001): 175-77 for information on the Rowntrees' role in publishing political journals.
 11. Webb, *Letters*, 3: 46-9, 53-6, 65-6, 103; Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 63 n.10.
 12. Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 185. Woolf faced a number of personal crises as he worked on the project. Virginia suffered a serious mental breakdown in February 1915 which incapacitated her for months. Indeed, the war had deeply affected the Woolfs. Most of their friends and some relatives, including Adrian Stephen, Clive Bell, and Duncan Grant, were conscientious objectors. Four of Leonard's five brothers served in the military, and two of them became casualties in 1916. Philip was wounded, and Cecil was killed in France. Leonard was unable to serve because of an inherited nervous tremor that was aggravated by stress. See also *ibid.*, 176-83; Virginia Woolf, *The Diary of Virginia Woolf*, ed. Anne Olivier Bell, vol.1: *1915-1919* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), 39. For more information on conscientious objectors who were friends and relatives see Wayne K. Chapman and Janet M. Manson, "Carte and Tierce: Leonard, Virginia and War for Peace," *Virginia Woolf and War: Fiction, Reality, and Myth*, ed. Mark Hussey (New York: Syracuse University Press, 1991), 69; Jonathan Atkin, *A War of Individuals: Bloomsbury Attitudes to the Great War* (Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 2002), especially 23, 31.
 13. Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 63.
 14. Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement*, 7-8. Shortly after the war broke out, Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson took steps to establish a pro-league organization called the Bryce Group after its most prominent member Lord James Bryce. E. M. Forster, *Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson* (1934; reprint, New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), 163-64; George W. Egerton, *Great Britain and the Creation of the League of Nations: Strategy, Politics, and International Organization, 1914-1919* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1978), 7-9. See also Pugh, *Educate*, 129.
 15. Sidney Webb to Leonard Sidney Woolf, 25 May 1915, Webb, *Letters*, 3: 55.
 16. See Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement*, 7-8.
 17. Chapman, "L.'s Dame Secretaire," 36; Margaret Cole, *The Story of Fabian Socialism* (London: Heinemann Educational Books, Ltd., 1961), 157.
 18. Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement*, 8.
 19. For an account of Virginia's contribution see Chapman, "L.'s Dame Secretaire," 36.
 20. Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 186. See also Pugh, *Educate*, 3,5-7, 126-27. Sharp was a dedicated Fabian and the son-in-law of Hubert Bland, one of the Fabian Society's founding members. Moreover, Sharp was the first editor of the *New Statesman* and served in that capacity from 1913-31.
 21. Leonard Woolf, *International Government: Two Reports by L. S. Woolf Prepared for the Fabian Research Department, Together with a Project by a Fabian Committee for a Supernational Authority That Will Prevent War* (London: The Fabian Society and George Allen and Unwin, 1916), 81-3, 231-3.
 22. *Ibid.*, 232; see also 53-5.
 23. *Ibid.*, 236-38, 245-50, 253-5. Except for the inclusion of the International High Court in this blueprint for international government, the similarities between its structure and that of the League of Nations and the United Nations is striking. Woolf's model, for example, provides for a Council of the Great Powers (Austria-Hungary, the British Empire, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Russia, and the United States) that would deal with questions, claims or disputes arising among them, as well as other international govern-



- ment business. This model is complex in many ways.
24. Egerton, *Great Britain*, 16; Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement*, 14-16; Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 123; Chapman, "L.'s Dame Secretaire," 36.
 25. Peter Wilson, *The International Theory of Leonard Woolf: A Study in Twentieth Century Idealism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003), 53-8. Although Wilson does place Woolf within the context of modern political theory, *The International Theory of Leonard Woolf* is a flawed study because Woolf was not a political theorist as Wilson assumes. And, unfortunately, Wilson has restricted his study primarily to Woolf's published writings and neglected the vast body of unpublished letters, committee reports, and memos that Woolf wrote that document the development of his political philosophy. See Janet M. Manson, review of *The International Theory of Leonard Woolf: A Study in Twentieth Century Idealism* by Peter Wilson, in *Woolf Studies Annual* No. 10 (2004): 383-86. See also Alfred Zimmern, *The League of Nations and the Rule of Law, 1918-35* (London: Macmillan, 1945), 171-2. Zimmern was a contemporary of Woolf's who served in the Political Intelligence Department, the League of Nations Section, of the Foreign Office in 1918.
 26. Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 190-91; Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement*, 16. E. M. Forster in *Goldsworthy Lowes Dickinson* (1934; New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), 162-5, notes how the war affected Dickinson. His colleague Bertrand Russell lost his lectureship at Cambridge and was "convicted under the Defence of the Realm Act" for his opposition to the war in 1916. Most of the male students left Cambridge to join the war effort and were replaced by female students. Both Russell and Dickinson joined the Union for Democratic Control. In 1920, Dickinson also left academia to work for peace. Atkin, *A War of Individuals*, 18-21.
 27. Swartz, *The Union of Democratic Control*, 11-18, 21-2, 41-3; Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 58, 92; Egerton, *Great Britain*, 5, 53; Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement*, 23-4; Henry R. Winkler, "The Development of the League of Nations Idea in Great Britain, 1914-1919," *The Journal of Modern History* 20 (June 1948): 106. Wilson (58-9, 93) notes that the UDC initially wanted to transform foreign policy, whereas Woolf supported the gradualist approach of the Fabians in crafting a postwar policy. For example, Woolf argued that existing institutions, such as the International Postal Union and the International Court, could be used in the formation of an international government. See also Henry R. Winkler, "The Emergence of a Labor Foreign Policy in Great Britain, 1918-1929," *The Journal of Modern History* 28 (1956): 249. Keith Laybourn, in *A Century of Labour*, 12-24, discusses the complex relationship between the Liberal and Labour parties and the factors that led to the decline of the Liberal Party and the rise of the Labour Party in the early 20th century, noting that there is much debate over which factors were most decisive in transforming these parties and their role in government. Nevertheless, he concludes that the war divided the Liberal Party between the followers of party leaders Herbert Asquith and David Lloyd George (166; see also 15, 36).
 28. Egerton, *Great Britain*, 8; Winkler, *The League of Nations Movement*, 16; Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 82-3; Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 190-1.
 29. Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 191.
 30. Theodore Marburg to Leonard S. Woolf, 28 September 1917; this is a cover letter for a 13-page draft document entitled "League to Enforce Peace: A Tentative Plan for Organization (A Tentative Study by a Private Group—not a Committee of the League—Revised to Date June 28, 1917)," University of Sussex Library, Manuscript Section, Leonard Woolf Papers, I.F.4.
 31. Theodore Marburg to Leonard S. Woolf, 28 January, 1918; a draft proposal dated December 15, 1917, was enclosed with this letter, University of Sussex Library, Manuscript Section, Leonard Woolf Papers, I.F.4.
 32. "Tentative Draft Convention for a League of Nations Based on the program of the League to Enforce Peace" (Uncompleted Study by a Private Group, not a Committee of the League, revised to December 15, 1917. Criticisms are invited by the chairman of the group, Theodore Marburg, 14 W. Mt. Vernon Place Baltimore U.S.A.). Public Record Office, London. FO371/3439, 27.
 33. Virginia Woolf, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*, eds. Nigel Nicolson and Joanne Trautmann. Vol. 6, *1936-1941* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1980), 87. Virginia's father, Sir Leslie Stephen, was the editor of *The Dictionary of National Biography* and one of the most influential intellectuals of the Victorian period. Sir Leslie and his wives Harriet M. Thackeray, who died in 1875, and Julia Jackson Duckworth, who was the mother of Thoby, Virginia, Vanessa, and Adrian, were closely linked to intellectual and literary circles through marriage and friendship. Thus, the Cecils, George Meredith, Henry James, Thomas Hardy, James Russell Lowell, and Frederic W. Maitland were among family friends and visitors to the Stephen home. Noel Annan, *Leslie Stephen: The Godless Victorian* (New York: Random House, 1984), 4-5, 98-9; V. Woolf, *Diary*, 1: xix-xxi. Cecil became undersecretary for foreign affairs in 1916 during Sir Ed-

ward Grey's tenure as foreign minister and then continued to serve in that capacity when Arthur J. Balfour, who was a cousin of Cecil's, took over as foreign minister later that year. Robert Cecil, *A Great Experiment: An Autobiography* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1941), 60, n.1. Robert Cecil, *All the Way* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949), 192.

34. Cecil, *Experiment*, 66, 105. Irene Noel was a friend of Virginia's before she married Philip Baker, a Quaker and an Olympic medal winner who became a diplomat. Sydney Waterlow attended Cambridge University with Leonard Woolf and Virginia's brother Thoby. Waterlow later became one of Virginia's suitors; he remained close friends with Leonard and Virginia after their marriage. Virginia Woolf, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*, eds. Nigel Nicolson and Joanne Trautmann, vol. 3: 1923-1928 (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), 147n; V. Woolf, *Diary*, 1: 6.
35. See Charles Seymour, *The Intimate Papers of Colonel House*. Vol. 4, *The Ending of the War, June, 1918-August, 1919* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1928), 3-8 for a description of Wilson's views on the League of Nations and House's role in shaping postwar policy. Charles Seymour served on the American delegation to the Versailles Conference.
36. Robert Cecil to Edward M. House, 16 February 1918. Public Record Office, London. F.O. 371/4365. A copy of the letter is also in Seymour, *House Papers*, 4: 8-9.
37. Robert Cecil's note of July 1918 attached to the Final Report of the Phillimore Committee, Public Record Office, London. F.O. 371/3439.
38. Notes from a telegram from Washington, 23 July 1918. Colonel House's letter of June 24 was circulated within the Foreign Office but was designated as a "private paper." Public Record Office, London. F.O. 371/3439.
39. Edward M. House to Robert Cecil, 24 June 1918. Public Record Office, London. F.O. 371/4365.
40. Edward M. House to Robert Cecil 13 July 1918. Public Record Office, London. F.O. 371/4365. This note was probably sent by cable because it was written in response to Cecil's cable of July 8.
41. Robert Cecil to Edward M. House, 22 July 1918. Public Record Office, London. F.O. 371/4365.
42. Imperial War Cabinet 481, 9 Minutes of 2 October 1918. Public Record Office, London, CAB 23/8; Imperial War Cabinet 457, 8 Minutes of 13 August 1918. Public Record Office, London, CAB 23/7.
43. Imperial War Cabinet 481, 9 Minutes of 2 October 1918. Public Record Office, London, CAB 23/8.
44. Egerton, *Great Britain*, 76-9. The author notes some of the points of disagreement between the United States and Britain.
45. Seymour, *House Papers*. 4: 22. This letter, dated June 25, is identical to the letter from House to Cecil dated June 24 that is in the Foreign Office files (F.O. 371/4365). In a letter to Cecil, Wiseman explained in some detail President Wilson's decision to delegate the task of drafting a League plan to House. Wiseman reported that "[Wilson] himself claims to have a 'single-track' mind, by which he means that he can only deal with one problem at a time. At present, as you will readily understand, every moment is taken up with the actual problems of the war." William Wiseman to Robert Cecil, 18 July 1918, Public Record Office, London, F.O. 800/249.
46. *Ibid.*, 23. See also David Hunter Miller, *The Drafting of the Covenant*, Vol. 1 (London and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928), 12-17. David Hunter Miller and William Wiseman served on their respective countries' delegations at the Versailles Peace Conference. In 1917, President Wilson formed the Inquiry, a group of experts from various fields, to draft a comprehensive plan for the postwar settlement.
47. Edward M. House to President Woodrow Wilson, 14 July 1918. Seymour, *House Papers*. 4:24.
48. *Ibid.*, 22,27, 36-8; Miller, *Drafting the Covenant*, 1: 15-17; Peter Raffo, "The Anglo-American Preliminary Negotiations for a League of Nations," *Journal of Contemporary History* 9 (1974), 164-5.
49. The Committee on the League of Nations, Interim Report, 20 March 1918, 4-7, Public Record Office, London, F. O. 371/3439. The final draft of the Phillimore Report does not repeat these recommendations; rather it refers the reader to the "Interim Report." The Committee of the League of Nations, Final Report, 3 July 1918, "Introductory," 1, Public Record Office, London, F.O. 371/3439. Copies of the Interim Report and the Final Report of the Phillimore Committee are also in Philip Noel-Baker's files. Public Record Office, London, F.O. 800/249. See Egerton, *Great Britain*, 65-9 for a discussion of the recommendations on peace-keeping contained in the Phillimore Report.
50. Lord Phillimore, "Appendix: Recent Schemes of Federation," in The Committee of the League of Nations, Final Report, 3 July 1918, 8-24, Public Record Office, London, F.O. 371/3439.
51. *Ibid.*, 12.
52. *Ibid.*, 8-24. Leonard Woolf's *The Framework of a Lasting Peace* reproduces proposals for international government by various organizations, including the Dutch Commission.

53. Seymour, *House Papers*, 4: 287-90, especially 289-90, Edward M. House to Woodrow Wilson, 19 January 1919. See also Cecil, *Experiment*, 63-4; David Hunter Miller, "The Making of the League of Nations," in *What Really Happened at Paris: The Story of the Peace Conference, 1918-1919 by American Delegates*, eds. Edward M. House and Charles Seymour (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), 402-4; Robert Lansing, *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative* (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1921), 88-92; Egerton, *Great Britain*, chapter 4, especially 114-17; Raffo, "The Anglo-American Preliminary Negotiations," 166-67.
54. Miller, *Drafting the Covenant*, 1: 51. Miller notes that Cecil's drafts of January 14 and 16 are similar in many ways. Copies of Cecil's drafts are in David Hunter Miller, *The Drafting of the Covenant*, Vol. 2 (London and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1928), 61-4, 106-16. Representation by League member states in a General Conference and the Great Powers in a Council were important subjects of negotiations between British and American officials. American officials believed that British plans allowed the Great Powers to exercise too much power within the League. Seymour, *House Papers*, 4:24; Lansing, *Peace Negotiations*, 88. For an account of negotiations between U.S. and British representatives, particularly Cecil, see Miller, *Drafting the Covenant*, 1: chapter 5, 52-55 and passim. There are a number of similarities between Leonard Woolf's proposal and the Cecil drafts. For example, Woolf's proposal did allow the Great Powers to exercise more power than other member states by providing for the establishment of two councils, an International Council composed of member states and a Great Power Council. A Great Power could reject decisions of the International Council that might "impair its independence or its territorial integrity, or . . . require any alteration of its internal laws." Woolf, *International Government*, 233.
55. As quoted in George Spater and Ian Parson, *A Marriage of True Minds: An Intimate Portrait of Leonard and Virginia Woolf* (New York and London: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977), 83. In 1946, Ian Parsons and Leonard Woolf merged their publishing operations, Chatto & Windus and the Hogarth Press, respectively.
56. Wilson, *The International Theory*, 54.
57. Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 188-89.
58. International Government Under the League of Nations. 3 January 1919. Signed S. P. Waterlow. Foreign Office/ P.C./019. University of Sussex Library, Manuscript Section, Leonard Woolf Papers, I.L.10. A copy of the first page of this document is in the Frederic Spotts Papers, Manuscripts Section, Smith College, Northampton, MA.
59. Philip Noel-Baker, "Mr. Leonard Woolf: Vision of International Cooperation," *London Times*, Thursday, 21 August 1969, 8f. See also L. Woolf, *Letters*, 286n.
60. Woolf, *Beginning Again*, 223-226; Chapman and Manson, "Carte and Tierce," 64.
61. Forster, *Dickinson*, 168-70; Cecil, *Experiment*, 104; Egerton, *Great Britain*, 90-2.
62. Wilson, *Leonard Woolf*, 129-30; Leonard Woolf, *Downhill All the Way: An Autobiography of the Years 1919 to 1939* (London: The Hogarth Press, 1970), 34-6; Virginia Woolf, *The Letters of Virginia Woolf*. eds. Nigel Nicolson and Joanne Trautmann. Vol. 2, 1912-1922 (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1976), 435.
63. Woolf, *Downhill*, 34. Woolf knew that he could not defeat the personable but superficial Fisher. As Wayne K. Chapman notes, the Woolfs were in fundamental disagreement with Fisher over his policies. He served in the Coalition Cabinet's Irish Committee, and Leonard believed that Fisher was at least partly responsible for the government's brutal Irish policies. Chapman, "Leonard Woolf and the Rowntree Political Monthlies," 178-9; see also V. Woolf, *Letters*, 2: 586.
64. Chapman, "Leonard Woolf and the Rowntree Political Monthlies," 176; Wilson, *The International Theory*, 3; Winkler, "Emergence of a Labour Foreign Policy," 248.