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Imperialism and Juvenile Literature, edited by Jeffrey Richards, shows a relationship between English children’s literature and the discourses of the British Empire. According to the book, the Empire needed children’s literature as a motivation to acquire its colonies. Martin Green’s chapter on Daniel Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe, for example, argues for the story’s importance in the acquisition of the colonies. In The Robinson Crusoe Story, Green develops his argument and claims that adventure stories such as Robinson Crusoe, R. L. Stevenson’s Treasure Island, and J. M. Barrie’s Peter Pan are closely related to imperialism. He observes that “we citizens of the white countries wanted to hear the Robinson Crusoe story”—a genre called robinsonade, examples of which had been produced by many other writers under the influence of Defoe—“told over and over again, because it fed an appetite deep in us, and it was the mythic fuel of our cultural engine” (3),¹ and that “though so influential, after 1900 the Robinson story was decadent in England” (154). Furthermore, Green indicates that Peter Pan both is and is not a 20th-century version of the Robinson Crusoe story; or rather, Peter Pan is not only an adventure story but also an anti-adventure story (154). While Green’s analysis of robinsonade is insufficient to explain the workings of the imperial
system, I agree with him that in *Peter Pan* "we find the most remarkable example of this delight in the decadence of adventure, combined with a sustained faith in real-life adventurers and with the empire they were still building" (155). Certainly, *Peter Pan*, set on the imaginary island Neverland, where the growth of the heroic boy Peter Pan is seen as problematic, implies that robinsonade as a teaching tool for imperialism does not play its traditional role. In short, *Peter Pan* marks the extreme point of robinsonade.

On the other hand, Fredric Jameson, in "Modernism and Imperialism," defines modernism as the end of realism or as a mode of imperialism that shows that "the structure of imperialism [...] makes its mark on the inner forms and structures of that new mutation in literary [...] language to which the term modernism is loosely applied" (44) and "the traces of imperialism [...] will be detected spatially, as formal symptoms, within the structure of First World modernist texts themselves" (64), taking E. M. Forster’s *Howards End* as a concrete example. According to Jameson, "what can be called the literature of imperialism," written by, for example, Henry Rider Haggard and Rudyard Kipling, "is by and large not modernist in any formal sense," and, "remained ‘minor’ or ‘marginal’ during the hegemony of the modern and its ideology and values" (43-44). That cause resides in the fact, Jameson argues, that since the West European countries rapidly advanced the imperialist policies after the Berlin Conference of 1884–85, it became especially difficult for the people to recognize the relationship between Britain and its colonies as an organic whole:
In that older period, from 1884 to World War I, the relationship of domination between First and Third World was masked and displaced by an overriding (and perhaps ideological) consciousness of imperialism as being essentially a relationship between First World powers or the holders of Empire, and this consciousness tended to repress the more basic axis of otherness, and to raise issues of colonial reality only incidentally. (48)

When Jameson's definition of modernism is organized in *Postmodernism*, it is observed that classical or market capitalism is realism, and that monopoly capitalism, or what V. I. Lenin called the stage of imperialism, is modernism (409-12).²

In other words, robinsonade is realism until *Peter Pan*, and *Peter Pan* turns into a fantasy that corresponds to the modernism that Jameson demonstrates or that reflects the representational impossibility of colonies. While robinsonade is a genealogy of realism, it becomes a fantasy in *Peter Pan* in response to the imperialism that Lenin defines as the highest stage of capitalism. It is symptomatic of the imperial problem (of finance capital) that its colonies are impossible to represent.

Then again, the imperialism Jameson presents is not colonialism of the kind Edward W. Said observes—"if one began to look for something like an imperial map of the world in English literature, it
would turn up with amazing insistence and frequency well before the mid-nineteenth century" (82-83). Said’s *Culture and Imperialism* succeeds in explaining a mode of imperialism and a (failed) representation of a colony in Jane Austin’s realist novel *Mansfield Park*, which is “implicated in the rationale for imperialist expansion” (84) and “affirms and repeats the geographical process of expansion involving trade, production, and consumption that predates, underlies, and guarantees the morality” (92-93). Yet, what Jameson argues is on a different level from this. In brief, in 19th-century colonialism, since the relationship of the mother country to the colony was that of man to merchandise, the novel could depict it. In 20th-century financial imperialism, however, that relationship is understood as the relationship with money, and moreover, this relationship of money cannot be represented by the realist novels, for it is not viewed as a straight line. That is imperialism as the highest stage of capitalism or as monopoly/finance capitalism. (As a matter of course, there are various opinions about when this imperialism emerges, yet, here, we will understand the end of realism that Jameson shows or the peak of robinsonade that Green observes as the birth of imperialism.)

The transition from 19th-century colonialism to 20th-century financial imperialism occurs very slowly and gradually. As a criterion, the Boer War of 1880–81 may seem to be the starting point, but this is only one standard. It can also be observed that its completion was attained after World War II, and that the transition itself continues up to the present day. What is important is that as a symptom of this gentle
shift, both the appearance of new liberalism and the maintenance of the Empire, for which the Boer War of 1899–1902 too would act as a trigger, take place. In other words, the traditional pattern of imperialism ending historically and sociologically in the Edwardian era is not observed, but rather the Edwardian culture (such as modernism, *Peter Pan*, and the domestic adventure story), different from the Victorian culture, nevertheless comes into being. And then, if we consider what this culture is, we will have to take into account (1) a new liberal criticism on colonialism; (2) the birth of the discourse of imperial maintenance; and (3), to argue about the relation between (1) and (2), the emergence of 20th-century financial imperialism.

What is characteristic of *Peter Pan* as a robinsonade fantasy? It depicts (1) the changing ideas about manhood, (2) the changing ideas about womanhood, and (3) the maintenance of the Empire. Fundamentally, robinsonade in the colonial period also worked as a method to teach readers about imperialism and the “right” manhood. Yet, the robinsonade in *Peter Pan* deserves praise for its portrayal of a protagonist who refuses to grow up, which is a character trait that was prevalent in modernist writing. We can observe that robinsonade has been useless for the developmental novel or bildungsroman, and to show the importance of being the eternal boy, *Peter Pan* has changed robinsonade into a fantasy. Womanhood also transforms for the purpose of balancing this boy with eternity. The former growth story, from the tomboy to the “angel in the house,” disappears, and Wendy appears as the motherly person that maintains and inherits home/the Empire.
Another chief point in this argument is that the problem of the switch from colonialism to (Leninite) imperialism, which arose in the periods of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, continues as that of financial imperialism centering on 20th-century USA. This is attested also by the fact that robinsonade survives in the 20th century. This imperialism had ironically been approved from the discourse of the new liberalism that attacked the former imperialism or colonialism.

Here, the recognition of freedom as innocence and the maintenance of the Empire become two sides of the same coin. *Peter Pan* expresses the thought of perpetually holding the colony built up in the imaginary island through the innocence of Peter (and by leveraging the motherhood of Wendy). The refusal of growth and the maintenance of innocence and the Empire are a line. The transformation of manhood, womanhood, and the investment of innocence in children would each be considered an example of what is to be called “sexual anarchy” at the turn of the century. What is behind them, nevertheless, is the change in the imperial management of its colonies, namely, the change in a mode of imperialist power.

The starting point of 20th-century American imperialism\(^6\) lies in early 20th-century critical discourses on colonialism, of which *Peter Pan* was the first. That is imperialism, which is hidden behind liberalism and which continues after the independence of the old colonies following World War II, and then which goes on in the form of both the North’s exploitation of the South and global poverty. Such a starting point exists in *Peter Pan*, where the imperialist system in the
absence of colonies or imperialism without colonies, which can be depicted only by fantasy, is represented. In other words, that is composed of (1) the innocent and liberal subject (the one who believes himself to be right in performing what he wants to do, and who considers what he performs to be not imperialism because imperialism is a relic of the past); (2) the innocent and motherly subject (the one who understands what she does as a woman, with the sole desire of helping Peter, is unrelated to imperialism); (3) the cathexis of the innocent subject (the one who approves of the lust of imperialism by doing that of the innocent child while desiring the innocent child, or, who loves Disney).

The aim of this dissertation is to examine the relationship between the changing nature of robinsonade and the emergence of modernism in the Edwardian era, 1901–1914, which was the golden age of British children's literature. The dissertation attempts two main analytical tasks: (1) to describe the shifting concepts of imperialism and liberalism and (2) to trace the aesthetic practices of canonical modernist writers and a canonical writer of juvenile literature. Chapters 1 and 3 emphasize the literary analysis of the canonical figures in modernism, D. H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf, whereas chapters 2 and 4 emphasize the analysis of a monumental work of juvenile literature by J. M. Barrie.

In chapters 1 and 3, I argue that the close relationship between the lifestyle and sexuality of Paul Morel in Lawrence's *Son and Lovers* and Martin Pargiter in Woolf's *The Years* has to do with the changing
discourses of British imperialism and liberalism by paying attention to Lawrence’s letter and Woolf’s *Mr Bennett and Mrs Brown* and her diary. Chapter 1 discusses *Sons and Lovers*, and chapter 3 considers *The Years*. In his letter, Lawrence writes that he was deeply impressed by Barrie’s *Tommy and Grizel*, the hero of which is considered to be the prototype for Peter Pan. Woolf observes in the former that “in or about December 1910 human character changed,” and in the latter writes that “Peter Pan, Barrie’s [sic] play […] was a great treat.” Both Lawrence’s and Woolf’s works reveal that it was appropriate for men of that period, including Paul and Martin, to stay as immature as Peter Pan. In other words, what Lawrence and Woolf try to do through Paul and Martin respectively is describe a new concept of life and sexuality that suits the Edwardian situation. *Sons and Lovers* and *The Years* take into account the changing notions and growth of that era.

In chapter 2, I address Barrie’s *Peter Pan* as a girls’ adventure story, and in chapter 4, I address it as a domestic adventure story. What is important in the reading of Barrie’s work is, I believe, the socio-cultural context in which the politics of sexuality and life are imagined: the new phase in the political imagination of the British Empire in the Edwardian era. In other words, I posit that the British Empire was not moving toward expansion but toward maintenance in the Edwardian socio-cultural discourse. Another main point is that the discourse of new liberalism effected changes not only in social policies, but also at the level of individual lifestyles, in which traditional femininity and masculinity, once employed to advocate empire-building,
grew increasingly irrelevant. As imperial subjects facing this situation, the children in *Peter Pan* are not able to accept the old Victorian idea that they should physically and mentally grow up. *Peter Pan* represents a new concept of growth through the children, including its hero. This is to be understood in not only the terms of the politics of sexuality and life but also the political discourse of the age.

Notes

1. On *Robinson Crusoe* and its meaning, Green observes, "*Robinson Crusoe* is one of the most important genres of that huge literary form, the adventure tale, historically speaking the most important of all our literary forms. For adventure in this sense was the literary reflection (and to some extent the inspiration, intensification, communication) of the expansive imperialist thrust of the white race, the nations of Europe" (1-2); "[*Robinson Crusoe*] is a story of *morally justified* imperialism. Crusoe starts with a desert island and a wrecked ship, two things of no use to anybody. But after a while, swimming to and fro between the two, he has sewn them together to make a valuable property. By the time he leaves it has become a colony, fit to belong to the British Empire" (23).

2. "One of the more commonly held stereotypes about the modern," Jameson observes, "has of course in general been that of its apolitical character, [...]", and, not least, its aestheticism and its ideological
commitment to the supreme value of a now autonomous Art as such.”

“None of these characterizations,” he continues, “strikes me as adequate or persuasive any longer; they are part of the baggage of an older modernist ideology which any contemporary theory of the modern will wish to scrutinize and to dismantle” (“Modernism and Imperialism” 45). For the institutionalization of modernism, see Jameson, *A Singular Modernity*, and Sinfield. It is also interesting and important that Said argues on modernism in *Culture and Imperialism*.

3. For the transformation of imperialism, see, for example, Mészáros, who demonstrates the history of imperialism as follows: “1. *Early modern colonial empire-building imperialism*, brought about through the expansion of some European countries in the relatively easily penetrable parts of the world; 2. *Redistributive* imperialism, *antagonistically contested by the major powers on behalf of their quasi-monopolistic corporations*, called by Lenin ‘the highest stage of capitalism,’ involving only a few real contenders, and some smaller survivors from the past hanging on to their coattails, coming to an end in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War” (50). About its transformation, I will explain in detail in the following chapters.

4. The new liberalism, which emerged at the period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, is the socio-political thought that contended the liberalist turn from “laissez faire,” which had been a fundamental principle of the classical liberalism, to collective “interventionism.” For the new liberalism, though it is to be detailed in the next chapters, see, for the time being, *The Crisis of Liberalism* by Hobson.
5. For the importance of the Boer War of 1899–1902—known as the Second Anglo-Boer War or the Second South African War—as a transitional phase of the Empire, see Stein and Magdoff and Smith, who respectively show that “As the time went on to the end of the nineteenth century and Victoria was over and the Boer war it began to be a little different in England. The daily island life was less daily and the owning everything outside was less owning” (46) and that “It has taken quite a bit of time for the United States, despite its overwhelming productive strength, to break through Britain’s preferred position as the world center of finance. And, significantly, the opportunities for accomplishing this were always associated with war. At first it was the Boer War” (*The Age of Imperialism* 81) and that “[T]he South African War [...] played a crucial part in the establishment of the reconstructed, modern states which exist today; and [...] contributed to the advance of capitalistic modes of social and economic organization within these states” (10-11). For this war, see also Hobson, *The War in South Africa*, and Arendt. I shall call it simply the Boer War in the chapters below.

6. This imperialism is presently called “Empire” by Hardt and Negri. Spivak observes the new political economic order or globalization as follows: “Rather than the end of imperialism [...] , globalization is a new stage of imperialism” (5).

7. For imperialism without colonies that is a dominating feature of the new imperialism, see Magdoof’s book of the same title, in which he considers this imperialism in relation to the end of colonialism.

8. For the new imperialism at present under the control of the USA,
see also Jameson's "Notes on Globalization as a Philosophical Issue," in which he explains the machinery of this imperialism and presumes it to be cultural imperialism or Americanization. In *Fairy Tale as Myth, Myth as Fairy Tale*, Zipes, too, uncovers the American imperialism hidden behind Disney's works (*Snow White*, *Cinderella*, *Sleeping Beauty*, and so on).

9. In regard to the end of the Edwardian era, like Trotter ("Kipling's England") and Powell, I will view not 1910 but 1914 as its end in this dissertation. For the golden age of British children literature, see, for example, Jonathan Rose.

10. Peter Pan, the eternal boy, first appeared in Barrie's *The Little White Bird* of 1902. *Peter Pan or the Boy Who Wouldn't Grow Up* was performed in London in 1904. *Peter Pan in Kensington Gardens*, the entire extraction of the place of Peter Pan from *The Little White Bird*, was published in 1906. The narrative version, which was titled *Peter and Wendy*, came out in 1911. *Peter Pan* had been popular among children and adults since its first performance, and statue of Peter Pan was erected in Kensington Gardens in 1912. The play version, whose title was the same as the stage adaptation, was published in 1928. *Peter Pan* became increasingly popularized by the animated cartoon version of 1953, produced by Walt Disney.

Let me briefly give a synopsis of *Peter Pan*. The story begins with the departure of the children. Wendy, John, and Michael live with their parents, a servant, and a nurse in Britain. Peter Pan, who never grows up to be an adult, takes them to Neverland. In Neverland, Peter
lives with a group of orphans known as the Lost Boys. The children live together and fight pirates. It ends with all the children except for Peter returning to Britain from Neverland after defeating the pirates. In Britain, they become adults; the boys find employment and Wendy marries and becomes a mother.

I would also add that the narrative version published in 1911, *Peter and Wendy*, is used as the main text in this dissertation.
Chapter 1
Empire and New Liberalism:
Anti-Bildungsroman of D. H. Lawrence and J. M. Barrie

D. H. Lawrence wrote that he had been deeply impressed by J. M. Barrie’s *Tommy and Grizel* (1900) in a letter in August 1910: “Do read Barrie’s [...] *Tommy and Grizel*. [...] [It’ll] help you [Jessie Chambers] to understand how it is with me. I’m in exactly the same predicament” (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence* 175). The hero in Barrie’s work is considered to be the prototype for Peter Pan, the figure of innocence who rejects growing up. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, in *Epistemology of the Closet* (1990), observes Lawrence’s “early identification with Barrie’s sexually irresolute character.” She argues that Lawrence found in Barrie’s work the example that made it possible to believe in non-growth at the period of sexual anarchy: “At the age of twenty-five, D. H. Lawrence was excited about the work of James M. Barrie. He felt it helped him understand himself and explain himself” (182).

What is lacking in Sedgwick’s argument is, I believe, the larger context in which the politics of sexuality was imagined: the new phase in the political imagination of the British Empire in the Edwardian age (1901–1914). When the British Empire had been forced to engage in the Boer War (1899–1902), it shifted its policy, changing its condition from
expansion to “maintenance,” from old laissez-faire liberalism to “new liberalism,” which placed the emphasis on welfare statism. In this phase, traditional masculinity, which once worked as an advocate of empire-building, grew increasingly irrelevant.

This chapter aims to disclose the reason why Lawrence was fascinated by Barrie’s works (*Tommy and Grizel* and *Peter Pan*) through an analysis of *Sons and Lovers* (1913). Its hero, Paul Morel, rejects the idea of having a relationship with and marrying a woman; he tries instead to keep his youth. The central theme in both Lawrence’s and Barrie’s work is non-growth. This is to be understood not only in the sexual, but also in the political discourse of the age.²

My argument consists of three parts. First, Sedgwick’s remark on Lawrence’s sexuality has to be taken in the historical context of the turn of British imperialism from outwardness to inwardness. Second, the relationship between changes in sexuality and masculinity and those in the political imagination is to be traced in the semiautobiographical *Sons and Lovers* and Barrie’s works on the heroes’ non-growth. Third, the anti-developmental plots of Lawrence and Barrie signify the emergence of the new type of bildungsroman in the Edwardian era.

² The Edwardian age was the period of the maintenance of the British Empire when Lawrence wrote about Barrie’s *Tommy and Grizel* and when *Sons and Lovers* was published.³ The British Empire was believed to be facing the crisis of its disintegration after the Boer War.
A new and emerging problem in the era was the prevailing fear that the British Empire might be invaded by rising nations such as Germany or marginalized by rising industrial power in the USA. Daniel Pick and Rod Edmond respectively argue that Bram Stoker’s *Dracula* (1897) and H. G. Wells’s Martian in *The War of Worlds* (1898) represented the threat from Germany and the USA in the discourse obsessed with the fall of the British Empire.

Samuel Hynes underlines that the discourse of national degeneration spread throughout the country in the Edwardian era (15-53). Its best example would be *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, published in 1905 by Elliott E. Mills, alias Vivian Grey, which “sold 16,000 copies in six months” (Searle, *A New England*? 302). As the title clearly shows, it is modeled on Edward Gibbon’s *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (1776–88). J. B. Bury’s 1897 edition of Gibbon’s book, which had a good reputation for its copious notes, went through many printings during the Edwardian age and after. The Edwardians often associated the destiny of the British Empire with that of the Roman Empire, as the cover of Mills’s booklet reads, “A brief account of those causes which resulted in the destruction of our late Ally, together with a comparison between the British and Roman Empires.”

Robert Baden-Powell, a hero of the Boer War, founder of the Boy Scouts, and author of *Scouting for Boys* (1908), was deeply impressed by Mills’s booklet. “I hope,” he observes in the back matter of Mills’s *The Further Surprising Adventures of Lemuel Gulliver in Topsy-Turvy
Isle of 1906, “you will go tomorrow morning and buy a copy of the pamphlet called ‘The Decline and Fall of the British Empire’” (Hynes 26). In Scouting for Boys, Baden-Powell emphasizes the importance of protecting the British Empire (especially England, which is located at the center of it) from foreign enemies:

People say that [...] our empire will fall to pieces like the great Roman empire. [...] [W]e have many enemies abroad, and they are growing daily stronger and stronger. (26-28)

[E]very good Briton ought to be prepared to keep up our Empire. [...] [Y]ou’ve got to keep England up against outside enemies. (281-82).

Interestingly and importantly, J. L. Garvin, who was a reporter for the Daily Telegraph and after that the editor of The Observer, wrote an article on the threat of Germany and the USA to the British Empire called “The Maintenance of Empire” (1905): “Germany and America absorb into their industrial system year by year a number of new workers twice and three times as large as we can find employment for. These States, therefore, gain upon us in man-power and money-power alike; in fighting-power and budget-power” (81).

If Garvin’s suggestion for “maintenance” indicates fundamental changes in the conception of an empire, British liberalism also shifts from old laissez-faire liberalism to “new liberalism” around the same
time. A representative economist of the era, J. A. Hobson, followed up his book *Imperialism* (1902) with *The Crisis of Liberalism* (1909). In the latter, he explains the significance of the conversion to “new liberalism” that puts stress on social reform under the national lead: “[T]he New Liberalism, [...] in the name of ‘social reform,’ proceeds to the attack upon ‘monopolies’ and unearned property” (xi). Criticizing “opportunist policy,” he advocates “the adoption of a vigorous, definite, positive policy of social reconstruction” which involves “modifications” of “private property and private industry” (xi).

The Boer War started and ended with the Conservative Party in power, and the British people demanded social reform owing to the critical situation caused by the war. This resulted in the Liberal Party’s victory in the general election of 1906. The Liberal Party’s administration attempted to prevent the British Empire from breaking up under its policy of “maintenance.” The main members of the Party, especially Herbert Henry Asquith, David Lloyd George, and Winston Churchill, carried out the policies of social welfare—such as national insurance and child endowment—in the name of national efficiency. This is “new liberalism,” which is also called “social imperialism,” according to William Greenslade, Jonathan Rose, and Bernard Semmel. As George Dangerfield observes in *The Strange Death of Liberal England* (1935), however, the Liberal Party was in a critical condition from the pressure of the Irish independence movement, labor movement, and women’s liberation movement (69).4

In this way, the Edwardian confusion after the Boer War led to
the policy of what can be called the "maintenance" of the Empire in a complicated relationship with the social policy of new liberalism, where liberty, in response to new liberalism's policies of social control, became the central topic in politics. The imperial policy here offers a larger context in which Sedgwick's observation on Lawrence's sexuality can be located. It is in this context that "growth" assumes a new meaning in relation to the idea of liberty or freedom in a way particular to the Edwardian era. The context eventually defines the basic shape of *Sons and Lovers* and *Tommy and Grizel*.

3

The quotation from Lawrence's letter at the beginning of this chapter tells Jessie Chambers about the end of their relationship. In the semiautobiographical *Sons and Lovers*, then, the friendship between Paul and Miriam is put in a similar way:

"I [Paul] do like her [Miriam]," he said, "but—." [...] "I *do* like to talk to her—I never said I didn't. But I *don't* love her." (251)

In Barrie's *Tommy and Grizel*, which Lawrence's letter recommends, Tommy says almost the same words to Grizel: "I do like her [...]. But I *don't* love her." And after this, Tommy explains:

"Grizel, I seem to be different from all other men; there
seems to be some curse upon me. I want to love you, dear one, you are the only woman I ever wanted to love, but apparently I can’t.” (186)

In *Peter Pan*, Barrie is even more articulate about the difference between liking and loving: Peter likes Wendy as his mother, but he does not love her as his lover:

“Peter,” she [Wendy] asked, trying to speak firmly, “What are your exact feelings for me?”

“Those of a devoted son, Wendy.” [...] “You are so queer,” he said, frankly puzzled, “and Tiger Lily is just the same. There is something she wants to be to me, but she says it is not my mother.” (162)

Paul, Tommy, and Peter share the characteristic of not wanting to become mature adults. None of them is committed to the notion of loving and marrying a woman in order to establish a home. Their rejection of marriage underscores their commitment to freedom: Not having any clear vision of the future, they all continue to live a free life. Overall, they seem to resist British imperialism; their bodies are governed by, and their individualisms exemplify, aspects of “new liberalism” and especially of the non-masculine ideals of that time. In other words, they are not able to grow up; their freedom is symbolically represented by such act as flying, in the case of Barrie, or the nomadic
and Bohemian lifestyle, in the case of Lawrence.\textsuperscript{6}

With the end of the Boer War, the growth narrative suffers confusion and transformation in Britain. In the Victorian age, as argued by Martin Green and J. A. Mangan, the transformation from childhood into adulthood is understood and supported in relation to the imperial rhetoric of expansion: A (male) child should and would grow up to become a proper member of the British Empire. In the Edwardian age, then, such associations were often lost. In Edwardian Britain, children were compelled to delay becoming mature men, since, when it saw German and American advances in industry, the British Empire was not able to define a positive position on international economic policy. John R. Gillis thus observes on Baden-Powell's intention of founding the Boy Scouts in 1908:

Scouting chose as its model the separation of adult and youth worlds [...] [I]t made a virtue of the postponement of access to adult roles [...] A fanaticism for the temperate, ascetic life ensured the isolation of youths from the normal pleasures of adulthood. [...] 'Be Prepared' meant to refrain from all prematurities, for the value to the nation of its young lay in the innocence and purity. (147)\textsuperscript{7}

Here, paradoxically, growth means maintenance: To grow is not to change. The paradox is justified by the progressionist idea of new liberalism resulting from an attack on (old) imperialism. New
liberalism places value on upkeep and freedom. In Edwardian Britain with the interest in the imperial maintenance, to reach to the old traditional masculinity is not "right growth"; on the contrary, to refuse to mature or to choose to be free is "growth," which correctly fits the contemporary socio-cultural paradigm.  

Paul in *Sons and Lovers* shows a new British way of life that suits the Edwardian situation. When he breaks off the relationship with Miriam, he observes:

"I have been thinking," he said, "we ought to break off."

"Why?" she cried in surprise.

"Because it's no good going on."

"Why is it no good?"

"It isn't. I don't want to marry. I don't want ever to marry. And if we're not going to marry it's no good going on." [...]  

"What do you want to do?" she asked.

"Nothing, only be free," he answered. (339-40)

After this, he becomes a close friend of Clara, but eventually he also breaks up with her. Succeeding in murdering his mother, Mrs. Morel, with morphine (437), he finally becomes completely free. What is most important in Paul's lifestyle is freedom:

Turning sharply, he walked towards the city's gold
phosphorescence. His fists were shut, his mouth set fast. He would not take that direction, to the darkness, to follow her. He walked towards the faintly humming, glowing town, quickly. (464)

At the end of the novel, he walks alone toward nowhere. He can only be “free,” as new liberalism dictates, under the Edwardian paradox of growth and maintenance.

On Paul’s lifestyle, David Rosen points out that he is a new and feminized man. He contends that the society of Britain as a whole was feminized in the Edwardian era, and the increasing participation of women in public affairs attests to Rosen’s observation. He depicts the feminization of Paul in relation to the “new women” of the novel, such as Miriam and Clara and Mrs. Morel (180-83, 206-07). Paul’s masculinity or his lack of it, however, should be understood not only in such negative terms as Rosen’s, but also in terms of a positive commitment to freedom and innocence in relation to the discourse of new liberalism. Donald Read and G. R. Searle argue about the importance of the notion of innocence during this period (Read 35-37). Especially, Searle examines the predominance of the discourse of innocence in British society of the era, which disappeared with World War I (A New England? 663-71). Innocence, in fact, is an appropriate notion for the remedy of the paradox of growth and maintenance: Growing innocent, according to Gillis’s emphasis on the value of “innocence and purity,” is a way of both growing and not growing. The
novel’s ending shows an intersection where the commitment to adolescence as a solution for the paradox is involved with the maintenance of the British Empire, which is justified as the commitment to freedom the discourse of new liberalism advocates.

When the ending of *Sons and Lovers* is thus understood, it also becomes clear why the contemporary texts of *Tommy and Grizel* and *Peter Pan*, which might have given Lawrence a hint for his novel, are obsessed with the innocent subjects who cannot grow up and thus remain immature. The characterization of Paul, Tommy, and Peter all concern the age’s new liberalism, also known as social imperialism, attaching weight to social welfare.

4

The semiautobiographical *Sons and Lovers*, whose hero is Paul, is also seen as the developmental novel, namely a bildungsroman.¹⁰ Franco Moretti observes that the traditional bildungsroman, where the protagonist strives hard to obtain social promotion, began to decline in the Edwardian era (229-45). In the context I have demonstrated thus far, the downfall of the conventional bildungsroman in Britain of the era is to be understood in relation to what Lenin in *Imperialism* (1917) calls the transition from “the classical imperialist world system” to “a whole new global and imperial system” in the period from the Berlin Conference (1884) to World War I, when the Great Powers “have completed the seizure of the unoccupied territories on the planet” and “the world is completely divided up, so that in the future only
redivision is possible” (76), with the result that, as Fredric Jameson observes in “Modernism and Imperialism” (1988), the unity between the mother country and colonies or between the society and individuals were broken (44-51). Paul, who, in such a situation, is not able to grow up as heroes of the previous era do, cannot but stay undeveloped.

The only thing that Paul can do in the last scene of the novel is to pursue his freedom by maintaining his own situation. In order to retain an adolescent body and soul like Peter Pan, then, Paul determines never to have relationship with any women:

“I think there must be something the matter with me, that I can’t love.” […]
“[W]hy, why don’t I want to marry […] anybody?” […]
“[T]o give myself to them [Clara and Miriam] in marriage—I couldn’t. I couldn’t belong to them. They seem to want me, and I can’t ever give it them.” (395)

His innermost thought shows that for him the relationship of equality with woman or the love relationship with woman, which leads to marriage, is not acceptable any longer, since such a notion is out of date as the Victorian conception of development. The framework of the 19th-century bildungsroman is here collapsing, where the growth is no longer a stable metanarrative that prescribes manliness. This is also where the social and cultural paradigm of the era is internalized and
psychologized. What Lawrence tries to do here is to describe a new idea on growth in the Edwardian age with using the older framework of the bildungsroman. *Sons and Lovers* stands in the tradition of the 19th-century novel of development, but it also takes into account the changing notion about growth in the Edwardian era.

Furthermore, this also relates to another aspect of Edwardian politics. Although the Liberal Party tackled domestic problems under the catchword “national efficiency,” the party then in power was not able to clearly set out foreign economic strategy as a replacement for the former expansionist policy before the rapid advance of other Western European powers. As one of the “blind agents of a great force,” therefore, Paul feels that “his experience had been impersonal” (399). Paul’s introverted way of life is thus closely connected with the political context in which he lives. What Sedgwick sees in Lawrence thus concerns the end of the bildungsroman as the result of the changes in imperial policies.

Starting with Lawrence’s letter in August 1910, in which he refers to Barrie’s *Tommy and Grizel*, I have tried to show that Paul Morel’s sexuality in *Sons and Lovers*, which is defined in terms of non-growth, has a close relationship with the changing discourse of British imperialism. The point is that the British Empire was moving not toward expansion but toward maintenance in the Edwardian socio-cultural discourse. In the Edwardian Empire, its subjects were
not able to accept the idea that they had to physically and mentally grow up. At the same time, the discourse of new liberalism effected changes not only in social policies, but also at the level of each individual's lifestyles. Lawrence might have remarked that it was appropriate for young men of the period to stay as immature as Peter Pan. For he wrote that *Sons and Lovers* was “the tragedy of thousands of young men in England” (*The Letters of D. H. Lawrence* 477).

**Notes**

1. *Tommy and Grizel* thus offers the prototype of Peter Pan: “Poor Tommy! he was still a boy, he was ever a boy, trying sometimes, as now, to be a man, and always when he looked round he ran back to his boyhood as if he saw it holding out its arms to him and inviting him to come back and play. He was so fond of being a boy that he could not grow up” (121-22).

2. Hiroshi Muto observes, pointing out the importance of a relationship between *Tommy and Grizel* and *Sons and Lovers*, on *Peter Pan* and the Empire, as well as Peter and his sexuality.

3. The Edwardian age was generally seen as the period of the expansion of the British Empire. Yet, according to Jed Esty’s *A Shrinking Island*, for example, while the peak of its expansion was in the 1920s, its contraction began in the 1930s. Although a look into the historical details of the era lies beyond this chapter’s reach, it would be
more correct to say that the British Empire began to maintain its status quo in the Edwardian age: if the British Empire started to pay attention to its inward condition when its policy of expansion was more or less arrested during the era, its general policy then was articulated as interest in its own maintenance. For instance, liberal J. A. Hobson severely criticized British imperialism in *Imperialism* (1902): “The fallacy of the supposed inevitability of imperial expansion as a necessary outlet for progressive industry is now manifest” (91), and seven years later he was to clearly attack imperialism from a position of new liberalism in *The Crisis of Liberalism* (1909). Ronald Hyam also points out that the Colonial Conference of 1907, where the name of the conference was changed to the Imperial Conference and the base of the British Commonwealth was constructed, “can be regarded as a decisive turning-point” (“The British Empire in the Edwardian Era” 55). In the conference, white colonies (Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Newfoundland) were granted the status of Dominion. In consequence, they stood on an almost equal footing with Britain. In this period, there certainly were still formal colonies such as India and Singapore, but imperialism, on the whole, was withdrawing from colonial management in consideration of the above. In other words, imperialism, in Harry Magdoff’s view, changed its phase from “colonialistic” to “finance capitalistic” (*The Age of Imperialism* 27, 40-41). Or, at least, as I believe, this hypothesis is what is to be observed from the readings of the contemporary cultural works. About the above-remarked matters, including the problem as to the changing imperialism that is referred to
briefly in section 4 of this chapter, I will argue in detail in the following chapters.

4. According to G. R. Searle, “George Dangerfield noted that there were certain common elements in the various challenges that faced Liberalism on the eve of the Great War. Ulster loyalists, physical-force Irish nationalists, syndicalists, and suffragettes were all in revolt, not only against the authority of Parliament, but also against contemporary notions of ‘respectability’” (*A New England?* 470).

5. A key person of new liberalism, L. T. Houbhouse, who can be ranked alongside Hobson, observes in *Liberalism* (1911) that “The foundation of liberty is the idea of growth” (122); “Liberty then becomes not so much a right of the individual as a necessity of society” (123); and, moreover, “The British nation is a unity with a life of its own. But the unity is constituted by certain ties that bind together all British subjects” (127).

6. As for Lawrence’s praise for Barrie’s work, H. A. Mason demonstrates that Lawrence and Peter Pan, the eternal boy, were in the same circumstances. He identifies Lawrence with Peter Pan: “*Tommy and Grizel* [...] takes the story from boyhood to the death of the principal character. [...] Lawrence was telling his sweetheart [Jessie Chambers], not that he was Sentimental Tommy, but Peter Pan” (197-98).

7. On the meaning of the Boy Scouts, see also Ensor, who remarks that “*Peter Pan* and a host of boys’ books exemplify [...] escape—that to the wild, to the life of the scout and the frontiersman, and the
primitive sensations that civilization, in proportion as it holds sway, eliminates. Based on this was Sir R. S. S. (afterwards Lord) Baden-Powell’s enormously successful invention, the Boy Scout movement” (554).

8. John Tosh argues about the relationship between masculinity and marriage in the Victorian age: “Masculinity, after all, was essentially about being master of one’s own house, about exercising authority over children as well as wife and servants” (89); “Only the final stage of marriage was a relatively fixed point in the transition to adult masculine status” (122). For the relationship between sexuality and (old) imperialism, see also Hyam, Empire and Sexuality and Britain’s Imperial Century, 1815-1914.

9. Hilary Simpson and David Trotter (The English Novel in History 1895-1920) argue that Mrs. Morel is the same New Woman as Miriam and Clara. She belongs to “Women’s Co-operative Guild” and is interested in “social hygiene” and acquires “sex education.” When she tries to control Paul’s mind and body, she is an “imperial mother” who is now out of date in the Edwardian maintenance of the Empire. This is the reason why she must be killed by Paul, which also exemplifies his refusal of maternal love. On the interrelation between imperialism and motherhood, see, for example, Davin. For Mrs. Morel, that is the “imperial mother,” see also Kinoshita (“Domesticity and Imperialism”), who considers the meaning of her existence in relation to the crisis of the Empire. Simpson points out, incidentally, that the context surrounding the New Woman in those days defines Miriam and Clara as
the two women with different personalities, that is, the contrast between “mind (art)” and “body (life)” is the inevitability of the birth of the New Woman, and, as the reaction to it, is brought to the world of the work. And, Trotter observes that (1) the changing conception of sexuality of those times caused the life and sexuality of this novel to be discussed; and (2) the novel, however, is not a “sex novel” about sexuality, and functions as a developmental novel by putting it back in the social context. In other words, the two opinions show that the social change of the meaning of life and sexuality determines the ground for the “growth” idea of the novel (through the female characters), and therefore the value of the “growth” in the novel can be understood only under the complicated, socially changing relationship between life and sexuality. For the New Woman, see also Showalter (“Syphilis, Sexuality, and the Fiction of the Fin de Siècle”), who argues about the new womanhood of Miriam and Clara, as compared with that of Sue and Arabella in Thomas Hardy’s Jude the Obscure (1895).

10. About the relation between Sons and Lovers and bildungsroman, Jerome Hamilton Buckley demonstrates that Sons and Lovers is characterized as a künstlerroman, a form of bildungsroman, and he emphasizes the continuity between the two (204-24). Tony Pinkney also points out that Sons and Lovers assumes the form of künstlerroman, but he turns his attention to a difference between bildungsroman and künstlerroman, and regards Paul’s feeling of alienation and insecurity as problematic, referring to Williams’s argument in his The English Novel that the distinguishing feature of Sons and Lovers lies in the
individual’s escape or estrangement from society (27-51). For a consideration of *Sons and Lovers* in relation to the social context of those days, see also Alden.

11. According to Eagleton, “The aesthetic is at once [...] the very secret prototype of human subjectivity in [...] capitalist society, and a vision of human energies as radical ends in themselves” (*The Ideology of the Aesthetic* 10). Conversely, the problematization of the aesthetic in capitalist society is that of the human way of life. What Paul represents—he tries to lead an artist’s life, but finds that he cannot—is that a problem has arisen in the human condition of the Edwardian society; that is, the aesthetic and the life are separated. This is also, as Jameson argues, the separation of the society and its individuals—and, by extension, the mother country and its colonies. For the aesthetic, see also de Man, who observes that what can be called ideology always exists behind the aesthetic.

12. I am indebted for this observation to Kunio Shin’s brilliant and sympathetic analysis of early modernism. On the relationship between modernism and the Empire, see also Williams, “Metropolitan Perceptions and the Emergence of Modernism.”

13. On the subject’s own activity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, Eagleton observes that “it is really no longer possible to pretend, given the transition from market to monopoly capitalism, that the old vigorously individualist ego, the self-determining subject of classical liberal thought, is any longer an adequate model for the subject’s new experience of itself under these altered social conditions.
The modern subject [...] is less the sharply individuated source of its own actions than an obedient function of some deeper controlling structure" (*The Ideology of the Aesthetic* 317).

14. The switch to oil as the main source of energy in Edwardian England seems also to influence Paul's non-growth. The British Navy, under the leadership of Churchill, shifted the fuel for its ships from coal to petroleum in 1911 (Balfour-Paul 493). Under this situation, Paul would not find meaning in being a miner like his father, Walter Morel.
Chapter 2
Who Was Wendy?:
Girlhood/Womanhood and Social-Imperialism

1

Martin Green's *The Robinson Crusoe Story* demonstrates a genealogy of robinsonade, the type of story modeled after Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), which had unceasingly continued to be written and read in the British Empire and Europe. Green regards *Peter Pan* as the extreme point of robinsonade (153-60). The changes Barrie's work employs—the setting is the imaginary island of Neverland and the growth of the heroic boy Peter Pan is questioned—show that robinsonade as a teaching tool for imperialism does not play its traditional role. In other words, in *Peter Pan*, robinsonade (as realism) ends and turns to a fantasy.

The main point of this chapter is, first of all, to accept Green's argument: *Peter Pan* as the final stage of colonial robinsonade consists of the major factor in considering the island as the imaginary one, which is related to the concept of boyhood/manhood and is manifested through Peter's refusal to grow up. I analyze this in detail elsewhere in this dissertation. This chapter examines the nature of girlhood/womanhood in robinsonade.

In *The New Girl*, Sally Mitchell demonstrates that after 1880,
“new girl(s)” from eight to eighteen years of age, who were neither children nor adults, appeared (1-10). This phenomenon was due to the changing environment around girls, including the commercialization of publishers; compulsory schooling; the changes in child-labor laws and economic circumstances; the new female occupations of nursing, teaching, and clerical work; the opportunity of extended academic or professional education—namely modernization. In addition, Mitchell observes that in Britain during the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, a number of adventure stories for girls were published, for example, *A Soldier’s Daughter* (1906) by G. A. Henty, famed as a writer of boys’ adventure stories; *Juliette, the Mail Carrier* (1907); and *The Youngest Sister: A Tale of Manitoba* (1913) by Bessie Marchant, also known as “the girls’ Henty.” According to Mitchell, the girls in these stories are generally graceful and modest in some ways, but they are active and behave in the manner of strong and spirited men in others. On the one hand they have an attitude to manage household affairs and to follow men, but on the other hand they acquire knowledge about how to row a boat on the sea and how to slide over the snow in a sleigh (114-17). In the case of *Peter Pan*, Wendy, who is dedicated to washing, cooking, and sewing/darning, flies through the air. The girls mentioned above, Mitchell explains, had to marry and become good housewives in the end (116-17). Well then, is Mitchell’s opinion fit for Wendy?

This chapter discusses the changing robinsonade of the Edwardian era, especially in regard to Mitchell’s theoretical framework.
I interpret *Peter Pan* as an adventure story for Wendy and explain, looking censoriously at Mitchell’s schema that the “angel in the house” is the opposite of the “new woman,” Wendy’s narrative in relation to the changing mode of imperialism. The reconsideration of Mitchell’s assertion will mean reconfirming the relationship between this literary work and its contemporary discourse of imperialism/nationalism.
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According to Mitchell’s definition, the “angel in the house” generally places importance on “home life and home duties” (1), which certainly applies to Wendy:

[A]cross this [fireplace] Wendy stretched strings, made of fibre, from which she suspended her washing. [...] The cooking, I can tell you, kept her nose to the pot. [...] Wendy’s favorite time for sewing and darning was after they had all gone to bed. (Barrie 134-35)

In Neverland Wendy is busy washing, cooking, and sewing for the boys (Peter, John, Michael, and the Lost Boys). Although she exclaims, as stocks of sewing and darning are piled high in front of her, “Oh dear, I am sure I sometimes think spinsters are to be envied” (135), a smile breaks out on her face. She is a motherly girl who has many children.

Washing, cooking, and sewing—in other words, housework—was
considered to be very beneficial to girls of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when home economics was emphasized by elementary compulsory education. For instance, according to “Domestic Economy Teaching in England,” in the 1882-83 year 457 schools offered cooking classes and 7,597 girls signed up for them; by the 1895-96 year these numbers increased to 2,729 classes and 134,930 students. In a similar comparison between 1891-92 and 1895-96, the number of schools offering classes in laundry work rose from 27 to 400 and girls taking these classes rose from 632 to 11,720 (Education Department 159, 167). Judging from “Suggestions for the Teaching of Needlework [STN],” needlework especially was regarded as an essential component of girl’s education. Interestingly, despite the popularization of sewing machines in those days, needlework—sewing done by hand—was promoted by “STN,” which states that the work appeals “directly to the natural instincts of the girls” (Board of Education 3).

These activities were not stressed only in the elementary school curriculum. They were also treated as important in both Girl Guides, founded in 1910, and Girl’s Own Paper, the most popular magazine among the girls of the era.

Thus, the washing, cooking, and sewing in which Wendy is involved, function as tools for making her the “angel in the house,” which matches well with the image of the “angel in the house” Mitchell defines. It was, in the above-stated sense, natural for girls of that age, including Wendy, to acquire the characteristics of the “angel in the house” that society highly valued. They lived in a social climate where
it was quite right for girls and women to behave girlishly and womanly.  

3

On the other hand, there is, Mitchell observes, not only the “angel in the house” but also a “tomboy” as in the adventure stories for girls of that era (137). Indeed, Wendy is a “tomboy,” which is clearly represented by her physical activity. “‘[T]omboyism’ is a wholesome delight in rushing about at full speed, playing at active games, climbing trees, rowing boats” (Mitchell 104). Wendy does, in my view, participate in a similar kind of activity—flying:

“We are on the rock, Wendy.” [Peter] said, “but it is growing smaller. Soon the water will be over it.” […]

“We must go,” she said, almost brightly. […]

“Shall we swim or fly, Peter?” […]

As they sat thus something brushed against Peter […].

It was the tail of a kite. […]

[H]e had seized the tail, and, was pulling the kite toward him. […]

[H]e had tied the tail round her. […]

[H]e pushed her from the rock; and in a few minutes she was borne out of his sight. (151-52)

Wendy […] had been carried hither and thither by the
Although in Neverland, Wendy is put in a difficult situation because of the rising water in a lagoon, but she can escape from danger by the physical activity of flying. Here, what would be important is that, as answering Peter’s question, she chooses not swimming but flying.

According to Judy Lomax, it was rarely the case that the women of that age accomplished this act of flying. For example, Elizabeth Mariam Shepherd, popularly known as Dolly, was famous as an entertainer who ascended in a balloon and parachuted down from thousands of meters above the ground. The news of her flight in June 1908 was reported in *The Illustrated Police Budget* (Fig. 1).
In fact, Wendy, in an important scene of its story, not only engages in an unfeminine physical action, but she also dares to undertake the type of flying that made for exhibitions in those days. This scene suggests that, even as she displays some aspects of the so-called “angel in the house,” she is represented as a distinctly
different type of woman than the stereotypical “angel in the house.”

Additionally, Wendy reacts positively to the unsuitable-for-women physical activity of fight:

Wendy [...] had stood by taking no part in the fight, though watching Peter with glistening eyes; but now that all was over [...]. She [...] shuddered delightfully when Michael showed her the place where he had killed one. (204-5)

She is not involved in the fighting, yet her positive attitude toward it can be inferred from her behavior. Her attitude also emerges in the scene where she and the boys are captured and killed by pirates. She shows an unflinching strength of mind and encourages the boys to take pride in dying as English gentlemen:

At this moment Wendy was grand. “These are my last words, dear boys,” she said firmly. “I feel that I have a message to you from your real mothers, and it is this: ‘We hope our sons will die like English gentlemen.’” (192)

Finally, Wendy is characterized by the sexuality of her “kiss.” After she sews Peter’s shadow on his foot, he praises her, saying that “one girl is more use than twenty boys.” She tries to kiss him in return, but, since he does not know what a kiss is, she presents a thimble to him
instead. After a while, when she begs him for a kiss, he returns her thimble, upon which she kiss him as if this is the way it is (90-95).

In this way, Wendy is a spirited girl. She likes activities that are inappropriate for girls and happily participates in them. But, we cannot disregard the fact that she assumes characteristics that are unsuitable for the so-called “angel in the house.” In a sense, she is a “tomboy” according to Mitchell’s definition; in other words, she is the “new woman” who arose concurrently with modernization at the beginning of 20th century.²

As cited above, Mitchell’s point that the heroines of Edwardian adventure stories for girls combine the features of the “angel in the house” with the “tomboy” underscores the dual logic of the birth of “new woman” and its final return to the “angel in the house.” In brief, the “tomboy,” Mitchell explains, grows up to be the “angel in the house” in the end. This, however, does not happen in Peter Pan, because (1) Peter himself does not grow up, and there is no concept of growth in this fantasy; and (2) to be specific, Wendy, also, is a motherly girl having the qualities of the “angel in the house” from the beginning, and she grows up not to be a good wife or wise mother. In short, the extraordinary situation, in which the “angel in the house” and the “new woman” do not confront each other, arises in girlhood/womanhood depicted in Peter Pan by reason of a lack of development. Viewed from Mitchell’s argument, Wendy’s singularity
lies in the emergence of "angel in the house" as a subjective state in robinsonade. And this problem in *Peter Pan*, as the highest point of robinsonade, is related to the fact that a question mark is applied to the concept of growth.

For instance, in Frederick Marryat’s *Masterman Ready* (1841), a robinsonade written before *Peter Pan*, Mrs. Seagrave remains an "angel in the house" as a subordinate object according to Rebecca Weaver-Hightower (55-59). Mrs. Seagrave never contributes to deserted island life except through household affairs like cooking or sewing. She is not in good health, but she is tender (Marryat 11), thus, she is symbolic of all women who are always protected by men.

Acting in a new womanly way, Wendy is conscious of behaving like the "angel in the house" at all times. Her full name is "Wendy Moira Angela Darling." Her middle name implies, as M. Joy Morse states, that Wendy realizes her assigned role of mother and that she is the "angel in the house" (297-98). The problem, however, lies in the fact that when she is genuinely the "angel in the house," this, together with the above-mentioned kiss scene, highlights her attraction to the opposite sex. In the scene of a face-to-face meeting between Wendy and Peter at the beginning of the story, she has already mastered the skill of sewing and casually shows it (88-91). Here a certain confusion arises. Is the woman who exhibits her "angel in the house" traits to men actually an "angel in the house," or a “new woman” who appears in the modern era and who is open about sexuality?

Wendy’s girlhood distinguishes her from Isabel Frazer, the
heroine of L. T. Meade's robinsonade *Four on an Island* (1892). Isabel is a born “tomboy,” or rather a “new woman,” and later she attains the status of “angel in the house.” Isabel is revered by a fellow boy with whom she is shipwrecked: “[Y]ou are the real leader, the real captain. You have had twice my pluck, twice my courage, from the first” (Meade 201). As Judith Rowbotham remarks, Isabel finally grows up to be a family-oriented woman, and the story ends (110-11).

Mitchell’s argument concerning the heroines of adventure stories for girls written toward the end of 19th century and the beginning of 20th century that the “tomboy” grows up to be the “angel in the house” is not applied to Wendy, though she certainly exhibits traits of both the “angel in the house” and a “tomboy.”3 (Mitchell’s theory, I believe, holds true for Isabel.) When the figure of Wendy is comprehended from the assumption that there is binary opposition between the “angel in the house” and the “new woman,” fundamental disorder arises.4

This very issue is the key to considering how Barrie’s *Peter Pan*, which is descended from robinsonade, exemplifies the contemporary discourse about imperialism. For (1) Wendy does not internalize from the start an idea of growth that is basic to Mitchell’s theoretical frame; and (2) Barrie really does not divide womanhood into the “angel in the house” and the “new woman” that Mitchell unconsciously regards as right.5 “What we need,” Peter remarks, “is just a nice motherly person.” “Oh dear!” “[Y]ou see I feel that is exactly what I am” (132), responds Wendy, who as a woman carries out the physical activity of flying and kissing the opposite sex on her own initiative. Wendy would have to be
recognized not as the “angel in the house” or a strange variation of the “new woman” or a deviation from that one, but as an image of woman Edwardian society newly represented.

With regard to womanhood, the estrangement between the “angel in the house” and the “new woman” results from the former imperial management of colonies, whereas the estrangement disappears at the end of its expansion. The Boer War formed a turning point in the history of the British Empire. In the Edwardian period, it became more difficult for the Empire to advocate its expansionism, and its maintenance was foregrounded by its society, which was highly related to the rapid advances of Germany and the USA in economic and military matters. J. L. Garvin wrote, as stated in chapter 1, an article on German and American menace to the Empire under the title of “The Maintenance of Empire” (1905). The said situation caused by the war resulted in the Conservative Party’s defeat and the Liberal Party’s victory in the general election of 1906. The new Asquith administration deepened relations with the Dominions (Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, and New Zealand) at the Imperial Conference of 1907 and also came to an agreement with them on building up military strength for Germany and the USA, which had both achieved the status of world powers by the time of the Imperial Conference on Defense of 1909. In short, at this time, the Empire united through a welfare statist policy and put emphasis on its maintenance. This was a deed that only
social-imperialism could do.9

The era of imperial maintenance saw the changing image of the British family in its colonies, including its Dominions, where a new image of girl as Wendy, who bears the characteristics of the “angel in the house” and the “new woman,” would come into the world. As its apt example, the British woman’s move from home to its colonies, that is, “woman/girl emigration” in the early years of 20th century is cited. The emigrants of that age were demanded to positively and independently act in the colonies, differently from the emigrants of the past. Most of them were from the middle class. The former emigrants were women called the “odd woman” or the “angel in the house.” They were not able to adapt to the severe environment of the colonies and were gradually replaced by women from working-class backgrounds. The working-class women as emigrants, however, were of bad quality, so that they gave way to the well-educated women hailing from the middle class again. This was the aforementioned emigration of middle-class women. In other words, the emigrant image of woman changed with the times, from the “angel in the house” (in the later part of 19th century) to the “new woman” (at the close of 19th century) to the “angel in the house” +/- “new woman” (in the early part of 20th century). And importantly, many girls emigrated to the colonies during the years. The reason was that, as they were generally obedient and pure compared with adult women, they were considered able to quickly adapt to the colonial life. In the case of girls’ emigration, similarly the good girls were selected.10 A large number of women, including girls, were sent as
emigrants, particularly to the Dominion of Canada, because Canada, in which colonial nationalism was rising at that time, planned to become independent from the Empire and to form a friendship with the USA, which was attempted to obtain a new hegemony over the world.\textsuperscript{11} The meaning of “woman/girl emigration” in those days lay in the fact that the Empire was not disrupted. The graceful and active emigrants to the colonies, where they lived the British way of life, contributed toward maintaining the Empire.\textsuperscript{12}

For instance, the \textit{Annual Report} of 1908 published by British Women’s Emigration Association (BWEA), which worked hard to emigrate many women to the colonies at the beginning of 20th century, says that “‘Our Empire rests on Emigration,’ [...] without female emigration there would be no Empire, for it cannot exist without homes, and homes cannot exist without women. By sending out women, we influenced the rising States with our Anglo-Saxon ideals” (34). And also, Ellen Joyce, who was a leading figure of the BWEA at the time, remarked that “I specially dwell upon Emigration to Canada […]. The next ten years, indeed I believe the next five years, will settle the colour of Canada for all time—British or Cosmopolitan” (126) at the 1913 general meeting of Girls’ Friendly Society that was in partnership with the BWEA.\textsuperscript{13}

In connection with the above-mentioned matters, it should be stated that in \textit{The Handbook for Girl Guides} (1912), one of “duties of Girl Guides” is “to live a frontier life” (16), and that “many of you in Great Britain will some day go out to one of the British Dominions
across the seas” (23). Agnes Baden-Powell, the author of this book, refers to the racial and national deterioration problematized after the Boer War (319-20) and tells the guides “you can play a very important part in holding the Empire” (414, emphasis added). Furthermore, *Girl’s Own Paper* often ran articles encouraging emigration. By way of example, in “Gardening as a Profession for Girls” (June 17, 1905), a school prospectus, stated that “A description of the work done at Swanley [in Kent] would not be complete without reference to the Colonial Branch. Its object is to train young women for colonial life, so that they may take up positions in our various colonies” (Shepstone 596), which plainly shows the importance of girls’ emigration to the colonies. Interestingly, *Girl’s Own Paper* has an article on a “rifle club” (Oct. 5, 1907, Fig. 2), which would suggest that a rifle is one of the necessaries of colonial life.
Similarly, “rifle shooting” is explained in *The Handbook for Girl Guides* (285-87). In addition, the article given below appears in *Girl’s Realm*, which was as popular among the girls of those times as *Girl’s Own Paper* was (Fig. 3).
The womanhood ideals that Edwardian customs required of the British girls of its era were, as Wendy displays, that of the “angel in the house” and the “new woman.” These two images of woman that would be considered contradictory to each other now were in fact consistent
according to society at the time.

If *Peter Pan*’s turning into a fantasy, as Green argues, is understood in relation to imperialist discourse, a transformation of womanhood about Wendy, also, must be linked with a shift in imperialist discourse. And, to be specific, this is connected with the above-stated emigration. Peter, together with Wendy, goes to (the imperial colony of) Neverland from the start, which signifies that they are imagined not as imperialists developing a colony, but as an emigrant family. Wendy’s father works in the City, her parents sometimes go to parties, and her family spends most weekends in the country. (69, 79, 72, 207). Wendy goes to Neverland with John and Michael as well as Peter; they look as if they are a family, and they appear to be emigrating as a family. Their aim is to plant Englishness there; that is to say, to hinder a colonial independence from the Empire. Therefore, Wendy, just as she possesses the characteristics of the “angel in the house,” acts actively and voluntarily. This is very important in living a hard colonial life. In sum, the meaning of her going to Neverland is to make the space-time of a colony similar to that of Britain, namely, to anglicize or domesticate it. Her actions have a close connection with the maintenance of the Empire.

The imperial maintenance as duty of Wendy is vividly described in the end of the story:

Wendy was married. [...] 

Years rolled on again, and Wendy had a daughter. [...]
She was called Jane. (220)

Jane is now a common grown-up, with a daughter called Margaret [...]. When Margaret grows up she will have a daughter, [...] and thus it will go on. (226)

In the beginning of 20th century, the Empire is said to have been feminized (Chilton 66-72). The colonial world, in particular, praised women for taking initiative as leaders and even trusted to do so (Marquis 60-63). This scene of the successive generations of Wendy, Jane, and Margaret shows the importance of woman in the nation, which replaces the masculinized notion of expansionism, placing emphasis on upkeep. It, therefore, underlines female bonds. Wendy and her direct daughters uninterruptedly visit in Neverland, which results from the fact that its land is united with London, where they were born.

I have considered the Edwardian turn of robinsonade through Wendy’s way of life. In Peter Pan, robinsonade, which by that time had become an object of ridicule, drew near to its end and developed into fantasy. Accordingly, the notion of womanhood in regard to Wendy also had to change. The transforming definition of gender caused by the absence of growth is the main characteristic of this work, which is directly linked to the fact that, as Green observed, the work grows into a fantasy. That, also, is similar to Jameson’s argument that the mode of
imperialism changes and the literary mainstream turns from realism to modernism. Taking E. M. Forster’s *Howards End* (1910) as an example, Jameson relates imperialism to its representational impossibility. In other words, a shift from colonialism to (finance capitalist) imperialism results in difficulty in depicting the colony and causes the colony to be imaginary. (I will argue in detail in the following chapters about the relationship between Green’s assertion and Jameson’s.) And, as a symptom of this transition, the imperial maintenance takes place. Wendy’s character setting would be impossible to disclose without understanding the transformation in imperialism. Wendy was a woman who had a close connection to the turning point of an imperialist nation to maintenance at the early years of 20th century.

Notes

1. The following, concerning the “angel in the house,” is what Woolf observes in “Professions for Women” (1931): “She was intensely sympathetic. She was immensely charming. She was utterly unselfish. She excelled in the difficult arts of family life. She sacrificed herself daily. If there was chicken, she took the leg; if there was a draught, she sat in it—in short she was so constituted that she never had a mind or a wish of her own, but preferred to sympathize always with the minds and wishes of others. Above all—I need not say it—she was pure. Her purity was supposed to be her chief beauty—her blushes, her great grace”
(141). For the problem that Wendy is typical of the good wife and wise mother, namely the “angel in the house,” see, for example, Wullschläger, who observes that “Wendy is left a Virgin Mother; with Mrs Darling, she joins a group of idealized but sexually unthreatening mother-figures who appear in English fiction for the next two decades—[...]; Mrs Wilcox in Forster’s *Howards End*; Mrs Ramsay in [Woolf’s] *To the Lighthouse*; [...]. Wendy is the most innocent of them [...].” (132). For girls’ education in Britain at the period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, see, for example, Dyhouse.

2. Showalter remarks on the “new woman” as compared with the “odd woman”: “[T]he sexually independent New Woman criticized society’s insistence on marriage as woman’s only option for a fulfilling life. […] [T]he New Woman […] engendered intense hostility and fear as she seemed to challenge male supremacy in art, the professions, and the home. Politically, the New Woman was an anarchic figure who threatened to turn the world upside down and to be on top in a wild carnival of social and sexual misrule” (*Sexual Anarchy* 38).

3. Mitchell only mentions that, regarding *Masterman Ready*, Eleanor Acland published an adaptation of it in 1935, *Goodbye for the Present: The Story of Two Childhoods, Milly, 1878-88, and Ellen, 1913-24*—Acland becomes a character in her own version of the story—and that, as for *Four on an Island*, Meade wrote it as a shipwreck story.

4. Clark points out that while Wendy is a motherly person, she is opposed to patriarchy and imperialism.
5. As to the relationship between the “angel in the house” and the “new woman,” Langland considers the “new woman” to be a transformation of the “angel in the house” and attempts to remove a barrier between the two.

6. What I call “maintenance” in this dissertation is essentially unrelated to territorial expansion: (1) as Magdoff observes in *The Age of Imperialism*, for example, the meaning of imperialism changed from colonialism to monopoly capitalism as the highest stage of capitalism; and (2) in Britain, this change was being supported by new liberalist criticism of colonialism.

7. Kono shows the importance of the new American “Empire,” namely, “emergent globalization” that lurks in Forster’s *Howards End*.


9. Generally speaking, social-imperialism is an attack on German socialism, whereas the above-named people, such as Jonathan Rose and Semmel, relate it to new liberalism of Edwardian Britain. This dissertation, therefore, follows its precedent. According to Semmel, “probably the Austrian socialist Karl Renner [...] employed, in 1917, the term ‘Sozialimperialismus.’” (14). Incidentally, in Schumpeter’s “The Sociology of Imperialisms” (1919), social-imperialism is defined as “an imperialism in which the entrepreneurs and other elements woo the workers by means of social welfare concessions which appear to depend on the success of expert monopolism” (175).
10. For woman/girl emigration at this time, see Bean and Melville, Hammerton, Parr.

11. On a relationship between colonial nationalism and the American “Empire” in Canada of the early 20th century, see Craig, Eddy and Schreuder, Thompson.

12. In Edwardian Britain, many “woman missionaries” were sent to its colonies by, for example, the London Missionary Society (LMS). Incidentally, the Religious Tract Society (RTS), which published Girl's Own Paper (GOP), was founded by evangelicals who belonged to the LMS. One of aims of the RTS was to send ladies to the colonies as missionaries. The RTS spent the proceeds of GOP for the missions. For the woman missionaries of those times, see Baily, Thron, and Haggis. The rise of woman missionaries was also a problem that had to be considered in relation to that of “lady travelers.” For a discussion of lady travelers in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, see Bush and Anderson.

13. Joyce states, just before this that “The exodus from the United States to Canada, until two years ago, was even larger than the exodus from Great Britain to her own Empire. Do we want the Stars and Stripes, or the Union Jack and the Royal Standard, to float over Canada?” (BWEA 125-26). She is conscious of the fact that the British Empire is exposed to the menace of the USA.

14. For the social value of Girl Guides in that era, see Hynes, Mackay and Thane, Warren.

15. As for Swanley Horticultural College, its advertisement was
featured in the BWEA’s official organ, *Imperial Colonist* (Fig. 4), in which three advertisements of other schools appear (Figs. 5, 6, and 7).

---

**The Horticultural College**

**SWANLEY, KENT.**

---

**Colonial and Domestic Training Branch.**

The house "North Bank" stands in its own garden in a high and healthy situation. It has lately been enlarged and is now well equipped for a thoroughly practical domestic and colonial training for educated women. The Superintendent has had many years of valuable experience, and is assisted by a past student who has worked for five years in Canadian and Mexican homes.

The subjects taught are cooking, domestic economy, laundry work, fruit preserving, sick nursing, gardening, dairying, poultry keeping and bee keeping.

The full course lasts one year, but students can be taken for short courses of not less than six weeks when there are vacancies.

Fees for board, lodging and tuition from £50 per annum.

For prospectus apply to The Secretary, The Horticultural College, Swanley, Kent.

---

Fig. 4. "[C]olonial training for educated women"

from *Imperial Colonist* XI.139 (London: British Women's Emigration Association, 1913) 137.
COLONIAL TRAINING COLLEGE

Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove, Worcestershire. Founded 1890.

Under the Patronage of
Her Royal Highness Princess Christian of Schleswig-Holstein.

The object of this Training Home is to give practical training in domestic work to ladies wishing to proceed to the Colonies to join their relatives, or as Home-Helps.

The course of training lasts from three to six months, and the terms are 17/6 weekly for a single bedroom, 12/6 for sharing a double room.

Instruction is given in housework, plain cooking, dairy-work, and the care of poultry. Laundry-work, simple dress-making, and cutting-out are also taught.

The pupils do all the work of the house, taking it in turn to perform the various duties.

At the end of the time, certificates stating capacity and conduct are given, and satisfactory pupils are assisted as far as possible in obtaining posts in the Colonies, through the agency of the British Women’s Emigration Association.

Further particulars may be obtained from the Hon. Sec., Colonial Training College, Stoke Prior, Bromsgrove.

Fig. 5. Advertisement 1

from *Imperial Colonist* XI.139 (London: British Women's Emigration Association, 1913) i.
Castle Hill School of Rural and Domestic Economy.

Farming, Dairying, Gardening, Poultry and Bee-Keeping, Cookery, Housewifery, Plain Dress-making, Laundry Work, and First Aid and Home Nursing.

No Student taken under 18 years of age.

Terms, one or two years course, £85 to £90. Six months course, £50. Three months, £30. Shorter periods 2½ Guineas a week. Board, residence and tuition.

Principal - Miss Debenham, assisted by a certified Staff.

LECTURES, DEMONSTRATIONS, TUTORIAL CLASSES
— A GOOD LIBRARY AND EXAMINATIONS.

Applications to be made to The Principal, Castle Hill, Ipswich.

Fig. 6. Advertisement 2

from Imperial Colonist XI.139 (London: British Women's Emigration Association, 1913) i.
Colonial Training for Ladies.

Wiltshire School of Cookery & Domestic Economy
HILPERTON ROAD, TROWBRIDGE.

Cookery, Laundry, Housewifery, Needlework, Dairy and Poultry-keeping

Inclusive Fees: £1 16s. per week. For intending Colonists, 12 guineas per term of twelve weeks.

APPLY TO THE PRINCIPAL.

Fig. 7. Advertisement 3 from Imperial Colonist XI.139 (London: British Women's Emigration Association, 1913) iii.
Chapter 3

Between Martin Pargiter and Peter Pan:
Empire and Innocence

1

Virginia Woolf, who observes in *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown* (1924) that “in or about December 1910 human character changed” (4), writes in her diary of that period, “Peter Pan, Barries [sic] play […] was a great treat” (*A Passionate Apprentice* 227-28), acknowledging the significance of *Peter Pan*, which J. M. Barrie created. Considering Woolf’s evaluation of Barrie’s work, Ann Martin looks at the gender/sexuality issue and notes that Woolf could have borrowed from Barrie’s productions when she invented characters for her own novels (88-96). Martin’s argument—particularly her observation that “Mrs. Dalloway's mending of the green dress echoes Wendy's attempts to sew Peter to his shadow again” (Martin 88)—suggests that the lineage of Clarissa in *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925) can be traced back to Wendy of *Peter Pan* and that both heroines object to British patriarchy (Martin 88-89).

The aim of this chapter is, on the basis of Martin’s examination, to connect the implications of the observation Woolf made in her diary with not only the gender/sexuality issue but also that of modernism, specifically exemplified in Woolf's *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*, a work also known as “the manifesto of English modernist literature”
In other words, the chapter reveals how Martin’s treatment of gender/sexuality relates to the new liberalism that emerged in modernist literature and assumed a critical attitude toward imperialism.¹

Martin’s assertion, which links the declaration in Woolf’s modernist manifesto that “human character changed” in the Edwardian era to a transition in terms of gender/sexuality, is thought provoking. However, if this is considered a change in human beings’ whole way of life, we cannot but question what caused this transformation in the understanding of gender/sexuality. As another significant factor, I also want to introduce to Martin’s discussion the structural change from colonialist imperialism to financial capitalist imperialism. In addressing this factor, I take up literary works including Woolf’s The Years (1937)² and Barrie’s Peter Pan. Considering the problem of unmarried characters common to two works, I will insert the new idea of “growth,” or an absence of the “growth idea,” into the meta-narrative of both the end of imperialism and the birth of the liberal conception of a nation-state. In the face of a paradigm that assumes the period after the fin de siècle brought increased correspondence between life and sexuality, a consideration of how both writers of that modernist period attempted to position themselves in this regard will be undertaken.

This chapter consists of three sections: the first confirms Woolf’s perception of Edwardian history through Martin Pargiter of The Years; the second points out that, in the background of Woolf’s historical review lies the social/cultural situation of the end of British
expansionism; and the third explains that the refusal to grow up or praise of childhood that both Woolf’s Martin and Barrie’s Peter represent suggest the close relation between the rise of “children’s literature” and the emergence of “modernism” in that era.³

2

In The Years, styled on a historical novel, Martin Pargiter, a single man blessed with youthfulness, appears. It is 1913 when a servant asks Martin, “[A]re you keeping pretty well yourself, Master Martin?” and he replies, “Not married yet” (Woolf 211). About twenty years after that, in the “Present Day” of the novel, he is still not married (338): “He must be over sixty himself […]. But he was wonderfully got up; as spring and spruce as a man of forty” (339). There is no good reason for him not to find a marriage partner: “there were plenty of nice young ladies who would be very glad to take care of him” (212). Why does he not marry anyone and why does he retain his youthfulness?

The description of Martin is suggestive of Barrie’s eternal boy, Peter Pan, whom Woolf mentions in her diary.⁴ Peter never grows up to be an adult man: “‘I don’t want ever to be a man,’ he [Peter] said with passion. ‘I want always to be a little boy’” (Barrie 92). Judging from Peter’s shout of “I’m youth” (203), youth characterizes him. In addition, he, like Martin, does not intend to marry:

“Peter,” she [Wendy] asked […] “What are your exact
feelings for me?"

"Those of a devoted son, Wendy."

"I thought so," she said [...]. (162)

Wendy hopes to develop love into marriage, whereas Peter, who wants to remain a boy, sees her as a motherly figure. What causes this gap between the two?

Regarding the view of love/marriage between man and woman, Martin expresses the same opinion as Peter and says he is bored with the matter. The following is a conversation between Martin and his cousin Maggie:

"Bored, are you?" she [Maggie] murmured.


[H]e told her his story; the story of the lady [he was in love with]; how she wanted to keep him, and he wanted to be free. (234)

He places great importance on the "freedom" that would be lost if he submitted to the restraints of love and, by extension, marriage. Interestingly, Peter too becomes tired of Wendy’s talk about familial love and relationships (Fig. 1):

[W]hen Wendy finished [telling her story] he uttered a hollow groan.
“What is it, Peter?” she cried, running to him, thinking he was ill. [...] “Where is it, Peter?”

“It isn’t that kind of pain,” Peter replied darkly.

(166-67)

---

Fig. 1. “Wendy’s Story”


“Wendy’s story” is “the story they [the boys] loved best,” whereas it is also “the story Peter hated” (163). Therefore, while Wendy is telling
her story, the boys enthusiastically listen to it. Peter alone sees himself as having time on his hands, as described in Fig. 1. After she ends the story, “they are [...] pleased with it” (166). But Peter, as indicated above, is tired of this narrative and moans vacantly with a depressed look on his face, for he is entirely sick of her story, namely, the conventional family romance full of love. In sum, from the start, Peter does not embrace the idea that he should physically and mentally grow up, marry, and establish a household. Martin similarly lacks a traditional, internalized notion of growth: like Peter, he refuses to grow up. He suggests, through his above-mentioned behavior, that he should have nothing to do with women if he desires to build himself up as a pure and innocent man—in other words, he rejects marriage. Precisely for this reason, his boredom, symptomatic of a changing view on marriage, arises.5

The physical and mental introversion boredom represents would have been an important problem in the British discourse of the early 20th century.6 The reason Martin and Peter desire eternal youth and freedom and feel discomfort toward traditional heterosexuality seems closely related to the social and cultural situations of those times. In fact, Martin is a soldier who has returned from the colonies. After returning to Britain, he performs the same actions as Peter. Why does he return home and behave like Peter? I want to consider this question in terms of the imperial context of that time. The hypothesis I propose here is that the value of freedom emphasized in this novel was often a topic of the political discourse of that era and was extremely
characteristic of the period. The Edwardian conception of growth is essentially the paradox that nongrowth is a kind growth. The progressionist line of thought justified this paradox, which arose from an attack on imperialism that generated a new liberalism. From this perspective, nongrowth combines with freedom, which is valued as growth. More important, however, is that this transformation is shown through the positioning of each person's idea and body rather than through a censure of social policy. In other words, this signifies that, although the imperial system would be maintained, its internal constitution would change. The changing Edwardian notion of growth relates to the political framework of new liberalism and resulted from new liberals' attack on the Empire.

"The British Empire was faced with the crisis of decline," and this dominated the prevailing discourse and deeply problematized understandings of the Edwardian era. The Empire's downfall deeply correlated with the advances of Germany and the USA at the time. As Daniel Pick argues, in that era, Germany, which possessed warships of a quality beyond even those owned by the British navy and attempted to wrest control of the seven seas from Britain, was recognized as a new menace to Britain. As Giovannia Arrighi or Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri would observe, the 20th century was the age not of Britain but of the USA, which gained imperial world hegemony. In the early years of the 20th century, Germany and the USA had begun to overtake Britain
in the production of coal. Garvin, referenced above, states, "Germany and America [...] gain upon us [the British Empire] in man-power and money-power alike; in fighting-power and budget-power" (81).

The above-mentioned factors related to the problem that the world lacked a new colony. As John Bellamy Foster demonstrates, the annexation of colonies by Western European imperialist nations reached its peak during the last quarter of the 19th century (101), which suggests that the uncivilized lands no longer existed on the earth. In other words, the colonialist imperialism that had supported the 19th-century Empire reached its summit. From our contemporary viewpoint, we can see that the financial capitalist imperialism centered in the USA probably became the main current of 20th-century imperialism, whereas at this earlier point in time—before Germany lost its supremacy over the world during the Second World War—new American and German forms of imperialism were perceived as threats to Britain.

The end of Britain's colonialist expansion is reflected in literature from the time—for example, the work of Rudyard Kipling, who published *The Jungle Book* (1894), *The Second Jungle Book* (1895), and *Kim* (1901) but did not write any more stories set in the jungle and India. The most important work he wrote after this time is *Puck of Pook's Hill* (1906). Another sign of the end of colonialism, or an attack on colonialism, can be found in Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1902), which acts as an imperial adventure/sea story in
which the character Kurtz becomes nativized while living in a colony.\(^9\)

As another literary indication of the end of colonial imperialism, Martin in *The Years* returns home from India. He is a man who has had a military career and belonged to a unit based in Africa. Unexpectedly, his manner also evidences the declining value of colonial India, the imperial evacuation of the British from India, and, more specifically, the imperial reorganization. As is generally known, India was the most important country in the Victorian Empire.\(^10\) As evidence of this importance, St. John Revers, Jane’s cousin in Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* (1847), went to India as a missionary and Hurry East, Tom’s friend in Thomas Hughes’s *Tom Brown’s School Days* (1857), joined the army after graduation and departed for India as a soldier. However, Martin follows a life path that is the opposite of theirs. This means he is also bored. Because of the discourse about the end of colonialism, he does not complete the work that must be done and is not able to build a plan that anticipates the future situation. The following instances from the two leading novels of the Georgian era clearly represent the end of expansionism: the adversarial relationship between Dr. Aziz and Cecil Fielding in E. M. Forster’s *A Passage to India* (1924) and Peter Walsh’s return from India in Woolf’s *Mrs Dalloway*.

However, based only on the discourse surrounding the end of colonialism, it would be difficult to fully understand the way in which Martin becomes bored and refuses to grow up like Peter. Rather, it is necessary to consider which kind of political framework was warranted as colonialism ended in Britain. This is where the emergent political
discourse of new liberalism comes into play. As Ronald Hyam points out, although the Empire realistically switched to the Commonwealth—also known as the welfare state—in 1931, the imperial conference of 1907 was actually a turning point. At the time, the dominions were becoming more important than the colonies (Hyam, “The British Empire in the Edwardian Era” 55). This evolution should be understood in relation to the rise of the new liberalism that criticized imperialism. As mentioned above, Hobson, who was the leading economist during the Edwardian era and found fault with imperialism in his book, *Imperialism* (1902), shows in *The Crisis of Liberalism* the importance of converting from conservative, expansionistic, “old *laisser-faire* Liberalism” (3) to new liberalism, placing emphasis on social reform through national initiatives. In addition, it would prove important that the Liberal Party, which took the government’s reins from the Conservative Party after the general election of 1906, would not clearly express a new economic growth strategy to replace the previous expansionist policy. Asquith, the Prime Minister who accepted the progressive idea of new liberalism, dealt with domestic problems under the “national efficiency” slogan, though he did not specify an effective method for resolving foreign affairs issues in anticipation of the rapidly advancing foreign powers.11

The Edwardian imperialism/liberalism metanarrative exerted, I believe, a decisive influence on the concept of “growth.” According to this narrative, there exists the paradox that to be nongrowing is in a way to be growing. As previously observed, imperialism lurks behind
the close relation between marriage and attainment of traditional masculinity—or, in other words, the identification of marriage with male growth. In contrast, in the imperialist/liberalist Britain of the Edwardian era, where signs of the end of colonialism had begun to show, attaining conventional manhood was not the “right growth.” The censure of imperialism in that era was considered ethically and morally right. Indeed, the proponents of the new liberalism that emerged as an alternative to imperialism could construct a new political system within Britain, but they lacked an economic vision for how to develop Britain/the Empire in the international context after abandoning imperialism. Accordingly, the characters of both Woolf and Barrie do not do anything other than cling to themselves: the realistic uncertainty pertaining to their “development” becomes linked to that of their “growth.” Martin demonstrates that his refusal to grow up and his choice of freedom over growth is in fact a form of “growth” that adequately corresponds to the socio-cultural paradigm of those days. For him, the way of living as a soldier or pursuing relationships with women that could lead to marriage is no longer acceptable. That is to say, it becomes an old-fashioned, Victorian way of life. The introverted, nonmasculinized, or infantilized lifestyle he leads reflects the critique of Victorian expansionism that followed the birth of new liberalism.

A kinship between Woolf’s modernism as reflected by Martin and Barrie’s Peter, an iconic character in British children’s literature, also
reveals a problem regarding the rise of children’s literature in Britain at the beginning of the 20th century. Generally, the golden age of British children’s literature is considered to have lasted from approximately 1860 to 1930—in other words, from the publication of Lewis Carroll’s *Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland* (1865) to that of A. A. Milne’s *Winnie-the-Pooh* (1926). In contrast to this view, however, Jonathan Rose suggests the importance of classic works of children’s literature that emerged under Edwardian Britain: Barrie’s *Peter Pan*, Kenneth Grahame’s *The Wind in the Willows* (1908), Kipling’s *Puck of Pook’s Hill*, Edith Nesbit’s *Five Children and It* (1902), Beatrix Potter’s *The Tale of Peter Rabbit* (1902), and others. Jacqueline Rose’s opinion is similar to Jonathan Rose’s. She observes that since children are pure and therefore have the power to threaten adults, it is particularly important that adults control children by treating them as innocent. Jacqueline Rose notes the implications of Peter’s appearance and argues that he is a clear example of this: “[W]henever innocence reappears on the cultural agenda, there is always something [...] to be learnt from *Peter Pan*” (xii). In sum, the argument that British children’s literature increased during the Edwardian age relies on the assumption that a “new” type of child was born, one that allowed the championing of the subject’s “innocent” image.

This figure or notion fundamentally differs from the theories or growth ideas proposed during the Victorian era, when the national policy of territorial expansion still worked well. For example, as stated before, St. John proposes marriage to Jane and wants to go to India with
her, while Hurry enlists in the army after graduating from a public school and leaves for his new post in India. In contrast to St. John and Hurry, Martin and Peter do not internalize the physical and mental idea of growth. From the start, the two are withdrawn individuals, who find meaning in the innocence of the absent center that exist in their hearts and who have separated their bodies from the 19th-century idea of growth. As noted above, they do not interiorize the Victorian views of manhood and marriage—that is, the Victorian view that a man becomes more of a man by marrying. Incidentally, as Stephen Kern observes, the idea of love based on chivalry, which arose during the Victorian age, changed in the Edwardian era. Kern’s observation also would have been understood in relation to the changes affecting the Empire during that era. 18

Such transformations correlated with the national discourse of the Edwardian era that attacked Victorian imperialism as meta-narrative and attempted to portray England as an innocent nation: (1) Woolf’s self-awareness as an orphan related to her rejection of H. G. Wells, John Galsworthy, and Arnold Bennett, as was depicted in Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown; (2) Woolf’s lack of seriousness contrasted George Eliot’s seriousness; (3) Roger Fry planned exhibitions of art by Manet and Post-Impressionists in 1910 that featured strains of primitive art, or art focused on the child; (4) the reception of Friedrich Nietzsche led to arguments regarding the meaning of primitivism and the superman. 19

Regarding the issue concealed behind the rise of Edwardian
children’s literature—namely, the factor that comprises children’s literature—Jonathan Rose links this to “decadence,” “industrialization” (184-89), or “modernization.” This might be effective in explaining the golden age of British children’s literature that began in the second half of the 19th century. However, to present the Edwardian period as the golden age of children’s literature requires a more detailed and accurate argument. This period marks a change in that the imperial developmental and expansionary logic becomes more tightly linked to the growth story of boys. This could be considered a lack of growth, and it manifests as a refusal to develop and marry that parallels the increasing difficulty of maintaining the totality of British society and, by extension, the Empire. Totality is only barely represented by an innocent figure like Peter.

When we consider that continuity exists between the “boredom” and rejection of development seen in modernist works and the praise of “innocence” displayed in British children’s literature, it become possible to reread Fredric Jameson’s study on the principle of the emergence of modernist literature from a new perspective. Jameson argues that, since the West European countries rapidly advanced the imperialist policies after the Berlin Conference of 1884-85, it became increasingly difficult for people to recognize the relation between Britain and its colonies or between society and the individual as an organic whole (“Modernism and Imperialism” 44-51). On the other hand, Green, mentioned above, traces the genealogy of the robinsonade genre and observes that the impossibility of imperialistic robinsonade
literature is depicted by *Peter Pan*, in which robinsonade changes into a fantasy (153-64). If this is the case, the fantasy of *Peter Pan* would in fact be accepted as the actual story, which shows the totality of new imperialism, financial capitalist imperialism not based on colonies, or shows the impossibility of representing colonies that essentially have the same structure as contemporary “modernism.” In sum, both the rise of children’s literature and the emergence of modernism are imperialist products peculiar to the Edwardian era.

Hobson, who represents the new liberalism of those times, explains that the financier and investor comprised the central pillar of the new imperialism that emerged in the period between the close of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century (*Imperialism* 324). In other words, this was imperialism as “the highest stage of capitalism,” as Vladimir Lenin observed. Also characteristic of this new imperialism that emphasizes finance is a link to monopoly capitalism (Mészáros 50). Taking into account Lenin’s *Imperialism*, Jameson considers Forster’s *Howards End*, arguing that it reflects the relation between modernism and imperialism ("Modernism and Imperialism" 46-48).20 Terry Eagleton also observes that the emergence of modernism relates to the birth of monopoly capitalism.21

Confirming this situation, the Martin who returns to London becomes absorbed in playing the stock market as an individual investor:

[Martin] was going to visit his stockbroker in the City. His affairs were turning out well. At one time, he was thinking,
his father had made a lot of money; then he lost it; then he made it; but in the end he had done very well. (213)

That he is deeply versed in stocks not abroad but at home corresponds to the changing imperialism of those days. As Harry Magdoff clearly demonstrates, this was the work of financial capitalist imperialism that emerged as a result of new liberalists’ attack on the 19th-century model of Empire and colonialism.\textsuperscript{22} This emerging imperialism centered on the City of London.\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Peter Pan} is similarly influenced by the new imperialism of the 20th century, as shown by the following: (1) the workplace of Wendy’s father, Mr. Darling, is in the City; (2) Mr. Darling is happy and anxious in turns about the rise and fall of stocks; and (3) some of the Lost Boys, whom Peter leads, come to work in what seems to be a financial company or institution.\textsuperscript{24}

Thus, the behavior of Woolf’s Martin as a product of modernism and that of Barrie’s Peter have an unexpectedly close relation to the changing imperialism of the Edwardian era during the golden age of children’s literature, or rather, to both the end of Victorian expansionism and the emergence of new financial capitalist imperialism caused by the birth of new liberalism. What this chapter has argued until now is not that British imperialism ended in the Edwardian period. That would necessitate the opinion that the Empire’s imperialism slowly ebbed after the Second World War. However, both the transformative period of British imperialism and sign of colonialism’s end appeared in literary works that emerged at least at
the level of the cultural discourse surrounding imagination. That was itself an “emergent culture.” Perceiving and describing “the emergent” is, as Raymond Williams observes, the work of the writer, and Woolf’s comment in the opening paragraph accomplished this task.

This chapter has considered the behavioral patterns of Martin Pargiter in Woolf’s *The Years*, who, in relation to the issue of imperialism, conducts himself as an eternal boy like the boy in Barrie’s *Peter Pan*, which Woolf mentioned in her diary. I made the point that at the level of the socio-cultural discourse of the Edwardian era the imperial situation was entering a new phase—in other words, the model on which the Empire was based was changing from colonialist to financial capitalist. As an imperial subject encountering the difficulties resulting from such a shift, Martin is not able to accept the traditional idea that man should physically and mentally grow up, which leads him to reject the prospect of having an intimate relationship with and marrying a woman. The lifestyle and sexuality of Martin is homologous with the principle underlying the emergence of modernism as a form of new imperialism. As evidence of this, Woolf notes in the essay *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown* that “in or about December 1910 human character changed.” For this reason, this essay by Woolf has been called the modernist manifesto.
Notes

1. According to J. A. Hobson's definition in *The Crisis of Liberalism* (1909) of the new liberalism that emerged in the period between the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century, "the New Liberalism, [...] in the name of 'social reform,' proceeds to the attack upon 'monopolies' and unearned property" (xi). In *Confessions of an Economic Heretic* (1938), Hobson posits "[t]hat 'New' Liberalism differed from the old in that it envisaged more clearly the need for important economic reforms, aiming to give a positive significance to the 'equality' which figured in the democratic triad of liberty, equality, fraternity" (52).

2. In order to consider how Woolf, who made the above statement in the essay *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*, depicts through character(s) in her novel(s) the society and culture of about 1910, this chapter addresses *The Years* in terms of the theme of Britain and, by extension, the Empire of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. In addition, in addressing the change of British society and culture during the Edwardian period depicted in *The Years*, published in 1937, it is important, I believe, to acknowledge that, in 1935, Dangerfield notes a crisis of liberalism in early 20th-century Britain, and in 1936, Ensor points out a tendency of characters to regress to childhood in British literary works, including children's literature, of the same period.

3. Using Woolf's *Jacob's Room* (1922) as subtext, Ota considers the representational meaning of Mrs. Brown in *Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown*
in relation to British imperialism and gender. See chapter 1 of Ota. For more on the relation between female characters in *The Years* and imperialism of the 1930s, the decade in which the work was published, see Aso.

4. Martin also recalls the ever-young and immortal character Orlando, who continues to live for about three hundred years in Woolf’s *Orlando* (1928). The discussional framework of the chapter applies to him/her, too. Orlando’s change in sex from male to female reflects his refusal to become an adult man or, namely, his refusal to grow up. This seems related to the fact that many women have played the role of Peter since the first performance of *Peter Pan* in 1904.

5. Not only Martin and Peter are bored in this way. For example, Evelyn Daughtry in Lawrence’s *England, My England* (1915) and Richard Hannay in John Buchan’s *The Thirty-Nine Steps* (1915) become similarly fatigued. They, however, participate in the First World War and succeed in escaping this fatigue by the physical engaging in the activity of the fight, and their actions are justified by the war. This demonstrates the schema that, since boredom is removed by the good cause of war, the hero grows up. Soseki Natsume, who goes to Britain to study at the beginning of the 20th century, is also tortured by a deep feeling of fatigue. To relieve his weariness, he purchases a gymnastics apparatus that Eugen Sandow, who is said to be the founder of body-building, has developed and attempts to restore his physical and mental condition. In addition, in Lawrence’s *Women in Love* (1922), an air of ennui hangs over the coal-master Gerald Crich, and he refreshes
his mind and body by doing jujitsu. For Buchan, see chapter 5 of Ota, and for Natsume, see Nakayama, and for Lawrence's *Women in Love*, see Kinoshita's "Jujitsu and Physical Culture in D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love.*"

6. For more on boredom, see also Abe's *An Approximation to the Modern*, especially chapter 2.

7. For more on the British production of coal at this time, see Church.

8. As discussed below, it is important to consider the relation between children's literature and modernism during the period in which Kipling's works changed from realistic to fantastic.

9. Regarding the problem of nativization, it is necessary to note that, in *Peter Pan*, Captain Hook, who hails from a public school, becomes the leading pirate and, like Kurtz, stays on in Neverland, which seems to be an imperial colony.

10. Regarding the importance of India during the Victorian Empire, see Mangan and Strobel.

11. For more on the British political situation during the early part of the 20th century, see Semmel.

12. Regarding the relation of masculinity to marriage in the Victorian era, as previously stated, Tosh's opinion is as follows: "Masculinity, after all, was essentially about being master of one's own house, about exercising authority over children as well as wife and servants" (89). Tosh later adds, "Only the final stage of marriage was a relatively fixed point in the transition to adult masculine status" (122).
For more on the relationship between imperialism and the way the male subject should have behaved in that era, see Mangan.

13. In understanding Martin’s lifestyle, it is crucial to know that he, who became a soldier like the father he dislikes, later confesses that he wanted to be an architect, a kind of artist, at the beginning of his life (218). Martin is suggestive of Paul Morel in Lawrence’s *Sons and Lovers*, who similarly dislikes his father and wishes to grow up to become an artist in that both characters fulfill a role generally associated with the genealogy of the developmental novel. Paul, like Martin and Peter, refuses to grow up and maintains his immaturity eternally. As to the relation between the behavioral patterns of Paul and Peter, the two nongrowing heroes, and the anti-bildungsroman, see chapter 1 of this dissertation.

14. Carpenter argues that “the work of the great children’s writers between about 1860 and 1930 formed some sort of discernible pattern of ideas and themes” (xi) and “[t]he expression ‘Golden Age’ is often applied to the period of English children’s books from Carroll to Milne, and it is appropriate in more ways than one” (xii). She continues, noting of children’s book that “many of them seem to be set in a distant era when things were better than they are now” (xii) and observing that “[c]hildhood itself seemed a Golden Age to many of these writers, as they set out to recapture its sensations” (xii).

15. Jonathan Rose explains, “The Victorians published at least as many children’s books as the Edwardians [...] , and these included the enduring works of Lewis Caroll and Edward Lear. But no other
generation in English history produced so many children’s classics as the Edwardians. This was the heyday of J. M. Barrie (*Peter Pan*, 1904), Kenneth Grahame ([*...* The Wind in the Willows, 1907]), Rudyard Kipling ([*...* Kim, 1901; *Puck of Pook’s Hill*, 1906]), and Edith Nesbit (who published all but one of her children’s novels between 1899 and 1913). Most of the works of Beatrix Potter appeared between 1895 and 1919” (181-82).

16. Jacqueline Rose observes, “Peter Pan is a little boy who does not grow up, not because he doesn’t want to, but because someone else prefers that he shouldn’t. [...] What is at stake in *Peter Pan* is the adult’s desire for the child. [...] I am using desire to refer to a form of investment by the adult in the child, and to the demand made by the adult on the child as the effect of that investment, a demand which fixes the child and then holds it in place. A turning to the child, or a circulating around the child—what is at stake here is not so much something which could be enacted as something which cannot be spoken” (3-4). She also states, “The child is sexual, but its sexuality (bisexual, polymorphous, perverse) threatens our own at its very roots. Setting up the child as innocent is not, therefore, repressing its sexuality—it is above all holding off any possible challenge to our own” (4). Additionally, she says, “Childhood also serves as a term of universal social reference which conceals all the historical divisions and difficulties of which children, no less than ourselves, form a part” (10).

17. Coveney’s book is useful for the information it gives on the
changing image of the child. Coveney writes, "The romantic assertion of innocence created a concept of the child’s essential nature [...]. It was against this conventionally innocent child that a revolution was effected at the turn of the nineteenth century" (33), where "[t]he child indeed becomes a means of escape from the pressures of adult adjustment, a means of regression towards the irresponsibility of youth, childhood, infancy, and ultimately nescience itself" (240). This problem, however, should also be considered in relation to the imperialist turn. Jacqueline Rose observes, incidentally, "Peter Pan comes at the end of a long history, one which can be traced back to the beginnings of children’s fiction" (8).

18. Regarding the change or decline in knightly chivalry, Kern gives the following explanation: "As women became more powerful and more aware of their power, they did not accept the image of all worldly power embodied in rescuing knights. By the early twentieth century, love based on the chivalric code was becoming, like the armor that protected the rescuing knight, a museum artifact" (228).

19. For Woolf’s personal understanding of orphan-hood, see Ota. For Woolf’s lack of seriousness, see Abe’s “Woolf’s unseriousness.” For the primitive art, or art focused on the child, that Fry addressed, see Shin. For the reception of Nietzsche, see Stone. In addition, George Bernard Shaw interestingly confesses in a letter to Erica Cotterill in 1907, “I have never yet been able to feel grown up; and now I never shall. [...] The child remains” (Jonathan Rose 178).

20. Kono points out the significance of “stock” and, by extension,
“financial capitalism” in Forster’s *Howards End*.

21. Regarding the relationship between modernism and capitalism, Eagleton makes the following arguments in “Modernism, Myth, and Monopoly Capitalism”: “[W]ith modernism we’re moving very definitely into a higher stage of capitalism—international monopoly capitalism” (281); “If capitalism was now distinctively international, so, of course, was modernism. Modernism as a movement cuts indifferently across cities, societies, art-forms, language, national traditions” (283). For more on this relationship, see also Eagleton’s *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*, especially chapter 12.

22. For instance, Magdoff points out the importance of “Great Britain’s [...] hegemonic position as an international financial center before World War I” (8) and observes that “alterations in economic structure and in the dominant ruling groups of the leading capitalist nations—from commercial to industrial and finally to monopoly capital—called for different strategies of colonial acquisition and for new policies of colonial administration” (*Imperialism* 99).

23. For the transformation from 19th-century colonialist imperialism to 20th-century financial capitalist imperialism, see also Panitch and Gindin. Using the “formal/informal empire” theoretical framework Gallagher and Robinson demonstrate, Panitch and Gindin explain the change in imperialism.

24. For the rising status of “white collar” people in Edwardian Britain, see Rubinstein. For the changing value of the denomination “gentleman,” see Cain and Hopkins, who constructed the political
economic theory of "gentlemanly capitalism."

25. Regarding the "structure of feeling" deeply connected with "emergent culture/the emergent," Williams makes the following observation: "[I]t [the structure of feeling] is known primarily as a deep personal feeling; indeed it often seems, to a particular writer, unique, almost incommunicable, and lonely. [...] Yet again and again, when that structure of feeling has been absorbed, it is the connections, the correspondences, even the period similarities, which spring most readily to the eye" (Drama from Ibsen to Brecht 10). For more on the "emergent culture/the emergent" and the "structure of feeling," see also Williams' Marxism and Literature and The Long Revolution.

26. Martin and Peter's refusal to grow up concerns the modernization of women. In the case of Peter Pan, this is signified by Wendy; historically, the problem of the modernization of women was clarified by the start of the First World War. Peter plays while Wendy, an all-around woman, manages housework and childcare, and participates in adventures. For further details about Wendy's femininity, see chapter 2 of this dissertation.
Chapter 4

(Im)possibility of *Peter Pan* of Boy's Adventure Story:
New Liberalist Imperialism and the Emergence of Modernism

As mentioned previously, Martin Green observes that J. M. Barrie's *Peter Pan* marks a new stage of robinsonade, or that, in *Peter Pan*, robinsonade turns toward fantasy. The two main changes Barrie's work brought are marked by (1) that this story is set on the imaginary island of Neverland, and (2) that the growth of the heroic boy Peter Pan is questioned, revealing that robinsonade does not play its traditional role as a teaching tool to support imperialism. On the other hand, in *Manliness and the Boys' Story Paper in Britain*, Kelly Boyd explains Green's argument from a different point of view: "In the years between 1890 and 1920 the ideals of manliness in boys' papers began to shift. [...] [T]he Victorian hero was aristocratic. [...] Edwardian heroes tended to reside lower on the social scale. [...] Fiction in this period was characterized by [...] 'domestic' adventures. [...] [T]he domestic adventure [was] set in industrial and urban landscapes with miners, engine-drivers, boxers and other working-class youths as heroes" (70-71). In short, in the magazines for boys published in Britain during the period from 1890 to 1920, the "domestic" adventure story was becoming more popular than the imperial adventure story, and the
heroes of such stories changed from belonging to higher classes to belonging to the masses.

This chapter will address the changes the robinsonade genre underwent during the Edwardian era on the basis of Boyd’s study, confirming that *Peter Pan* continues developments inside Britain. In doing so, I take into account three facts: (1) that British liberalism was transformed from laissez-faire liberalism to new liberalism by the emergence of criticism on imperialism; (2) that in the so-called mainstream novel, realism ended as modernism emerged; (3) that Fredric Jameson relates the emergence of modernism to imperialism, and I want to clarify the meaning of the impossibility of robinsonade, which Green describes in relation to *Peter Pan*, in terms of not the end of imperialism but of the change in it. In other words, this chapter will consider how the imaginary “island” of Neverland, which Green attempts to posit as representing the end, or impossibility, of the robinsonade genre, correlates with the invisibility of the colonies in modernist works. This literature of the new imperialism, as Jameson suggests, also correlates with the structural transformation occurring in Britain, as colonialist imperialism shifted to financial capitalism.

Boyd points out that around the fin de siècle, the trajectory of adventure stories for boys transitioned from imperial to domestic, and their main characters shifted from upper class to lower class; this change also applies to the way of life of the boys in *Peter Pan*. These
boys often look to be playing football, also known as soccer, or to be relating to this sport in some way. John, Wendy's brother and the Darling's eldest son, attends a soccer school, or club, in London "[o]n John's footer days" (Barrie 71). In Neverland, a number of mermaids play with a large bubble instead of a soccer ball. They hit it with their tails, and trying to keep in the bounds of the rainbow until it bursts: "The goals are at each end of the rainbow, and the keepers only are allowed to use their hands" (141). However, "the moment the children [the boys] tried to join in they had to play by themselves, for the mermaids immediately disappeared" (141). John would have been able to introduce "a new way of hitting the bubble, with the head instead of the hand" (141), owing to his soccer-playing experience. In addition, in the story's opening scene, the leader of the (lost) boys and the hero of this story, Peter Pan, "rose and kicked John," with whom he was not yet acquainted and who was asleep, "out of bed, blankets and all; one kick" (95). Peter even kicks Captain Hook, who hails from a public school, into the sea with his foot, putting an end to his fight against Hook:

As he [Hook] stood on the bulwark looking over his shoulder at Peter gliding through the air, he invited him with a gesture to use his foot. It made Peter kick instead of stab. (204)

In this way, Boyd's theoretical framework for both manliness and the adventure story do effectively apply to Peter Pan, as does Boyd's
observation, made about the boys’ magazines of that period, that heroes changed “from aristocratic to lower-class” (72), “working-class boys” who were absorbed in “football” (76-77). Boyd explains, “Imperial adventure stories faded away and adventures were set in the ‘mean street’ of London” (73). The boys play soccer in London and Neverland because continuity exists between the two, a fact that implies that Neverland reflects not only the problem of the colonies but also that of Britain; in other words, Neverland assumes certain aspects of Britain. In short, Neverland is represented as the Britain where the Boer War caused a turning point, and “the rise of juvenile delinquency” became a problem as “[b]oys were the hope of the nation” (Boyd 72). It also could be seen as the island of which T. S. Eliot would later write: “Here, the intersection of the timeless moment / Is England and nowhere. Never and always” (Eliot 42).

To better understand the above-mentioned behavior of these boys, it is important to note that Elaine Sisson considers “Peter Pan and the Lost Boys” to be the “boy hooligan[s]” (121-22),¹ and Jack Zipes observes, “Peter is [...] a rebel who consciously rejects the role of adulthood in conventional society” (“Negating History and Male Fantasies through Psychoanalytic Criticism” 142). The suggestion that the boys of Peter Pan are boy hooligans is, I believe, to the point, as these boys are children without parents, who do not attend school, play exclusively, and enjoy a sport that seems to be soccer, which came to be identified with the lower-classes after the founding of a soccer league in 1888. For example, newspapers (The Daily Graphic, The Sun, South
London Chronicle and so on) from August 1898 devoted space to the hooligan problem: "Boot 'em at Waterloo"; "They [hooligans] Play Football with a Man"; "Kick a Man like a Football" (Pearson 76-77); and the illustrations included below portrayed the prevailing situation of that time (Figs. 1 and 2).²
Fig. 1. Hooligans and hooliganism

from *Punch* CXV (London: Bradbury and Agnew) 110.
In Britain, the boy hooligan had become an issue of public concern. One man who dedicated himself to solving this problem was Robert Baden-Powell, a hero during the Boer War and the founder of the Boy Scouts. He published *Scouting for Boys* (1908). The subtitle of this book, called the manifesto of the Boy Scouts, is *A Handbook for Instruction in Good Citizenship*, which clearly suggests how his awareness of the hooligan issue caused him to found this association. In
Scouting for Boys, he observes, “We have at the present time in Great Britain two million boys, of whom one-quarter to one-half a million are under good influences outside their school walls. [...] The remainder are drifting towards ‘hooliganism’ or bad citizenship for want of hands to guide them the right way towards being useful” (299). Here, the air of social anxiety felt by the British in the early 20th century, as the coming fall of the Empire became apparent, is associated with the boy hooligan problem. In general, the Boy Scouts is said to be an effective tool for teaching imperialism, and, indeed, its aim was initially to disseminate imperialist or colonialist ideology. In fact, it shifted to promoting the view that good child rearing is crucial, a view that responded to the domestic unrest at the time.

The problem of the boy hooligan, or, more specifically, the educational problem of how to bring up children to lead the next generation, would have been an important topic of British discourse at the beginning of the 20th century. As remarked above, the boys in Peter Pan look antisocial and unfit. However, they go on to take up healthy occupations—as an engine driver, lawyer, and, I believe, banker or financier—in the end. They find employment in the interior of Britain. Why then are they rehabilitated in this way and why do they become employed in such ways? I want to consider the domestic problem Boyd observes in relation to the imperial context of that period. The spirit that led to the foundation of the Boy Scouts by the Boer War hero was infused with imperialism, but, at the same time, it corresponded to the domestic uneasiness and internal discourse, specifically that of the new
liberalist criticism of imperialism. In other words, the Boy Scouts, or its manifesto *Scouting for Boys*, reflects the same complex nesting structure as *Peter Pan* did—the imperial colony of Neverland, which has become an imaginary colony, actually reflects the problem affecting Britain’s inland as well.\(^6\) This situation, in which internal issues merge with the external ones as if on a Möbius strip, was a major subject of cultural discourse during the Edwardian era, at the dawn of the period of (high) modernism that Jameson describes.
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A prevailing notion in the discourse of the Edwardian era was that “the British Empire was faced with the crisis of decline,” as has been mentioned repeatedly in this dissertation, and this was deeply connected to German and American advances. Garvin’s “The Maintenance of Empire,” referred to in the preceding chapters, states, “Germany and America […] gain upon us [the British Empire] in man-power and money-power alike; in fighting-power and budget-power” (81). As touched upon earlier, Baden-Powell’s *Scouting for Boys* describes the importance of defending the Empire, especially its center, England, from external invaders: “[E]very good Briton ought to be prepared to keep up our Empire. […] [Y]ou’ve got to keep England up against outside enemies” (281-82). As Hiroshi Muto clearly demonstrates, *Peter Pan* depicts the good group, led by Peter, fighting the bad group, led by Hook, in order to protect the Empire (14-15).\(^7\) Despite the fact that Garvin, Baden-Powell, and Barrie differ in their
early biographies, religious backgrounds, and political stands, we can read in their works a certain discourse that attracts them like a magnetic field. That discourse centers on the importance of “the defense of the Empire, or, the crisis of the imperial decline.”

In this way, when the British Empire had reached a crisis point in 1906, a general election was held, resulting in a change in governmental leadership from the Conservative Party, whose head was Arthur Balfour, to the Liberal Party, led by Asquith, David Lloyd George, and Winston Churchill. It is important here to acknowledge that the Liberal Party, which returned to the Government party, attempted to solve the critical situation facing the Empire by introducing new liberalist policies, which led the above-named people to secretly form a coalition with the Conservatives in 1910. In the end, the coalition’s vision dissolved, because of the policy differences separating the two parties. For instance, at that time, A. A. Milne, who would later write *Winnie the Pooh* and become a famous writer of children’s literature, wrote an article summarizing the meeting at which the coalition government was discussed, titled “The Secret History of the Conference” (November 16, 1910) in *Punch* (Vol. CXXXIX) and signed it using only his initials, A.A.M. The following figures represent how the secret talks to form a coalition eventually broke down (Figs. 3 and 4).
Fig. 3. The informal conference 1

Fig. 4. The informal conference


When news of this visionary coalition, both of the Liberal attempt to
form it and the Conservative attitude toward it, emerged, the affair stirred up public opinion. Importantly, the Liberal Party wanted to use the coalition government to emphasize the educational issue. The figure presiding over that conference was Lloyd George, and his memorandum on the coalition from August 17, 1910 includes a description of the role of education in “national reorganization”: “There are several questions coming under this head which could be much better dealt with by a Coalition than by a Party administration. There is education. Not merely could the denominational issue be thus much more satisfactorily disposed of, [...], but there are questions like the raising of the age limit, which is quite essential if the youth of the country are to receive a training which will enable them to cope with the workmen of Germany and the United States of America” (Grigg 365).10 Nothing is surprising about the glimpse this memo gives us into how the Liberal Party introduced the progressive idea of new liberalism and tried to increase “national efficiency” in every field. However, we must not disregard the fact that, when the Liberals were about to confront the imperial crisis of the Empire’s decline, they made an effort to address the problem of education. In short, Lloyd George intended to politicize education. Interestingly, Vivian Grey (born Elliott E. Mills), who published *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (1905) and is generally considered conservative in his principles, also wrote *Boy and Girl* (1906) in collaboration with Edward S. Tylee. They gave this book the subtitle, *Should They Be Educated Together?* and considered the implications of coeducation. It is also worth noting that this book is
mentioned on the back cover of *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire*, printed in 1906 (Fig. 5).\footnote{11}
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**Fig. 5.** Coeducation and the degenerating Empire from Vivian Grey, *The Decline and Fall of the British Empire* (Oxford: Alden, 1906) [Cover and back cover].

In short, despite the different political positions of those times, the new liberalist thought, which placed importance on social policies through state intervention or political initiatives, therefore addressed the rearing of the next generation of imperial subjects, and issues regarding the fall of the Empire and rise of hooligans became matters of concern and interest in Britain.
From the above, we can understand that, in *Peter Pan*, the issues concerning the raising and educating of the boys closely related to both the discourse focused on the deterioration of Britain at the fall of the Empire, and the fact that new liberalist ideas were treated as important for efficiently regenerating British society. One of the best ways to remedy the present situation was to bring up children equipped to effectively shape the nation's future, that is, to build up the nation's strength through education. Accordingly, in the name of efficiency, boys in those days were encouraged to spontaneously train themselves physically and mentally not through the physical activity of rugby that had been stressed in public schools of the Victorian era and not through rote learning based on the 3R's (Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic)—the mode of instruction in elementary schools after 1870—but through a sport familiar to them: soccer. This is why the boys in *Peter Pan* play soccer. Similarly, Baden-Powell, who sensed the issue at the center of the boy hooligan problem was that they watched soccer matches from the stands and did not actually kick the ball themselves (277, 297), considered playing soccer an effective approach to toughening their bodies and minds (Fig. 6).
In other words, this emphasis on strengthening or changing the education approach suggests that the bodies of Edwardian boys, including those in Peter Pan, had become objects of national control or supervision.14

Barrie describes the Lost Boys as follows: “They are the children who fall out of their perambulators when the nurse is looking the other way. If they are not claimed in seven days they are sent far away to the Neverland” (94-95). They are children discarded by their parents. Because of their parental abandonment and their lack of good rearing and educating, they have fallen under the nation’s rule. For example, as reported by the national assembly of 1901 at the National Union of
Teachers, “[T]he welfare of society and of the nation are seriously menaced by [...] the unwillingness or inability of parents to carry out the duties of their position. The hooligan [...] is not a sudden growth” (Humphries 18). In other words, parental laziness produces hooligans. Moreover, as Anna Davin points out, “The problem [of ‘Physical Degeneration’ or ‘Race Degeneration’ or ‘Deterioration’] was constantly linked [...] with the question of child [...] rearing, and with the ‘ignorance’ of [...] mothers” (16), and parental carelessness causes the physical deterioration of the child and the race, triggering, by extension, national degeneration. In *Peter Pan*, John and Michael’s mother, Mrs. Darling, neglects the family budgeting: “[A]t first she [Mrs. Darling] kept the books perfectly [...] but by and by whole cauliflowers dropped out, and instead of them there were pictures of babies without faces” (70). Since John and Michael have entertained doubts about their mother’s maternal competence, in this cultural climate of new liberalism, they are at risk of running away from home.

Though the boys in *Peter Pan* do nothing other than have fun except for when they fight the pirates in Neverland, a place continuous with Britain, they succeed in attaining the sound development of their bodies and minds by playing soccer.\(^{15}\) This development is shown to have been effective when, at the narrative’s end, they enter employment in London. Although they are educated, it is nevertheless importantly that they are Edwardianized. For instance, the three boys from R. M. Ballantyne’s *The Coral Island* (1857), who are well-born, dream of becoming soldiers, missionaries, or colonial consuls; while Hurry East,
Tom's friend in Thomas Hughes's *Tom Brown's School Days* (1857), joins the army after graduating from a public school and departs for India as a soldier, which prompts Tom to envy him. In contrast, the boys in *Peter Pan* tread an opposite path. They do not internalize the physical and mental idea of growth that had become conventional during the Victorian era. Under the discourse surrounding the end of colonialism, it is almost impossible for them to entertain any hope of going to an imperial colony like the boys mentioned above; at the same time, this corresponds with the birth of a new liberalism and relates to the problematic transformation of colonialist imperialism into nationalism. Hence, Neverland is represented as Britain. In connection with the discourse of the decline of the Empire, which led to the emergence or reorganization of British nationalism, the boys of *Peter Pan*, who look like the "working-class youth as heroes" of "the domestic adventure set in industrial and urban landscapes" (Boyd 71), train their bodies and minds while adventuring and playing soccer in Britain and attempting to expel the pirates invaders. In short, what *Peter Pan* shows, as is discussed below in the following consideration of Jameson, is not only that the Empire is impossible to represent, but also that the continuity between Britain and its colonies is impossible to represent.

In relation to both the end of the 19th-century model of imperialism and the appearance of the 20th-century version of nationalism, the boys in *Peter Pan* obtain employment in London, the capital of Britain:
You may see the twins and Nibs and Curly any day going to an office, each carrying a little bag and an umbrella. Michael is an engine-driver. Slightly married a lady of title, and so he became a lord. You see that judge in a wig coming out at the iron door? That used to be Tootles. (220)

Importantly, the occupations they take up are not in industries such as mining or manufacturing, but in the service industry, serving as transporter, lawyer, and, probably, banker or financier. This suggests neither anti-imperialism nor Little Englandism, which also opposed imperialism, but the transition of imperialism itself. As noted in previous chapters, Hobson observes, “The new imperialism differs from the older [...] in the dominance of financial or investing over mercantile interests” (Imperialism 324), and Lenin defines this new imperialism as “the monopoly stage of capitalism” (88), which is “capitalism in that stage of development in which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital has established itself” (89). This kind of imperialism also has close affinity with the new liberalism that emerged at this time, as it explains that the welfare state system of the 20th century, which developed out of new liberalism, basically coexisted with the 20th-century imperialism that would survive into the present and is now called globalization. In other words, the imperialist turn from the old colonialist approach to the new financial capitalist approach occurred and developed in parallel with the internal reforms
of the new liberalists. Therefore, the boys in *Peter Pan*—like Martin Pargiter, who embodies the same eternal boyhood that Peter represents and is absorbed in playing the stock market as an individual investor in London in Woolf’s *The Years*—do not accept occupations of soldiers, missionaries, or colonial consuls, as the situation under which such professions prevailed no longer exists, and they recognize such positions as old-fashioned and Victorian ways of life. It corresponds truly to the turning imperialism of those days that their workplace is the service industry, and moreover, not abroad but at home. Their introverted lifestyle arises from the new liberalist critique of Victorian expansionism.19

4

*Peter Pan* is a monumental work of British children’s literature. Its hero, Peter, wanders continuously like a floating signifier. His lifestyle is seemingly inconsistent with that of the other boys, but a person like him must exist to give meaning to their existences. The converse is also true; the actions and narratives of the boys are right leaning, in that they cooperate to arrive at an ultimate answer after experiencing twists and turns during their growth process. That is, they finally grow up to be respectable men. At the same time, the actions of Peter, who follows the bohemian narrative of modernists as mentioned in earlier chapters, are left-leaning.20 In other words, even though his way of life differs from theirs, his ties with them, like the ties between the Liberals and Conservatives who attempted to discuss the
imperialism problem across party lines, are closely, even if loosely, united from beginning to end by the discourse of the declining Empire and emergent new liberalism that draws them in like a magnetic field.

If we consider the fact that the lifestyle of the boys of *Peter Pan*, including Peter, is shown even in literary works by modernists such as Woolf and Lawrence, it becomes possible for us to approach from a new perspective the continuity between Jameson’s argument about the emergence of modernist literature and Martin Green’s claim about the impossibility of (imperialistic) robinsonade. More precisely, when Green’s assertion is considered and expanded in light of Jameson’s argument, the fantasy of *Peter Pan* can be understood as a story representative of the totality of new imperialism or financial capitalist imperialism and not based on the colonies or their (realistic) representational impossibility, which essentially has the same structure as contemporary “modernism.” Jameson sees the representation of colonialism’s failings in Forster’s *Howards End* and perceives that novel as representing the birth of modernism in the way it inscribes the colony into the British inland as if it is a box nesting inside a bigger box. In my opinion, a structural similarity does exist between *Howards End* and *Peter Pan*. Neverland is an imaginary island standing in for the colony that is no longer possible to represent. At the same time, this island includes Britain, which acts like a nest. Conversely, simply because Neverland is continuous with Britain, it can be described as none other than a fancied island. This singular or complicatedly spatial matter metaphorically shows that, as Jameson argues, the close
relationship (concerning financial capital) between Britain and its colonies within the new imperialism that will cause the birth of modernism is impossible to represent. Jameson, who considers modernism the literature of the new imperialism, observes that the imperial (adventure) stories by, for example, H. Rider Haggard and Kipling, are not modernist works. Jameson’s study exactly accords with what Green demonstrates: that *Peter Pan* marks the end of realism in the robinsonade genre.  

5

Through a discussion of the boys’ lifestyle in *Peter Pan*, this chapter has considered the transformation in the robinsonade genre that occurred in the Edwardian era. As Green observes, robinsonade, which lost its individuality and became an object of ridicule after 1900, ended and became a form of fantasy in *Peter Pan*. Also, as Boyd points out, the setting at the center of the imperial adventure shifted from an undeveloped and isolated island to the island country facing the imperial crisis of decline that the Boer War had triggered, namely, Britain.  

Nevertheless, these adventure stories had an unexpectedly close relation to the principle that prompted modernism to emerge in that era, as evidenced by the nesting structure defining Britain and its colony that appeared in Neverland and resembled the modernist structure that Jameson recognized in *Howards End*. In other words, I argued in this chapter that (1) *Peter Pan* and *Howards End* have homologous structures; (2) Jameson’s study was more concretely
considered in relation to both the appearance of Empire maintenance discourse and the birth of new liberalist discourse; and (3) more clearly and more precisely, Jameson’s study was interpreted as tracing the paradigm shift from colonialist imperialism to financial capitalist imperialism.24

Notes

1. Sisson observes, “J. M. Barrie’s Peter Pan [...] is not merely an example of a romantic narrative about childhood but, more particularly, a narrative about boyhood as a ‘Never-Never Land’ where adult masculinity [...] is constantly deferred. [...] [T]he end of the Boer War and increased social concern about class unrest resulted in the emergence of the socially deviant category of the boy hooligan. The increase in discourses on hooliganism and spirited adolescence became part of an unstated need to attempt to control, or at least contain, ‘boy nature’. [...] ‘Boy life’ became a convenient shorthand for the assumption that control over boys was ‘the key to the future of nation and empire’. The tensions between perceptions of the boy as romantic ‘other’ and as social deviant fixed attention on boyhood as a site of potential disaster as well as of nostalgic longing. Boys needed close monitoring in order to guard against the possibility that they would, like Peter Pan and the Lost Boys, refuse to ‘grow up’ (i.e. become free-spirited adolescents) and would fail to enter into the world of
responsible adult masculinity” (121-22).

2. Clarence Rook’s *The Hooligan Nights* (1899) defines hooligans as “young villains, who start with a grievance against society, and are determined to get their own back. That is their own phrase, their own view. Life has little to give them but what they take. [...] The leader gains his place by sheer force of personality. The boy who has kicked in a door can crow over the boy who has merely smashed a window. If you have knocked-out your adversary at the little boxing place off the [Lambeth] Walk, you will have proved that your friendship is desirable” (16).

3. Boehmer points out the elements of *Peter Pan* that are present to a large extent in *Scouting for Boys*: “Baden-Powell’s favourite play [is] J. M. Barrie’s *Peter Pan* [...] , which he saw many times in the years he was gestating *Scouting for Boys*” (xxx); “The Boy Scout [...] was [...] Baden-Powell’s Peter Pan (after whom he named his son). It seems likely that he found in the figure of the Scout and of Peter, as well as in Kim, another boy-hero, a focus for [...] being a boy. [...] The disciplined, resourceful boy of *Scouting for Boys* [...] is pictured as attractively independent of family ties and responsibilities, again like the orphan Kim or the adult-averse Peter” (xxxi). Sisson also shows that the boys in *Peter Pan* could be seen as relating to the Boy Scout movement (121-22). For the connection between Baden-Powell and *Peter Pan*, see also Jeal and Scout Association.

4. Regarding the arguments on the relation between the Boy Scouts, militarism, and, by extension, imperialism, see Rosenthal and
5. The Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration reported in 1904, “The Committee hope that the facts and opinions they have collected will have some effect in allaying the apprehensions of those who, as it appears on insufficient grounds, have made up their minds that progressive deterioration is to be found among the people generally” (92). The report continues, “With regard to physical degeneracy, the children frequenting the poorer schools of London and the large towns betray a most serious condition of affairs” (13). The report is also referred to in Scouting for Boys by Baden-Powell: “Recent reports on the deterioration of our race ought to act a warning to be taken in time before it goes too far. [...] Reports on school children, made by the London County Council, show that out of 700 examined only twenty had sound teeth, 323 had more than five teeth decayed” (184).

6. Regarding the domestic problem that Neverland represents, it is important to note that Wendy acts as if she were a “health visitor” or a “female social investigator” of the kind that emerged in the period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and who visited poor homes in order to check on their home environment and teach them how to bring up their children. For more on this dynamic, see, for example, Nord, especially chapter 7.

7. Hook, who is represented as an incarnate fiend, is suggestive of Dracula, the hero of the eponymous novel by Bram Stoker, the Martian in H.G. Wells’s The War of the Worlds, and Professor Moriarty from the
Sherlock Holmes series by Arthur Conan Doyle. In Britain during those times, the discourse about the possibility that other countries might invade Britain that arose as fear of the Empire’s decline grew, was reflected in many literary works. For example, Hynes explains, “[T]he core of anxiety about national decadence was the question of national and imperial defense. This anxiety [...] was [...] apparent in the flourishing of an odd sub-category of popular literature—the literature of invasion” (33-34). Hynes continues, “The books and pamphlets that appeared made a number of common points: the British were unprepared to defend themselves; the Volunteers were badly trained; the national economy would be destroyed by an invasion” (34), also stating, “The external threat was not identified with any single enemy [...]. Over the years from 1900 to the war, the publication of invasion literature increased markedly” (34). For the relation between invasion literature and the fall of the Empire, see also Edmond. Regarding this connection, it is important that, as Trotter remarks, “[T]he Boy Scout movement [...] had successfully elided scouting and spying. The front cover of Scouting for Boys,” in which Doyle’s The Adventures of Sherlock Holmes is a recommended book, “shows a scout observing from behind some rocks as an invasion partly lands. [...] Baden-Powell celebrated spying as an extension of scouting [...] and as the best possible form of regeneration” (The English Novel in History 1895-1920 179).

8. For Garvin’s, Baden-Powell’s, and Barrie’s backgrounds, see Gollin, Jeal, and Birkin, respectively.

9. Semmel and Searle (The Quest for National Efficiency) provide
information about the Liberal plan for a coalition government.

10. For Lloyd George’s scheme to establish the coalition government, see also Scally and Powell. Incidentally, this project would derive from the political group called the Coefficients, which included Liberals and Conservatives and which Sidney and Beatrice Webb organized in 1902 in an effort to form a new political party furthering National Efficiency. The Coefficients dispersed in 1908. For more on the Coefficients, see Semmel, especially chapter 3.

11. Further supporting this connection, The Decline and Fall of the British Empire contains an advertisement for a “co-educational public school” (Fig. 7).
Fig. 7. "Co-education of Boys and Girls"


12. For the importance of soccer as a form of athleticism in
elementary education in Edwardian England, see Mangan and Hickey, and Jeffrey Richards, *Happiest Days*.

13. Baden-Powell’s opinion about soccer, also called football, is as follows: “Football in itself is a grand game for developing a lad physically and also morally, for he learns to play with good temper and unselfishness, to play in his place and ‘play the game’, and these are the best of training for any game of life. But it is a vicious game when it draws crowds of lads away from playing the game themselves to be merely onlookers at a few paid performers” (Baden-Powell 297).

14. The passage from *Peter Pan* quoted below suggests that boy and girl bodies can be controlled as if doing so is perfectly natural: “One of the first things Peter did next day [after their reaching the Neverland] was to measure Wendy and John and Michael for hollow trees. Hook, [...], had sneered at the boys for thinking they needed a tree apiece. [...] [Y]ou simply must *fit*, and Peter measures you for your tree as carefully as for a suit of clothes: the only difference being that the clothes are made to *fit* you, while you have to be made to *fit* the tree. [...] Once you *fit*, great care must be taken to go on *fitting*, and this [...] keeps a whole family in perfect condition. Wendy and Michael *fitted* their trees at the first try, but John had to be altered a little” (emphases added, 133). As Thomson observes, “The political debates about the health of conscripts which had emerged in the aftermath of the Boer War in 1901 had led to a nationwide concern for the health of babies. The need for British babies to be—literally—fighting fit, was a central tenet of British social welfare in the early part of the century” (163).
15. The following demonstrates the healthy growth of the boys: “It must also have been rather pretty to see the children resting on a rock for half an hour after their midday meal [before which they had played the mermaid game, namely, soccer]. [...] So they lay there in the sun, and their bodies glistened in it” (Barrie 141). They appear to lead a regular life comprised of exercise, food, and rest. This could also suggest “eugenic thought.” For instance, in Edwardian Britain, it was increasingly becoming important for the child to be fit enough to fight, and the health of babies and children grew as an issue of concern. For more on this subject, see Stone, Thomas Richards, and Thomson.

16. For the end of colonialism at the beginning of the 20th century, see especially chapter 3 of this dissertation. Incidentally, Lenin observes that, in this period, “the capitalist countries [the Great Powers] have completed the seizure of the unoccupied territories on the planet. For the first time the world is completely divided up, so that in the future only redivision is possible” (76).

17. In Britain at that time, awareness of the problem that modernization could ruin cities and urban British areas, especially affecting people from the lower classes, resulted in the appearance of discourse on the regeneration of mind and body through country life; this, in turn, produced discourse positing the country as equal to the colony, or, in other words, rural Britain as continuous with Britain’s colonies. Regarding the matter mentioned above, see Greenslade and Wiener. In addition, it is significant that Williams observes that the country and city are represented as follows under capitalist society:
"[T]he common image of the country is now an image of the past, and the common image of the city an image of the future. [...] The pull of the idea of the country is towards old ways, human ways, natural ways. The pull of the idea of the city is towards progress, modernization, development. [...] We have seen how often an idea of the country is an idea of childhood: not only the local memories, or the ideally shared communal memory, but the feel of childhood [...], from which, eventually, in the course of growing up, we are distanced and separated [...]" (The Country and the City 297).

18. As for domestic adventures, Boyd points out, “The most common use of the domestic adventure story was in the detective novel” (92), “whose popularity was probably sparked off by the huge success of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s Sherlock Holmes” (71). Boyd observes, “All sorts of detectives proliferated and their exploits were firmly anchored in the urban landscapes of Britain” (72).

19. For the transformation of imperialism from the 19th-century colonialist model to the 20th-century financial capitalist model, see also Callinicos.

20. The lifestyle of the boys, including Peter, can be divided into two types, which corresponds to the fact that, as I argued in chapter 2 of this dissertation, Wendy herself embodies the division between “angel in the house” and “new woman” in her actions.

21. Boehmer regards Scouting for Boys, which closely relates to Peter Pan, as a “modernist Edwardian text” like, for instance, T. S. Eliot’s The Waste Land, in that it is composed of excerpts from many
22. As for imperialism and modernism, Esty is right in the argument he makes about "late modernism" itself in A Shrinking Island, yet I am in slight disagreement with him over the following: (1) the boundaries of robinsonade, clearly an important tool for advocating imperialism, as Green observes, emerge in the Edwardian era earlier than Esty says they does, and the "anthropological turn" Esty demonstrates occurs in Peter Pan; (2) Esty, who indicates that 19th-century imperialism transitioned to nationalism in the early 20th century, loses sight of the important fact that the 20th-century model of nationalism had an affinity with imperialism; in other words, Esty lacks the motive to criticize the imperialism under which we presently live. Although Esty's next work, Unseasonable Youth, founded on Arendt's definition of imperialism as (territorial) expansionism, addresses the relationship between "imperialism" and the "growth" of the heroes of literary works in the modernist period, it also lacks an incentive to attack the financial imperialism that lead to the existing globalization.

23. The changing setting for the boy's adventure story, as Boyd observes, relates to the problem that Williams points to in "Metropolitan Perceptions and the Emergence of Modernism," where he posits that the roaring and surging metropolis had generated modernism.

24. While the representation of colonialism is important in novels written under 19th-century realism—such as Jane Austen's Mansfield Park—as Said argues, the importance there lay in colonialist
imperialism while, as Jameson observes, the birth of modernism correlated with the expansion of the Empire through financial capitalist imperialism.
Conclusion

The Modernized Robinsonade, and Imperialism without Colonies or with Neverland

This dissertation has tried to show the relationship between robinsonade and modernism in the Edwardian imperialist period through considering the literary works of J. M. Barrie, D. H. Lawrence, and Virginia Woolf.

Robinsonade, as Green observes, transformed into a form of fantasy in *Peter Pan*. This is linked with the fact that, as Jameson argues, the imperialist mode changed and the literary mainstream turned from realism to modernism in the early 20th century. While robinsonade is a genre of realism, it becomes fantasy in *Peter Pan* in response to the modernism that Jameson argues expresses the impossibility of representing the colonies or the imperialism that Lenin defined as the highest stage of capitalism. In other words, the imperial shift from colonialist to financial capitalist imperialism makes the colonies difficult to depict, and Neverland appears as the symptom of this difficulty in *Peter Pan*, thus representing a major characteristic of 20th-century imperialism that Magdoof calls “imperialism without colonies.”

It is also important to my argument to acknowledge that, as Gertrude Stein observes, “English literature when it is directly and
completely describing the daily island life beginning with Chaucer and going on to now did have this complete quality of completeness” (24), yet after the Boer War “[t]he daily island life was less daily and the owning everything outside was less owning, and, [...] the writing was not so good” (46).\(^1\) Paralleling Lawrence’s and Woolf’s observations exactly, this claim articulates a problem plaguing the British way of life. To put it in Jameson’s words, “the whole colonial system of the British Empire [...] determines the very quality of the individual’s subjective life” from the stage of classical or market capitalism, but “those structural coordinates are no longer accessible to immediate lived experience and are often not even conceptualizable for most people” at the stage of monopoly capitalism or imperialism (Postmodernism 411).\(^2\)

In its attempt to clarify the relationship between imperialism and modernist writers with an interest in Barrie’s works, this dissertation consisted of the following chapters.

Chapters 1 and 3 discussed the way in which characters in the literary works of the canonical modernist writers, Lawrence and Woolf, conduct themselves like the eternal boy Barrie depicts and whom Lawrence and Woolf respectively mention in his letter and her diary. Paul Morel from Lawrence’s *Son and Lovers* is treated in chapter 1, and Martin Pargiter in Woolf’s *The Years* in chapter 3. Neither Paul nor Martin are able to accept the traditional idea that man should grow up physically and mentally, which leads them to reject the prospect of an intimate relationship with and marriage to a woman. This is
acknowledged as reflecting the Edwardian socio-cultural discourse of new liberalism, which criticized the previous forms of imperialism or colonialism. As evidence of this, Lawrence wrote in his letter that *Sons and Lovers* was “the tragedy of thousands of young men in England,” and, Woolf noted in her essay that “in or about December 1910 human character changed.” Lawrence and Woolf would have agreed, I believe, that it was suitable for Edwardian men to remain as immature as Peter Pan.

Chapters 2 and 4 focused on *Peter Pan*, and chapter 2 discussed the womanhood of Wendy while chapter 4 discussed the manhood of the boys other than Peter. Since the changing definition of gender, caused by the absence of a conventional notion of growth, is a main characteristic of this work, Wendy is a motherly and perhaps also a new womanly person who demonstrates the qualities of the “angel in the house” from the beginning of the story, although she does not grow up to be a good wife and wise mother. The boys do not accept occupations abroad as soldiers, missionaries, or colonial consuls as earlier generations of men may have, and are instead employed in the service or financial industries in London. In the final analysis, the extraordinary situation in which Wendy’s identities as an “angel in the house” and a “new woman” do not contradict each other arises from the change in the imperial management of colonies. Likewise, the introverted manhood of the boys results from the new liberalist attack on Victorian expansionism and the end of colonialism. The meaning of these characters’ roles, including those of Paul and Martin, would be
impossible to explain without referencing the transformation in imperialism in the early years of the 20th century. This imperialism, concealed behind liberalism, persists in the form of the North’s exploitation of the South and the global poverty that followed the independence of the former colonies in the post-World War II world.

Notes

1. For Stein’s observation on English literature, see also Ashton, who points out that “[Stein] appears to identify the decline of British writing with the decline of the British Empire” (290).

2. For Jameson’s argument about the relationship between imperialism and the experience of individuals, see also his “Cognitive Mapping.”
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