Introduction

Gill Plain

> Sophia Garfield had a clear mental picture of what the outbreak of war was going to be like. There would be a loud bang, succeeded by inky darkness and a cold wind. Stumbling over heaps of rubble and dead bodies, Sophia would search with industry, but without hope, for her husband, her lover, and her dog. It was in her mind like the End of the World, or the Last Days of Pompeii, and for more than two years now she had been steeling herself to bear with fortitude the hardships, both mental and physical, which must accompany this cataclysm.[1]

Transition – in life and literature – is seldom as clear cut as Sophia Garfield's imagination might suggest, even in the case of something as politically, culturally and ethically cataclysmic as the Second World War. Sophia, the hapless heroine of Nancy Mitford's 1940 comic novel *Pigeon Pie*, manifests here the apocalyptic traces of the interwar literary imagination, her attempt to articulate her fears conditioned not by the shape of things to come, but by impressionistic reports of the Spanish Civil War. *Pigeon Pie* was composed during the so-called 'phoney war', and by the time the book was published, Mitford felt the need to preface it with an apology. It was, she said, 'an early and unimportant casualty of the real war which was then beginning'.[2] But Sophia's vision, while absurd in its hyperbolic self-dramatisation, is also disturbingly accurate: there would be rubble, there would be bodies and, in the desecration of the camps, there would be something very like the 'End of the World'. Mitford's mistimed comedy thus tells us that writing and history do not map tidily one on to the other, the one offering a record of the other's stately progression: rather literature erupts into history – and vice versa – subverting, applauding, anticipating, avoiding, resisting, recording and sometimes misreading the often overwhelming stimuli of a rapidly changing world. Transition gets

[1] Nancy Mitford, *Pigeon Pie* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1961 [1940]), p. 7. [2] Ibid., n. p.

ahead of itself, and it lags behind – and it struggles to be noticed in a period persistently mediated through the shadow of 1945.

With the annihilating qualities of 1945 in mind, this volume of the *Transitions* series prioritises the aftermath rather than the act of war. It looks at cultural, critical and imaginative transformations that are part of a continuity of literary development, as well as those brought about by the rupture of war. That it is able, at least in part, to avert its gaze from the mesmeric power of Britain's 'finest hour' is the result of a revival of critical interest in the literature of 1939 to 1945. Since the turn of the millennium, there has been an explosion of new writing on the Second World War: Mark Rawlinson's *British Writing of the Second World War* (2000), Marina MacKay's *Modernism and World War II* (2007) and her *Cambridge Companion to the Literature of World War II* (2009), Lyndsey Stonebridge's *The Writing of Anxiety* (2007), Patrick Deer's *Culture in Camouflage* (2009), Sara Wasson's *Urban Gothic of the Second World War* (2010) and Leo Mellor's *Reading the Ruins* (2011), to name but a few.[3] The recognition that the conflict had a literature of its own is long overdue, but while this 'curious gap in the knowledge of many readers'[4] is now being plugged, the same cannot be said for what came after. Indeed, between the technical end of hostilities and the emergence of the angry young man, the student of British literature might be forgiven for thinking – in Cyril Connolly's redolent terms – that it was 'closing time in the gardens of the West'.[5] So who wrote in the postwar? And what did they write? Did British culture react through nostalgic re-entrenchment, or did it find expression in subversive spaces and unexpected forms? Was it exhausted or reinvigorated, at an end or a beginning, or – as Sophia's vision suggests – both? This introduction, and the twenty-one chapters that follow, explores these questions, mapping some of the literary reconfigurations that took poetry from T. S. Eliot to Thom Gunn, the theatre from Noel Coward to Shelagh Delaney, and the novel from the bedsits of Patrick Hamilton to the

[3] There has also been a growing interest in the resonances and rewritings of the war across the full breadth of the twentieth century. See Victoria Stewart, *The Second World War in Contemporary British Fiction: Secret Histories* (Edinburgh University Press, 2011); Danielle Hipkins and Gill Plain (eds), *War-Torn Tales: Literature, Film and Gender in the Aftermath of World War II* (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2007); Petra Rau, *Long Shadows: The Second World War in British Fiction and Film* (Northwestern University Press, 2016).

[4] Patrick Deer, *Culture in Camouflage: War, Empire, and Modern British Literature* (Oxford University Press, 2009), p. ix.

[5] *Horizon*, vol. XX, nos 120–1, December 1949–January 1950, p. 362. The phrase was adopted by Malcolm Bradbury to argue that the postwar arts in Britain were characterised by 'minimalism and muteness'. Malcolm Bradbury, '"Closing Time in the Gardens" or, What Happened to Writing in the 1940s' in *No, Not Bloomsbury* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1987), p. 71.

bunkers of Ian Fleming. Yet the volume also, crucially, resists the stability of 'transition' and its metaphors, exploring writers – such as Elizabeth Bowen, Agatha Christie, Graham Greene and Stephen Spender – who persisted and, more or less, mutated, in the face of unprecedented cultural change.

'Postwar' as concept and *Postwar* as title are consequently designed to draw attention to the missing link between two mythical moments of British historical becoming. The selective habits of cultural memory have ensured that 1940 to 1960 is a period more powerfully marked in its opening (the shock of war) and its closure (the shock of Suez), than in its substantial middle. Yet these middle years are of fundamental importance to understanding both what went before and what came after: in these lost years we find the impact of total war and the challenges of reconstructing cultural life in a world on the brink of a new – and frequently terrifying – modernity. As with the other volumes in this series, *Postwar* displaces the conceptual category of the decade in favour of a twenty-year period. A twenty-year block is, of course, no less arbitrary than a ten-year one, and this categorisation should not be seen as anything other than a provisional necessity – a spatio-temporal holding cell – which enables us usefully to interrogate the movements, displacements, transformations and transitions of mid-century Britain. Not surprisingly, as the chapters of this volume reveal, interrogation also exposes the contradictions, reversals, denials and recantations of a period in which, for many, 'transition' must have seemed a double-edged sword. Yet in the particular case of the postwar, changing the shape of the holding cell has considerable critical value. It uncouples the glib distinction between war and after, insisting that wars neither begin nor end with formal declarations, and it enables close attention to the forgotten middle years, 1945 to 1955, a 'decade' that in literary terms has been both misread and overlooked. In so doing, the volume is part of, and a showcase for, new literary critical work that examines continuity as well as change, and which seeks to trouble conventional categories and canons of mid-century British culture.[6] Crucially, though, 'postwar' constitutes not only a temporal space, but also a cultural sensibility, reaching back into the war and forward into the second half of

[6] The bulwark between the 1930s and the 1940s, while seemingly held in this volume, is equally insecure, as the lines of influence and affiliation that survived the war reveal. See volume 2 in the *Transitions* series, Charles Ferrall and Dougal McNeill (eds), *British Literature in Transition 1920–1940: Futility and Anarchy?* (Cambridge University Press, 2018), and the concept of the 'long 1930s' posited by Leo Mellor and Glynn Salton Cox, 'The Long 1930s' *Critical Quarterly* (2015) 57(3) pp. 1–9.

the twentieth century; it is a political condition and a state of mind, a mode of being that oscillates between a violent impetus for change, and a desperate longing for the security of the known and familiar. In the section that follows, I explore this sensibility and the contexts from which it emerged.

Interrogating the Postwar Sensibility: Hope, Fear and Fatigue

I suggested above that 1940 to 1960 might be thought of as a 'holding cell', a potentially disturbing image of confinement and interrogation designed to suggest transience, instability and uncertain outcomes. These are all terms singularly applicable to the situation in which the country and its writers found themselves in September 1939. The outbreak of war, shocking yet long anticipated, rendered previously articulate commentators, such as Stephen Spender, temporarily speechless (a state of affairs announced in his eloquent 'September Journal'). Others by contrast were keen to document new experiences and participate in the emergent propaganda war. This war of words would be integral to the conflict and its aftermath, and it is hard to overestimate the impact of mass mobilisation on the national psyche. To win the war for democracy, the British Government assumed unprecedented control over its citizens' lives, subjecting them to rationing, conscription, evacuation and a 'white noise' of rhetoric that – while undoubtedly effective – had a crushing impact on what Adam Piette terms the 'private imagination'.[7]

There was, then, much to write about and very little opportunity to write it, and the conditions of the conflict had an inevitable impact on the possibilities of publication and performance. London theatres, for example, were initially closed for the duration, but when the expected cataclysm proved slow to arrive, activities resumed – and continued throughout the blackout and the bombs. Yet, as Rebecca D'Monté's chapter demonstrates, this was just the beginning of a radical transition in the infrastructure and practice of theatre across the nation. The novel faced different problems, not least, as the conflict progressed, a shortage of paper, but Elizabeth Bowen was not the only writer to find the conditions of total war inimical

[7] Adam Piette, *Imagination at War: British Fiction and Poetry, 1939–1945* (London: Papermac, 1995), p. 2. For participation, see Phyllis Lassner, *British Women Writers of World War II: Battlegrounds of Their Own* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1997) and Jenny Hartley, *Millions Like Us: British Women's Fiction of the Second World War* (London: Virago, 1997). For speechlessness, see Gill Plain, *Women's Fiction of the Second World War: Gender, Power and Resistance* (Edinburgh University Press, 1996) and *Literature of the 1940s: War, Postwar and 'Peace'* (Edinburgh University Press, 2013), pp. 39–44.

to the writing of long fiction.[8] In its place, however, other forms flourished, with the chief literary beneficiary being the short story, which alongside diaries, reportage and documentary observations of wartime life found itself well suited to composition under fragmentary and disruptive conditions.[9] The short story was also well suited to radio, and broadcast media became a vital conduit for the consumption and production of literature in the war years, as is evident from James Procter's study of West Indian writing at the BBC in Chapter 6.[10] The benefits of bite-sized literary forms were felt by readers as well as writers, and a feature of the conflict was the proliferation and success of literary magazines such as *Horizon*, *Penguin New Writing*, *The Welsh Review* and *Poetry London*. These magazines published new writing, but they also provided a forum for critical self-reflection. Indeed, as Thomas Davis demonstrates in Chapter 9, *Horizon* under its charismatic editor, Cyril Connolly, argued itself almost to exhaustion debating what, exactly, should be the role of the writer in wartime.

The holding cell image also reminds us that in historical as well as literary terms, the boundaries dividing war from postwar are porous; the concept is not tethered to treaties and the term acquires its cultural validity long before the cessation of hostilities. Indeed, almost from the outbreak of war, British culture was imagining and writing towards a future postwar world – most famously in *Picture Post*'s January 1941 'Plan for Britain' issue. This early emergence of the postwar would become particularly marked after 1942's decisive victories in North Africa: the point at which – for those on the home front – the war became less of a threat and more of a regime to be endured. Without imminent danger to make sense of sacrifice, the war increasingly became a site of crippling lethargy and imaginative exhaustion, a state of mind evoked at the time in the documentary fiction of Inez Holden, and effectively reconstructed by Patrick Hamilton in the magnificent *Slaves of Solitude* (1947).[11] People no longer wanted to read about the war, nor to watch it on screen, and cinemas filled instead with audiences

[8] For the concrete impact of war on book production and consumption, see Angus Calder, *The People's War* (London: Pimlico, 1992 [1969]), pp. 511–13.

[9] Stories themselves differed radically in style: from the uncanny snapshots of Elizabeth Bowen, to the overtly symbolic modernism of William Sansom, the surrealism of Anna Kavan and the pared-back, deceptive simplicity of Elizabeth Berridge.

[10] For a full exploration of the diverse roles played by radio in generating and disseminating a literature of war, see Ian Whittington, *Writing the Radio War: Literature, Politics and the BBC, 1939–1945*, (Edinburgh University Press, 2018).

[11] Documentary writing was a significant aesthetic feature of the war, and Holden's 'docudramas', including *Night Shift* (1941) and *There's No Story There* (1944), provide particularly good examples of the form. For the world evoked by Hamilton, see Marina MacKay's chapter in this volume.

desperate to escape a deeply dreary contemporaneity through the good offices of James Mason's man in grey and Margaret Lockwood's wicked lady.[12]

Yet the emergent features of a postwar sensibility were not confined to a desire for imaginative liberation. In a war in which the boundaries between home front and frontline, civilian and combatant had become increasingly indistinct, both men and women lived in a state of suspended reaction, and the postwar would be marked by the gradual emergence of grief and post-traumatic symptoms. Returning soldiers and POWs were confronted by a world changed out of all recognition, while women, variously liberated or coerced into radical new subjectivities, were confronted by men they scarcely recognised, and who were all too frequently traumatised by experiences they could neither express nor understand.[13] Indeed, it was largely through fiction – from Henry Green's *Back* (1945) to Nigel Balchin's *A Sort of Traitors* (1949) to Elizabeth Taylor's *A Wreath of Roses* (1949) – that the psychological impact of war found expression in the postwar period. Publicly, men were told to 'move on', while women were urged to go back, resuming conventionally gendered domestic roles in an attempt to reconstruct an illusory pre-war ideal. And integral to public pronouncements on postwar reconstruction was the resumption of heteronormativity: the family was to be reconstituted, relocated and encouraged to reproduce.[14] The tensions, anxieties and pressures consequent upon such reassembly make themselves felt throughout the period and throughout this volume. They are present in Marina MacKay's survey of the novel, in Nigel Alderman's analysis of transitions in poetic language, in Charlotte Charteris's chapter on postwar desire, and in my own examination of the re-gendering of postwar genre fiction. Repression, understood as a keynote of 'Britishness', cannot be underestimated as a force determining the limits of articulation in this period and its literature.

The term 'postwar' also, deliberately, speaks to a signifying absence: peace. Global conflict persisted in spite, or because, of the treaties of 1945, while for a Britain struggling to reconstitute itself in the aftermath of an

[12] Both actors starred in *The Man in Grey* (1943) and *The Wicked Lady* (1945). The box office success of these early Gainsborough Studio melodramas was matched only by the degree of middle-class critical opprobrium they attracted. See Sue Harper, *Picturing the Past: The Rise and Fall of the British Costume Film* (London: BFI, 1994).

[13] For an insightful account of demobilisation and its repercussions, see Alan Allport, *Demobbed: Coming Home after the Second World War* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009).

[14] On the challenges of finding a home, see Michael Sissons and Philip French (eds), *Age of Austerity* (Oxford University Press, 1963); on pro-natalism and the restoration of 'home', see David Kynaston, *Austerity Britain, 1945–51* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007), pp. 98–104.

economically devastating conflict, American cultural hegemony caused almost as much disquiet as the threat of Communism. However, for many it was technology that most profoundly symbolised the end of security. What peace was possible after the invention of a weapon that could annihilate a city and carry on killing with invisible power? John Hershey's *Hiroshima*, first published in Britain by Penguin in 1946, and broadcast by the BBC, brought home to many the immense implications of the atomic age, and ensured that when Mass Observation surveyed public attitudes regarding 'peace' in 1947, respondents voiced feelings of ambivalence and despair. The fears generated by American cultural and technological hegemony are addressed in Ina Habermann's chapter on J. B. Priestley and Jaquetta Hawkes Priestley, whose postwar work, both individual and collaborative, sought tirelessly to resist the culture of 'admass' and the prospect of nuclear annihilation. Both became active supporters of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, founded in 1958. More mediated fears of technology are also integral to Allan Hepburn's analysis of catastrophe fiction – a significant genre of the 1950s that addressed, in a range of pessimistic, dystopian contexts, fears of unchecked scientific ambition and its consequences.

Yet postwar exhaustion co-existed with a powerful will-to-change: a desire to build a better Britain. The Labour landslide victory of 1945 emerged from a widespread desire *not* to return to pre-war poverty and unemployment, and this vote symbolises the contrary, and hard-won, strand of regenerative hope that runs through the period. The general election was a political turning point, as – in terms of the resurgence of cultural debate – was the British Council's decision to sponsor a controversial exhibition of wartime work by Matisse and Picasso at the V&A. In 1946, the wartime Council for the Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) emerged in the new plumage of the Arts Council, and 1947 saw the foundation of the Edinburgh International and Fringe Festivals. There was even, in 1948, an Olympic games. Optimism's zenith was reached, however, with the belated arrival of the 1951 Festival of Britain, a much-postponed outburst of social, artistic and scientific self-celebration imagined as a 'tonic to the nation'. The festival aimed both to entertain and to 'set the broad parameters of a social democratic agenda for modern Britain',[15] it also – by accident rather than design – ushered in

[15] Becky Conekin, '"Here is the Modern World Itself": The Festival of Britain's Representations of the Future' in Becky E. Conekin Frank Mort and Chris Waters (eds), *Moments of Modernity: Reconstructing Britain 1945–1964* (London: Rivers Oram Press, 1999), p. 228. Conekin argues that the festival 'betrayed surprisingly little nostalgia', but was rather a vision of technologically mediated

a series of 'national' achievements that similarly seemed to symbolise the birth of a newly modern nation. A symbol of Britain's technical prowess, the de Havilland Comet became the first commercial jetliner, entering service with the British Overseas Airways Corporation (BOAC) in May 1952, while 'national' character was showcased in the Conquest of Everest in May 1953. The achievement of the New Zealander Edmund Hillary and the Nepalese Sherpa Tenzing Norgay, as part of a massive 400-strong British expedition, seemed to close the book on narratives of courage in adversity and heroic failure, and the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II in June 1953 was perceived as the beginning of a 'New Elizabethan' era.[16]

However, before Britain could celebrate anything it had to rebuild, and in 1945 the task ahead of the newly elected government was monumental. Tony Judt puts the challenge into perspective: 'Britain was insolvent . . . The cost of World War Two to Britain was twice that of World War One; the country lost one quarter of its national wealth.'[17] Judt goes on to observe that perhaps this would not have mattered quite so much had Britain not also been responsible for a global empire. As it was, the only solution was austerity, a programme of ongoing rationing and restrictions in which pretty much everything was unavailable. And it was this quotidian deprivation, an all-pervasive grey chill, which more than anything made its mark on the culture of the immediate postwar years, as Marina MacKay demonstrates in her analysis of the austerity novel. How writers responded to the constraints of victory was, she suggests, largely a matter of political alignments: J. B. Priestley saw the potential for a new beginning, Barbara Pym made light comedy out of cultural disorientation and Angela Thirkell gave voice to a deeply conservative middle-class nostalgia for a semi-mythical pre-war in which boundaries were respected and places known. Britain was building anew, but behind the builders there still remained an intellectual infrastructure permeated with the products of conventional public school and Oxbridge educations.[18]

modernity that could enrich the lives of all. Nonetheless, Conekin doubts its effectiveness, wryly concluding that: 'For whatever reason, it seems that many found in the Coronation Day celebrations two years later a more reassuring balance of the modern and the quintessentially British' (p. 246).

[16] See Philip Gibbs, *The New Elizabethans* (London: Hutchinson, 1953) for a representation of this brave new Britain.

[17] Tony Judt, *Postwar: A History of Europe Since 1945* (London: Pimlico, 2007), p. 161.

[18] Ross McKibbin, *Classes and Cultures: England 1918–1951* (Oxford University Press, 1998), p. v. See also Sissons and French, *Age of Austerity* and *Kenneth O. Morgan, The People's Peace: British History 1945–1990* (Oxford University Press, 1992) for the tensions of reconstruction, including the controversies attending the birth of the National Health Service.

A similar paradox emerges in examining Britain's relations to the wider world of its empire. Indian independence, enacted through partition and the creation of Pakistan in 1947, might have seemed to symbolise a radical transformation in British colonial attitudes, but the empire had been fundamental to the wartime survival of the nation and politicians left and right were agreed in their belief that the remaining colonies were essential to the reassertion of Britain's status as a world power. Consequently, considerable effort was made to strengthen the ties between the mother country and her dependencies. In spite of a desperate shortage of manpower, 'new blood' was dispatched to administrate the colonies, while the 1948 British Nationality Act extended citizenship to all Commonwealth countries. For the many West Indians who answered the mother country's demand for labour, however, the welcome was cold. Making a journey now metonymically linked to the arrival of the *Empire Windrush* in 1948, the emigrants rapidly discovered that some citizens were more equal than others, and in the late 1940s and throughout the 1950s, the issue of who belonged to Britain became a complicating factor in a postwar landscape already fraught with industrial unrest, anti-Semitic riots and dire prognostications of juvenile delinquency.[19]

That one of the most influential literary transitions of the postwar period would be the emergence of black British voices and a postcolonial aesthetic is, in consequence, something that would have surprised the bulk of the nation in 1945. As David Kynaston's poetic snapshot suggests, austerity Britain was literally as well as metaphorically monotone:

> Britain in 1945. No supermarkets, no motorways, no teabags, no sliced bread, no frozen food, no flavoured crisps, no lager, no microwaves, no dishwashers, no Formica, no vinyl, no CDs, no computers, no mobiles, no duvets, no Pill . . . Four Indian restaurants. Shops on every corner, pubs on every corner, cinemas in every high street, red telephone boxes, Lyons Corner Houses . . . Central heating rare, coke boilers, water geysers, the coal fire, the hearth, the home, chilblains common. Abortion illegal, homosexual relationships illegal, suicide illegal, capital punishment legal. White faces everywhere.[20]

In such a context it is, as Gail Low has observed, remarkable that much of what is now considered the canon of postcolonial Anglophone West

[19] Kathleen Paul, *Whitewashing Britain: Race and Citizenship in the Postwar Era* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997); Tony Kushner, 'Anti-Semitism and Austerity: The August 1947 Riots in Britain' in Panikos Panayi (ed.), *Racial Violence in Britain in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (London: Leicester University Press, 1996); Kynaston, *Austerity Britain*, pp. 364–9.

[20] Kynaston, *Austerity Britain*, p. 19.

African and Caribbean writing was first published in London in the 1950s. Low opens her study of postcolonial publishing with a list that includes Amos Tutuola's *The Palm-Wine Drinkard* (1952), George Lamming's *The Emigrants* (1954), Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners* (1956), V. S. Naipaul's *The Mystic Masseur* (1957) and Chinua Achebe's *Things Fall Apart* (1958). This is an impressive list, but also one that could be longer. Low's concern is solely with African and West Indian contexts, but mainstream British publishers in this period also published – to give a contrasting example of literary exchange – popular Indian women writers such as Attia Hosain and Kamala Markandaya. Hosain's *Phoenix Fled and Other Stories* appeared in 1953, Markandaya's bestseller *Nectar in a Sieve* followed in 1954.[21]

Publishing tells a fascinating story about the relationship between metropole and periphery in the 1950s, but the literary success of the so-called 'Windrush Generation' and, indeed, the influence of an earlier generation of South Asian writers, including such notable figures as Mulk Raj Anand and M. J. Tambimuttu, give a deceptive sheen to the wider reception of colonial immigrants.[22] Alan Sinfield observes that 'racial discrimination was ubiquitous and continuous', and 'Liberal optimism about the tolerance (let alone fairness) of English society was rudely undercut by outbreaks of violence against Blacks in Nottingham and then Notting Hill (London) in August and September 1958'.[23] Sinfield indicts the dangerously prejudicial newspaper reporting of these events, but it was not only race that generated postwar press hysteria. The virulence of mass media attacks on minority communities and cultural outsiders is replicated in debates about sex and sexuality in the 1950s. Here too we find anxiety about the emergence of a police state and the abuse of institutional power. *Against the Law*, Peter Wildeblood's 1955 memoir of his arrest and imprisonment for homosexual offences as part of the 'Montagu Case', is a remarkable document, both admirable in its delineation of prejudice,

[21] Gail Low, *Publishing the Postcolonial: Anglophone West African and Caribbean Writing in the UK 1948–1968* (London: Routledge, 2011). For Markandaya and Hosain, see Maroula Joannou, *Women's Writing, Englishness and National and Cultural Identity: The Mobile Woman and the Migrant Voice 1938–1962* (London: Palgrave, 2012), pp. 134–60; and Ruvani Ranasinha, *South Asian Writers in Twentieth-Century Britain, Culture in Translation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2007). For the preoccupations shaping early black British writing, see James Procter, *Dwelling Places: Postwar Black British Writing* (Manchester University Press, 2003).

[22] See Ranasinha, *South Asian Writers*, for discussion of the writing, reception and influence of writers in the 1930s and 1940s, including Anand, Tambimuttu, R. K. Narayan and Raja Rao. Anand is also discussed in Kristen Bluemel, *George Orwell and the Radical Eccentrics: Intermodernism in Literary London* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004).

[23] Alan Sinfield, *Literature, Politics and Culture in Postwar Britain* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), p. 126.