CONSERVATIVE MODERNISTS

Despite sustained scholarly interest in the politics of modernism, astonishingly little attention has been paid to its relationship to Conservatism. Yet modernist writing was imbricated with Tory rhetoric and ideology from when it emerged in the Edwardian era. By investigating the many intersections between Anglophone modernism and Tory politics, *Conservative Modernists* offers new ways to read major figures such as T. S. Eliot, Ezra Pound, T. E. Hulme, and Ford Madox Ford. It also highlights the contribution to modernism of lesser-known writers, including Edward Storer, J. M. Kennedy, and A. M. Ludovici. These are the figures to whom it most frequently returns, but, cutting through disciplinary delineations, the book simultaneously reveals the input to modernism of a broad range of political writers, philosophers, art historians, and crowd psychologists: from Pascal, Burke, and Disraeli, to Nietzsche, Le Bon, Wallas, Worringer, Ribot, Bergson, and Scheler.

CHRISTOS HADJIYIANNIS was born in Nicosia, Cyprus, and is currently a Research Fellow in English Literature at Wolfson College, University of Oxford. He has published widely on modernism, including essays on T. E. Hulme and Edward Storer; Ezra Pound; J. M. Kennedy; Imagism; the avant-garde; and affect theory, phenomenology, and the literature of the First World War. He has written various encyclopaedia entries and reviews non-fiction books regularly.

CONSERVATIVE MODERNISTS

Literature and Tory Politics in Britain, 1900–1920

CHRISTOS HADJIYIANNIS
University of Oxford

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06-04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108426367

DOI: 10.1017/9781108550895

First published 2018

Printed in the United Kingdom by Clays, St Ives plc

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-108-42636-7 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-44403-3 Paperback

For my parents, for everything

Contents

Acknowledgements

Writing a book may be a solitary (and often lonely) affair, but it is impossible to write alone.

I started thinking about this book as a Research Fellow in English Literature at Wolfson College, Oxford, where I was immediately welcomed into a community of intellectuals (foxes and hedgehogs). I am thankful to everyone at Wolfson, especially its then President, Dame Hermione Lee, whose vision, generosity, and grace I will always find unmatched.

For their precious feedback, advice, and encouragement at different stages of the project, I would like to thank Laura Marcus, Rebecca Beasley, Tim Armstrong, Rachel Potter, Michèle Mendelssohn, Stefano Evangelista, David James, Olga Taxidou, and Vassiliki Kolocotroni. Many thanks also to Julie Taylor, Matthew Creasy, and Samuel and Sarah Shaw, who read portions of the book and made helpful comments, and to Valeria Petrocchi, Robert Ferguson, Ronald Schuchard, Ron Bush, and John Gery, who so generously shared their expertise with me. Further, I am deeply grateful to Jim McCue for his shrewd observations and suggestions on the typescript, and to Fiona Whelan for helping me gather genealogical information about Kennedy and Storer.

It was a pleasure to work with Ray Ryan, Edgar Mendez, and Lisa Sinclair at Cambridge University Press, and the book was made immeasurably better by the responses of the two anonymous readers of the press. I would like to acknowledge Faber and Faber for granting me permission to quote from *The Complete Prose of T. S. Eliot* and I would also like to express my gratitude to the kind librarians and archivists at the British Library, the Bodleian, the National Library of Scotland, Keele University Archives, the Harry Ransom Center at Austin, Texas, the McMaster University Library, Hull University Archives, and Tate Library and Archive.

The first – and best – teacher to inspire me was Peter Howarth, whose undergraduate lectures were the reason I took an interest in the politics of modernism in the first place. Peter is the academic I'll always strive to be, as is Finn Fordham, on whose friendship, bonhomie, and wisdom I hope to always be able to call. Whether they realise it or not, I couldn't have written this book without their input. I am also hugely indebted to Alex Thomson. Alex taught me how to read, write, and think anew. His feedback and faith throughout the years have been transformative; I cannot thank him enough.

I am lucky to have been able to rely for conversation, comfort, and advice on Andreas Vrahimis, Yiannis Christofides, Christakis Georgiou, Jamie Castell, Foteini Dimiroulli, Charlotta Salmi, Jennifer Johnson, Kei Hiruta, Nick Hall, Cathryn Setz, Anastasia Tolstoy, Christine Fouirnaies, Michelle Kelly, John Scholar, Edward and Renée Doegar, Margaret Scarborough, Hannah Joll, Sylvia Villa, and William Charrington. Elina Aletrari, Antonis Theocharides, Costas Michaelides, Jo Simon, and my fellow-strollers Danilo Raponi and Florian Nigsch, were there for me when I asked for their help – but also when I didn't. My brother Yangos and my sister Demetra have always looked after me; for that, and for everything else, I thank them dearly. I am exceptionally grateful to Henry Mead, Mark Bolsover, Jarad Zimbler, Alexandra Manglis, and, of course, Lina Protopapa. Meeting Lina has been life's great triumph. She read through the typescript painstakingly and meticulously, made helpful suggestions, offered guidance and purpose, and kept me going: I am fortunate, and privileged, to have her in my life and to be able to count on her love and intellect.

I wrote the majority of this book at *kxoffee project* café in Nicosia, Cyprus. I would like to thank Christos and Maria for their steady supply of short blacks, and Marios Petrondas, who used not to interrupt.

Every opportunity I have had in my life I owe to my parents Theo and Georgia – to whom this book is dedicated, with infinite love and gratitude.

Introduction: Modernists against Modernity

What we call 'modernism' was concocted out of various ingredients; one of them was Toryism before and during the Great War. This book is the story of how a group of London's self-styled 'Tory' writers responded in their writings to key events in the British political, artistic, and intellectual landscape during the period 1900–20. T. E. Hulme, Edward Storer, J. M. Kennedy, T. S. Eliot, and Ford Madox Ford (known until 1919 as Ford Madox Hueffer) all contributed to the development of modernist thinking in significant ways. They also all aligned themselves, to different degrees, with Toryism: with the principles and policies of the British Conservative Party, which during these years saw its dominance challenged from various quarters, but also with the broader philosophical and political outlook of conservatism. *Conservative Modernists* re-examines the politics involved in their classical brand of modernism by exploring different ways in which their literary and critical writings were imbricated with Tory politics.

The ways in which groups of modernists fused their poetics with their politics have interested scholars for decades, especially so since the end of the reign of New Criticism (with its treatment of literary texts as self-contained aesthetic objects) in the 1950s. Those enquiring into the politics of modernism today are therefore well-served in beginning by thinking about the question afresh, and examining its present-day pertinence. This is what Douglas Mao does at the start of a recent essay on the politics of Wyndham Lewis and W. H. Auden, when he challenges every literary critic and historian who continues to write on the subject by asking: 'Is there any point in continuing to assess the politics of modernism?'

There is, first, the question of what we mean by 'modernism'. By adopting new tools and broadening their remit, scholars have continued to reveal the variety of modernisms that went into the making of

'modernism'. If any reminders were needed, this has in turn emphasised that there will always be a range of political positions in any one group – and even within individuals. But this need not mean that we cannot examine or talk of a *politics of modernism*. This is the conclusion that Mao reaches, too: the works of some writers, he argues, 'seem meaningfully constellated [and] speak to each other in ways that cannot, except under the most willfully repressive and selective kind of reading, be deemed apolitical'.[1] This is the case with Hulme, Storer, Kennedy, Eliot, and Ford, all of whose writings are meaningfully constellated around a shared political and aesthetic classicism. Meaningfully but not seamlessly, for as we will see, their respective classicisms are manifested in different – and sometimes contradictory – ways.

Yet, while they were Tories in different senses and for different reasons, all five found that early-twentieth-century Toryism spoke to some of their strongest aesthetic and political sensibilities. It gave them a political framework for upholding their deep-rooted conviction in the extraordinary power of the few over the many and it accommodated their longing for some fabled time when artists were recognised as playing an important role in society. In common with other Edwardian Tories, they were preoccupied with tradition, as against what they disparagingly called 'progress'; they were suspicious of egalitarianism and affiliated themselves with elites; and they valued hierarchical politics over romantic ideas of the individual. As a movement that sought to overturn romanticism, classical modernism was actually full of nostalgia for a mythical past. Writing at the beginning of a new century, Tory modernists all looked resolutely backwards.

In this sense, these were modernists writing *against* modernity. We now know that modernists were more adept at exploiting mass-market economics than they pretended, but this was not to say that they approved of the new institutions of mass culture – or those who consumed it.[2] As artists and intellectuals living in London in the early twentieth century, they admitted to feeling relegated to the margins by the advent of mass democracy and the rise of popular culture. Their convictions about the status and function of art were informed by cultural nostalgia, the myth of the artist as legislator, and a fancy – as another classical modernist, Ezra Pound, put it in 1912 – for rule by 'an aristocracy of the arts'.[3] Pound, styling himself as a troubadour out of sync with industrial England's modes of cultural production, expressed his own resistance to modernity as longing for the 'age of gold', the time when the poet was left alone to pursue his art without consideration of the laws of

the market or the machinations of mass politics.[4] He vowed to sing (as he wrote in one of his earliest, and finest, poems) 'of the diverse moods / of effete modern civilization', of 'risorgimenti, / of old things found that were hidden', and to 'reach towards perceptions scarce heeded'.[5] Pound's modernising project was driven by a disaffection with modernity, and this is true of the figures studied here, too.

Noting the anti-modernist credentials of modernism is nothing new. It is a subject which has attracted the attention of several critics, including those who have read (as I do) the uneasy relationship between modern aesthetics and anti-modern politics as inherent in the very idea of the modern. After all, as Charles Ferrall puts it early on in *Modernist Writing and Reactionary Politics*, 'The idea of the modern has always harboured its opposite':

> If the Judaeo-Christian awareness of history as moving towards an end implied some kind of progress or, more apocalyptically, a notion of Redemption, it also presumed a sense of degeneration or, more catastrophically, of Fall. Similarly, when Bernard of Chartres used the term 'modernus' in the twelfth century to claim that the Moderns could see further than the Ancients, he also pointed out that it was only because they were dwarfs standing on the shoulders of giants.[6]

Ferrall finds precisely this doubleness – a desire for radical break with the old coupled with an ambivalence towards the new – underlying the politics of Eliot, W. B. Yeats, Pound, Wyndham Lewis, and D. H. Lawrence. He maintains that, ultimately, the combination in these high modernists of 'a radical aesthetic modernity with an almost outright rejection of even the emancipatory aspects of bourgeois modernity' led them to fascist ideologies. Being parodies of revolution, he claims, fascist ideologies accommodated their attraction to transformation while also harbouring their scepticism about modernity.[7] For Michael North, really it could not have been otherwise, since aesthetic modernism, for him, 'is at once part of the larger project of enlightenment, emancipation, and progress and a reaction against that progress'. Through their aesthetic works, North concludes (with Yeats, Pound, and Eliot in mind), modernists sought to rehearse and reconcile the several contradictions of modernity.[8]

One of the places in which the doubleness of classical modernism is most apparent is in its attitude towards popular culture. Classical modernists may have been dismissive of mass culture (which, in keeping with late-nineteenth-century stereotypes, they gendered feminine) and disapproving of the easily seduced masses who consumed it, yet they had no compunction about offering their art as commodity.[9] Aware that – to use

Pierre Bourdieu's term – resistance to mass culture could yield maximum cultural capital, they sought patronage from an emerging elite of patron-investors that included John Quinn, Harriet Shaw Weaver, and Scofield Thayer, who funded their various projects.[10] They were also capable of playing prospective publishers off against each other to secure maximum returns for their elitist experiments.[11] Further, while by their own account anti-populist, modernists followed the publication of their works in limited or deluxe editions with public and commercial editions.[12] To be sure, they wanted to speak first to the select few, but they eventually wanted to address a wider public, even when this audience (like the 'wise and simple man … who is but a dream' in Yeats's 'The Fisherman') did not yet exist.[13]

This incongruity, which was pointed out by several other scholars before him, is what has allowed Lawrence Rainey to argue with credence and conviction that 'modernism and commodity culture were not implacable enemies but fraternal rivals'.[14] A few years earlier, Andreas Huyssen had already alerted us to this uneasy bond when he described modernism as suffering from an 'anxiety of contamination by its other: an increasingly consuming and engulfing mass culture'.[15] Extending our scope beyond economics and culture into the sphere of politics, we see that the classical modernists engaged with politics in the same way as they engaged with culture. Their disdain for mass democracy did not stop them utilising the findings of crowd psychology in order to influence the enlarged franchise of new electors whom they regarded with condescension – and they weren't, of course, immune to indoctrination themselves.[16] Rainey's conclusion that the modernists, trapped between an inability to reconstruct an artistic aristocracy of the salon and an unwillingness to embrace the egalitarianism of the commodity, resorted to doing 'a little of both at once: to reconstruct an aristocracy, but to do it with the world of the commodity', applies also in their attitude towards politics.[17] Classical modernists wanted both to live in an ivory tower and (as Flaubert would have it) stem the tide of *merde* that was beating at its walls.[18]

Other contrary forces, too, were pulling conservative modernism: for example, in the Tory modernists' twin calls for an aesthetics of strong wills and for exterior discipline; in their idea of tradition as both unconscious and organic, deliberative and externally imposed; in their poetic ideal of concreteness and their desire for symbolic persuasion; and in their stipulations that the author be disinterested yet also impressionistic (and therefore invested). Unsurprisingly, incompatible imperatives are

also found in their politics, where even as individuals they had conflicting notions of conservatism. Partly, this is because what each understood conservatism to be changed from period to period and debate to debate; partly it is because, although they defined themselves as 'Tories', none was exactly loyal to the principles and policies dictated by Tory leadership. On the contrary, they were often vehemently critical of the Tory party, which in any case, like many mainstream political parties, was – and remains – a broad church. It is one of the arguments of this book that, rather than a unified political identity, Toryism during the years 1900–20 is better understood as a platform or coalition of interests, many of which were incompatible.

The idea that one key role of political parties is to aggregate diverse interests and so operate as coalitions of the incompatible has been expounded by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe. Following them, we may say that the political identity of the Toryism invoked by the writers considered in this book is analogous to Saussure's linguistic signs: it is best understood as a discourse constituted through articulation, as part of a process during which combinations of different discursive elements are formed and transformed.[19] This is one way of highlighting how the different ideas of Tory modernists may all operate under the sign of 'conservatism'. Commenting on how the process described by Laclau and Mouffe works in effect, Anna Marie Smith explains that 'the value of each subject position is shaped by its relations with the others, but always remains open to the constitutive effects of new differential relations'.[20] Political identities are the result of antagonistic relationships, and when one camp is set in opposition to another camp, incongruous positions form a 'chain of equivalence'. This is true of the Toryism of the writers studied here, which was articulated chiefly as opposition to twentieth-century Liberalism. Further, while an idea may be articulated within a specific discourse (in this case that of early-twentieth-century Toryism), it can also participate in other political discourses – Guild Socialism, for example, or Distributism. Finally, just as for Laclau and Mouffe a 'chain of equivalence' never dissolves into a singular homogeneous mass but differences between the subject positions remain, so we may say that Hulme, Storer, Kennedy, Eliot, and Ford were Tories – without downplaying or suppressing the differences in their distinct subject positions.[21]

Despite valiant attempts to give Toryism (as Storer put it) the 'expressed philosophy' they thought it was lacking, the Tory modernists examined in this book affiliated themselves with Toryism not despite its being but because it was a body of ideas without abstract dogmas.[22]

Toryism, or conservatism, satisfied their ambivalence towards modernity and opposition to an advanced industrialist society, which Eliot thought was 'worm-eaten with Liberalism'.[23] Because Toryism had symbolic value, it could broach a variety of anti-Liberal ideas. This allowed them justifiably to claim that they were Tories, and in turn licenses us to use the term 'Toryism' to describe the ragbag of ideas found in Hulme's anti-pacifist democracy, Storer's hierarchical politics, Kennedy's aristocracy, Ford's paternalistic feudalism, and, later, Eliot's Christian society.

Because Edwardian Toryism was not monolithic, it is important to have a good sense of the history of the Conservative Party up to the constitutional crisis of 1910–11. And because it was much more than a political alliance, it is helpful to remember that conservatism had (and still has) philosophical, political, and religious aspects. If this book moves between several definitions of conservatism, it is because conservatism can be read as anti-utopianism; as a belief in original sin; as the politics of fear; as historicism; or – as it likes to imagine itself – as the voice of 'common sense'.

All critical endeavours carry political implications, which is why, to the initial question 'What does it mean to assess the politics of modernism?' the literary critic and historian must add another: 'What is involved in reconstructing the history of a dominant strand of modernism?' While (as Michael Whitworth has recently noted) modernist criticism has continued to press on with the interrogation of the politics of modernism, over the last few decades it has also sensibly challenged traditional chronological, geographical, and disciplinary boundaries, effecting what Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz have jointly identified as an *expansion* in modernist studies: both spatial (moving away from national to transnational modernisms) and vertical (pluralistic opening to other modernisms).[24] Absorbing the insights of postcolonial criticism, scholars of modernism have sought to address the canon's bias towards Anglocentric historicisations of modernism. They have also vowed to write women back into modernist history. Years ago, in her edited anthology *The Gender of Modernism*, Bonnie Kime Scott made the point that, inevitably, attention fixed on a small set of white male modernists can only perpetuate a 'conservative, anxious, male strain of modernism', which is why, she argued, it is important to include a broader array of authors and texts (including non-experimental texts) in our investigations.[25]

This English, white, male, and sometimes imperialistic strand of modernism, and the widely anthologised texts that it has produced, is

precisely the kind of modernism placed under examination here. There are ethical and political repercussions, but to investigate it over two decades is not to deny the importance to modernism of other nations and intercultural exchange, or of women artists and women's politics, nor is it to suggest that earlier and later periods were somehow less significant. It is, rather, to scrutinise a particular but dominant history. This entails employing what Michael Levenson has called a 'minimalist' definition of modernism, but with the important caveat that we need be otherwise 'maximalist in our accounts of the diverse modernizing works and movements, which are sometimes deeply congruent with one another, and just as often opposed or even contradictory'.[26]

Now recognised as one of early modernism's most influential figures, T. E. Hulme made a name for himself as an early and enthusiastic advocate of the philosophy of Henri Bergson, an insinuator of Imagism and Vorticism, a supporter of abstract art, and a conduit into British consciousness for ideas from thinkers as diverse as Gustave Kahn, Théodule-Armand Ribot, Pierre Lasserre, Wilhelm Worringer, Georges Sorel, and Max Scheler. Though there hasn't been any concerted critical effort to explore his Toryism, Hulme was also a 'certain kind of Tory' (as he put it), who took a profound interest in the Conservative Party crisis that followed the 1910 elections, who debated theories of propaganda in aid of the Tory party, and – as he explained in his most famous lecture, 'Romanticism and Classicism' – who made 'no apology for dragging in' his conservative politics when writing about art.[27]

Although a regular contributor to *The New Age*, Hulme published most of his political essays in the conservative weekly *The Commentator*, alongside Edward Storer, a figure whose impact on literary modernism is still little appreciated.[28] Writing about 'non-modernist modern' poets, David Goldie has bemoaned the way the strictures of modernism have left out some poets, perhaps because they preferred 'evolution to revolution'. While Goldie's list of non-modernist writers who were nonetheless poetic modernisers does not include Storer, he is a case in point.[29] Three years older than Hulme, Storer was born in 1880, the son of an insurance agent. He trained as a lawyer and qualified as a solicitor in 1907 before turning to criticism, poetry, and translation (in the 1911 census he gave his occupation as 'journalist'). Storer's ideas for modernising poetic form and content – using free verse, juxtapositions of images, and concrete language – anticipate the work of many of the later poets associated with Imagism and Vorticism.

In his 'History of Imagism' (1915), F. S. Flint remembered Storer as a key figure of the 'Tour d'Eiffel' group, the early modernist coterie that began meeting at the Restaurant de la Tour d'Eiffel in Soho in 1909, and which comprised poets talking and experimenting with the 'Image': with poetry that aspired to 'a form of expression, like the Japanese, in which an image is the resonant heart of an exquisite moment'.[30] The young Pound was introduced to the group in April that year, and was later to credit it as a pivotal moment in the development of Imagism.[31] According to Eliot, this was the beginning of modern poetry in Britain.[32] Moving in step with Hulme, Storer began campaigning around 1911 against Liberalism in politics and romanticism in literature. Like his friend, he became part of a larger group of party commentators committed to helping the Conservative Party to reform its outdated message.[33] It was as part of this concerted political campaign to make the Tory position more appealing to the electorate that they distinguished between romanticism and classicism, an antithesis that was to form the basis of early modernist classical poetics. In their eyes, romanticism and Liberalism were built upon vague, optimistic universals, whereas classicism, modernism, and Conservatism favoured the tangible, the precise, and the definite.

Concurrently, in the pages of *The New Age*, J. M. Kennedy was also campaigning against Liberalism and romanticism. Neither a poet nor a modernist, he objected vociferously to the artistic experiments of his contemporaries, yet many of his ideas are representative of this brand of 'classical' modernism and his use of the distinction between romanticism and classicism predates those of Hulme and Eliot. After A. R. Orage, Kennedy was the most prolific contributor to *The New Age*.[34] Kennedy was also an important Nietzsche scholar at a time when the German philosopher's ideas were beginning to circulate, often in very adapted forms (in 1907, Helen Zimmern published her authorised translation of *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*).

Although *The New Age* has attracted a good deal of scholarly attention, very little is known about Kennedy.[35] The air of mystery surrounding his name (some thought him a spy) has not helped. Genealogical research shows that he was born in Londonderry in 1886 as the only child of a lower middle-class family (his father was a commercial writing clerk). By 1908, he had moved to London, where he reported for *The Daily Telegraph*, working, according to Rebecca West, as assistant to the paper's Russian correspondent, E. J. Dillon.[36] Having published a short monograph on Nietzsche in 1909, he was commissioned to help translate

Nietzsche for Oscar Levy's 18-volume edition of the Works.[37] Among the other books that Kennedy wrote, translated, or edited in his short life were a study of Eastern religions and philosophies, a lengthy study of the 'imperialistic' ambitions of the United States, and translations from Italian, French, and Sanskrit.[38] In two of these, *Tory Democracy* (1911) and *English Literature, 1880–1905* (1912), and in essays published in *The New Age* in the years 1910–18, Kennedy drew associations between Liberalism, romanticism, and the literature of chaos, emotion, and individualism. A decade later, Eliot would make similar associations, famously taking a stand for classical, impersonal, and organic order.[39] Rather than dismiss Kennedy as an eccentric thinker (which he was), promulgating bigoted and poisonous ideas (which he did), it is more productive to see him as someone whose influence on classical modernism exemplifies the diversity of the ideas that went into the making of modernism.

Eliot published his most distinctly political writings after the war, and particularly after his confirmation in the Anglican Church and his naturalisation as a British citizen in 1927. But long before he described himself as an 'old-fashioned Tory' and attached himself (with characteristic scepticism) to 'temperate conservatism', he was mixing Tory politics with modernist critical attitudes in a way comparable to those of Hulme, Storer, and Kennedy.[40] *Conservative Modernists* finds Tory politics in Eliot's graduate papers and unpublished lectures and reviews, as well as in some of his earliest and least-known poems. Tracing the development of his theories of tradition and inspiration from their earlier stages, it shows them to be part of a movement that includes the rest of these figures. Moreover, while placing Eliot alongside Hulme, Storer, and Kennedy reveals something about Eliot's intellectual development, conversely, it restores a balance in modernist historiography by highlighting the contribution of those such as Storer and Kennedy, who, like many others of Eliot's contemporaries, have suffered neglect in the shadow of his reputation.[41]

Modernist attitudes to art and literature coincide with Tory politics again in the pre-war writings of Ford Madox Ford. An idiosyncratic conservative, Ford pronounced himself a 'Tory' on several occasions, and supported many Conservative policies, but he also claimed never to have voted for the party and supported numerous policies that were distinctly un-Conservative, notably Irish Home Rule.[42] His writings were full of nostalgia for a feudalist past that accorded with the paternalistic fantasies of Edwardian Radical Tories. He questioned and tested the viability

of Conservatism in both his journalism and his literary output – most famously, in *Parade's End* (1924–8), the tetralogy based on his experiences fighting in the trenches during the Great War.

Beginning in 1910, and amidst the 'Conservative Party crisis' that followed the General Elections of 1906 and 1910, Hulme and Storer took part in a public discussion regarding the future of the Conservative Party. In line with party propagandists and commentators, they argued that political conversion is chiefly an emotional process, and stressed the value of propaganda in winning adherents. Tory rhetoric, they claimed, needed to be more 'direct': it ought to aim for simple language and 'fresh' metaphors, and it ought to appeal to voters' instincts rather than their reason. Significantly for an understanding of the close relationship of Tory propaganda and modernist poetics, these were the very rigours being demanded of poetry, not only by Hulme and Storer, but also by Pound and his Imagist allies. Although there were other sources of influence for the Imagist aesthetic and other shared discursive modes, Tory propaganda and Imagist poetics were based on similar evolutionary accounts of language and incorporated the same emotional theories of conversion.

Like the political essays of Hulme and Storer, Kennedy's argued that, as well as reforming Tory rhetoric, the Conservative Party needed to buttress its beliefs around a broad yet comprehensive political philosophy. To this effect, these writers associated Tory views with classicism, and contrasted classicism with romanticism and Liberalism. It is in this context, and as part of a wider discussion about the future of the Conservative Party, that the distinction between romanticism and classicism in its modernist sense emerged. Whereas romantics/Liberals believe in inevitable progress, classicists/Conservatives endorse the doctrine of original sin, which leads them to appreciate human nature for what (supposedly) it really is: limited and inherently fallible. Just as Toryism is the expression of the classical worldview in the political arena, the classical aesthetics of Hulme, Storer, Kennedy, and Eliot are its literary manifestations. Modernist poet and Tory thinker alike acknowledge human limitations and welcome the organising power of tradition.

During this time, H. H. Asquith's Liberal coalition was passing sweeping social and constitutional reforms, the most contentious of which was the 1911 Parliament Act, which sought to limit the Lords' powers to veto legislation. As self-described Tories, all of the figures studied here found themselves at odds with the society in which they lived and wrote. Against a backdrop of social and political change, they formulated and

developed their ideas about inspiration and about the duties of writers and critics. In Ford's account, the writer served a vital social and political role by cultivating a 'critical attitude'. Kennedy's ideal writer resembled a strong statesman, having a seer-like quality which set him apart from the masses. Equally, the classical poets envisaged by Hulme and Storer would possess rare abilities, very much like Pound's ideal poet, who 'perceives at greater intensity, and more intimately, than his public'.[43] Eliot, meanwhile, was calling on critics and poets to exercise 'erudition … sense of history, and generalizing power', and both to embody and to develop tradition.[44] Literary and critical values, here, are also political.

While Liberals and Conservatives were fighting over the future of the House of Lords, in the art world all the talk was about the anti-representational art that emerged in the wake of Roger Fry's Post-Impressionist exhibition of November 1910. Fry and his fellow Post-Impressionist critics Desmond MacCarthy and Clive Bell questioned artistic standards handed down to them from the Renaissance, and called for a return to more 'primitive' – abstract and expressive – forms. Storer, Hulme, Ford, and Eliot welcomed the new abstract art, with Hulme claiming it as the manifestation of an anti-humanist outlook consonant with the Tory classicism that he and Storer advocated in *The Commentator* in 1911–12. When read according to the anti-materialist art histories of Alois Riegl and Wilhelm Worringer, the modernist turn towards abstraction was a deliberate choice – an expression of a particular *will towards order*. While intolerant of modern abstract art, Kennedy too championed abstraction in art for political reasons, as did A. M. Ludovici, the Nietzschean Tory who wrote on art for *The New Age*, at the time one of the leading journals of radical visual modernism. Unlike Hulme, Storer, Ford, or Eliot, however, Kennedy and Ludovici found order only in the works of artists who surrender personal expression and recognise external authority. Notions of conservatism and aesthetic values often conflicted among and within these writers.

Hulme, Ford, and Kennedy all supported the declaration of war on Germany in 1914. In arguing that the war was in response to German aggression, and that it was Britain's duty to fight for European peace, they lined up behind the Liberal Government, as did the Conservative Party. The enemy was no longer Liberalism, but Prussianism overseas and pacifism at home. While Ford wrote propagandist books for the government, and Kennedy for the *Daily Telegraph*'s 'War Books' series, Hulme picked a fight with one of the most vocal opponents of the war, Bertrand Russell, whose ideas he regarded as a form of misguided and

naive liberal-pacifist democracy. Instead, he urged a different kind of politics which would be based on duty, sacrifice, and individual (but not unrestrained) freedom. Elements of this vision of duty and sacrifice could long be traced in the writings of Ford and also Eliot, who warned in 1928 that the notion of right creates distorted ways in which individuals are estranged from politics and culture.[45] Hulme and Ford each volunteered for active service, driven by commitment to this kind of politics. As part of his debate with Russell, and in order to account for his support of war, Hulme also developed a theory of objective ethics, which is best understood through the phenomenology of Max Scheler, and which was taken up after Hulme's death by Eliot – to this day, the chief representative of classical modernism.