

THE MIGRATIONS OF MODERNISM: REMAKING ENGLISH STUDIES IN THE COLD WAR

The fashion now is to proclaim that modernism has given - or is giving - way to postmodernism. Before settling on this agenda, it is worth recalling that modernism has not maintained an even or unbroken domination over twentieth-century theory and practice of literature, art and criticism. Looking at the issue from another direction, we have persuasive accounts of how English 'rose' in Britain as a certain kind of study - in complex implication with ideologies that were imperialist, nationalist, empiricist, sexist, elitist.¹ But how did we get from the peak of that tendency - the dominance of Leavisism (and the Movement) in the 1950s - to the point where the question is how postmodernism supersedes modernism? Here, too, there is a history and a politics, and one conclusion I shall draw is that socialist accounts of English studies have overlooked the effective political impetus of the reinvention of modernism in the United States, dwelling instead upon an Englishness and Leavisism that is in fact only residual.

ANGLO-SAXON ATTITUDES

We associate *Scrutiny* with the championing of Eliot, Yeats, James, Conrad and Lawrence, but that did not constitute endorsement of modernism. Four defining characteristics of modernism, as it has generally been understood, did not suit Leavis's views: cosmopolitanism and internationalism, self-conscious experimentation with language and forms, the idea of the artwork as autonomous, and the concept of the artist as alienated by the special intensity of his (usually his) vision of the modern condition. Leavis wanted literature to be culturally central in an English tradition, and therefore it should be English, relatively comprehensible, concerned with positive moral values, not avant-gardist. Leavis and his associates read Eliot, Yeats, James, Conrad and Lawrence so as to emphasize the qualities they could use and marginalize the others. As Harold Rosenberg has demonstrated, *Scrutiny* published articles opposing many modernists - Marianne Moore, Faulkner, Bergson, Apollinaire, Laforgue, Mallarme, Valery, Gertrude Stein, Pound, Wyndham Lewis and Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake*. Rosenberg observes: 'No writer after Lawrence was ever permitted to affect the magazine's perspective. For Leavis, such men as Kafka, Kierkegaard, and Sartre might as well never have existed. . . . Leavis embraced the modernist revolution in order to bring it to an end.'²

As higher education and teacher-training expanded rapidly in the 1950s, Leavisism was promoted as a vital and necessary programme, capable of

development in both conservative and progressive directions, and having relevance for all age-groups in education. Although *Scrutiny* closed in 1953, *The Use of English* (1949) and *Critical Quarterly* (1959) were founded on Leavisite principles, and *Universities Quarterly* was edited by Boris Ford from 1955. Well after 'the moment of *Scrutiny*', after 1953, significant work was published by Leavis, L. C. Knights, D. A. Traversi, D. J. Enright, H. A. Mason, D. W. Harding, Denys Thompson, David Holbrook, John Speirs, Wilfrid Mellers, A. E. Dyson and C. B. Cox. *The Pelican Guide to English Literature* was published between 1954 and 1961: edited by Boris Ford, it placed a fundamentally Leavisite canon and set of interpretations within every student's reach at five shillings per volume.

Even more striking than this tendency in education, was the convergence of academics and writers. Prominent younger poets and novelists of the 1950s, especially those seen as belonging to 'the Movement', acknowledged some allegiance to the *Scrutiny* school;³ D.J. Enright had published often in *Scrutiny* from 1941 to the end, and he edited a key volume, *Poets of the 1950s* (1955), in which Movement writers introduced their work with provocatively brisk statements of their aims and beliefs. This overlap of literary and academic factions was, in itself, contrary to the spirit and practice of modernism, which had sought to release literature from established institutions. In fact, anti-modernism was a key feature of Movement writing. 'What poets like Larkin, Davie, Elizabeth Jennings, and I had in common at that time', writes Thorn Gunn, 'was that we were deliberately eschewing modernism, and turning back, though not very thoroughlygoingly, to traditional resources in structure and method.' John Wain declared that the idea 'that all ardent, youthful spirits would naturally write in a "modern" manner . . . was manifestly absurd by 1950'. Larkin realized that he did not like modern jazz because it is modernist like Pound and Picasso, and this means indulging in 'irresponsible exploitation of technique in contradiction of human life as we know it', diverting us 'as long as we are prepared to be mystified or outraged', subject to a compulsion 'to wade deeper and deeper into violence and obscenity', and 'tending towards the silly, the disagreeable and the frigid' - and all because the artist is 'piqued at being neglected'.⁴

The reaction against modernism in British writing and criticism can hardly be overstated. It was manifested also by writers of a slightly earlier generation, such as Anthony Powell, Angus Wilson, C. P. Snow, Pamela Hansford Johnson and William Cooper. On the left, Doris Lessing declared her commitment to 'the great realists' of the nineteenth-century novel;⁵ and in *Culture and Society* (1958) Raymond Williams discussed Lawrence and Eliot not as modernist experimenters but as thinkers in an English tradition concerned with industrialism and community.

The political impetus of anti-modernism in the 1950s may be sketched, quite rapidly, in terms of three frames of reference: literary institutions, class and nation. Within the institutions of literature, anti-modernists continued a Leavisite hostility towards a metropolitan (Bloomsbury) establishment that was, allegedly, trivializing and perverting the literary tradition. Leading figures like

Cyril Connolly, John Lehmann, Stephen Spender, C. M. Bowra, Edith Sitwell and Dylan Thomas were associated with a left-over modernism that was, its opponents felt, both watered down and desperately extreme. Younger writers saw little scope for development there and cultivated self-consciously unpretentious styles.⁶

At the level of social class, anti-modernists regarded modernism, perhaps correctly, as a rebellion effectively *within* the higher bourgeoisie. As John Holloway explained in the *Hudson Review*, even the prominent leftwing writing of the pre-war period had come from the upper classes; 'behind it, at varying degrees of half-discredited remoteness, stood literary Bohemia or Bloomsbury or the literary country-house weekend'. Not only did the Movement writer come from a lower-middle-class and suburban background, 'he is on the whole staying there. If he is teaching it is not in an upper-class preparatory school, but in a "red-brick" university. The automatic decanting process into upper-class England has been interrupted. Perhaps it is no longer wanted.'⁷ Exactly the same analysis may be applied to the Leavisite academic (of course, several Movement writers *were* academics). Modernism was out of key with the welfare state and its purported concern with the ordinary person; in the Movement writer's 'beery "blokeish" ambience'⁸ there was a residual egalitarianism, deriving from service in the armed forces and the hopes of 1945, and presided over, ambivalently, by the ghost of Orwell. Modernist pretensions were at odds with the kind of person a writer or don (if the word was still appropriate) now seemed to be. Al Alvarez observed 'an attempt to show that the poet is not a strange creature inspired; on the contrary, he is just like the man next door - in fact, he probably *is* the man next door'.⁹

Finally, we should recognize a framework of national consciousness, to address the preoccupation with Englishness that fuelled hostility to modernism. Modernism generally had been a European phenomenon, and British literary modernism specifically had been dependent upon immigrants, particularly from the United States. In the first quarter of the century, London had attracted writers and artists because it was at the heart of a massive empire and was hence a major cultural centre. There, modernists could both repudiate and, in a typical paradox of avant-gardism, participate in the cultural establishment. But with the passing of British imperial power, Englishness became, even more than before, a sensitive matter, and evocations of it became insecure, defensive and backward-looking. Modernism, as such, had never been properly English (though its writers and texts could be incorporated), and the same kind of sensitivity that produced the Suez invasion, the 'independent' nuclear 'deterrent' and hostility towards immigrants tended to position modernism as a fashion that had had its day. Furthermore, concurrently, modernism was being reinvigorated and recentred just where Englishness was most distressed: in the United States, the former colony to which world hegemony had passed.

Where the ascendant British literature and criticism had its reasons for forgetting about modernism, US counterparts had reasons for reconstituting it. My theme is this divergence of cultural tendencies and how the US conception prevailed.

MODERNISM IN THE GLOBAL VILLAGE

Economically, politically and militarily, the United States was taking over in the 1940s roles that had belonged to European states; it seemed only right and natural that cultural centrality should follow. Serge Guilbaut has shown how action painting, or abstract expressionism, was the immediate vehicle through which 'New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art':¹⁰ it was recognizably descended from European high modernism, and yet distinctively 'American'. One of its principal promoters, Clement Greenberg, wrote in 1948: 'The main premisses of western art have at last migrated to the United States, along with the center of gravity of industrial production and political power.'¹¹ The poet Frank O'Hara rejoiced, in 1958, that action painting has 'given us as Americans an art which for the first time in our history we can love and emulate, aspire to and understand, without provincial digression or prejudice. The Europeanization of our sensibilities has at last been exorcised as if by magic.'¹² In other art forms similarly, techniques of and affiliations to modernism were developed: beat and confessional poetry; novels by Vladimir Nabokov, John Barth and Thomas Pynchon; the music of John Cage and Morton Feldman; even modern jazz (to the chagrin of Philip Larkin). Such work was both modernist and 'American'; thus, in 1957, Allen Ginsberg's *Howl* was defended against a charge of obscenity on the grounds that it resembled Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* and Pound's *Cantos*, and defended and attacked on the ground that it continued the manner of Dadaism.¹³ And it all added up. In 1961, for instance, Paul Carroll wrote in the *Evergreen Review* (which from 1957 published every modernist it could find): 'Singlehandedly Ginsberg has transfused into American prosody the important discoveries of jazzmen like Charlie Parker and the spontaneities of the Action Painters.'¹⁴

Of course, post-1940 US modernism was not uncontested. It was at odds with middlebrow culture, for instance, and with nostalgia for European classical culture, which remained potent. An alternative poetics of place was developed, too, from William Carlos Williams to Elder Olson to Ed Dorn - the oppositional character of this line of writing is evident in its exclusion from the *Faber Book of Contemporary American Poetry*, edited by Helen Vendler in 1986. Intricacies of internal US cultural politics are beyond the scope of this article. But it is germane to observe that US modernism gained great impetus from the claim that it not merely countered, but threw into reverse, a long-standing anxiety that US culture was unsophisticated and provincial. John Cage remarked:

Once in Amsterdam, a Dutch musician said to me, 'It must be very difficult for you in America to write music, for you are so far away from the centers of tradition.' I had to say, 'It must be very difficult for you in Europe to write music, for you are so close to the centers of tradition.'¹⁵

Modernist enthusiasm for experiment and innovation could be interpreted as freeing the US artist or writer from the authority of traditions in which (it was felt) he or she only partly shared. One incident in the identification of current US work with established modernism was the taking-up by the New York art world of Marcel Duchamp, whose 'Nude Descending a Staircase' (1912) is a key

NEW FORMATIONS

painting of modern art. Duchamp found that the United States had become fertile ground for modernism. Perhaps partly tongue-in-cheek, he said that European artists are

up against all those centuries and all those miserable frescoes which no one can even see any more - we love them for their cracks. That doesn't exist here. You don't give a damn about Shakespeare, do you? You're not his grandsons at all. So it's a good terrain for new developments. There's more freedom, less remnants of the past among young artists. They can skip all that tradition, more or less, and go more quickly to the real.¹⁶

The internationalist and cosmopolitan strand in modernism was also congenial to US modernism, for it could be related to the international predominance and consequent cultural eclecticism of the United States. In the first thirty years of the century, the cosmopolitanism of European modernism was, often, a repudiation of the dominant structure in international power relations, the nation state. When the European powers armed and fought against each other and took the rest of the world as terrain upon which to compete for the largest share of imperial spoils, internationalism and cosmopolitanism registered a significant protest. But by 1945, geopolitical power had simplified into two blocs: 'a multilateral system of equilibrium centred upon Europe had been displaced by a system of global bipolarity between the two great extra-European powers, the United States and the Soviet Union'.¹⁷ In these circumstances, the obscuring of time, place and national difference customary in modernism could be reorientated as a proper and apparently natural incorporation, or effacement, of cultures less powerful than that of the United States. Cage notes the adoption of his 'silences' and 'chance operations' in contemporary European music, and comments: 'It will not be easy, however, for Europe to give up being Europe. It will, nevertheless, and must: for the world is one world now.'¹⁸ Cage's 'one world' is, in actuality, a world dominated by the United States; and US modernism, thus understood, merges internationalist and chauvinist criteria, folding the two together so that world culture *is* US culture. At the moment when (I have argued) English literature partly for chauvinist reasons was repudiating modernism, US culture, partly for similar reasons, was reinventing it.

Modernism as US chauvinism may be observed in the ideas of a Canadian, Marshall McLuhan, who received surprising intellectual respect among theorists of modernism in the 1960s.¹⁹ His evocations of technology as the key to the modern condition repeatedly invoke modernist works and ideas (for instance: 'The advent of electric media released art from this straitjacket [of the printed word] at once, creating the world of Paul Klee, Picasso, Braque, Eisenstein, the Marx Brothers and James Joyce').²⁰ The revealing ambiguity in McLuhan's vision concerns the word 'we', as when he says: 'We are certainly coming within conceivable range of a world automatically controlled', and 'Our new electric technology . . . extends our senses and nerves in a global embrace.'²¹ In such instances, 'we' may seem to be humanity, but in actuality we know that these powers are not possessed by most people, or even most businesses and governments (the distinction is further apparent in McLuhan's

disdainful stereotyping of the rest of the world - Africa as backward and savage, and so on). As Christopher Brookeman puts it, 'McLuhan's image of a global village joined by a single universal technology of electric circuitry chimed in with America's world role in reconstructing and maintaining the world economic and political system'.²² McLuhan actually compares 'our' control of media with 'our' knowledge about 'maintaining equilibrium in the commercial economies of the world'.²³ So he was consulted and financed by multinational corporations, advertising and the US and Canadian governments, and featured in the glossy journals of western thought and commodity consumption.²⁴ 'Our' means North American when McLuhan asserts, 'Our unified sensibility cavorts amidst a wide range of awareness of materials and colours which makes ours one of the greatest ages of music, poetry, painting, and architecture alike.'²⁵ The ultimate ratification of US world hegemony is modernistic artistic greatness.

The reworking of the cosmopolitan and internationalist dimension of modernism as chauvinism may be illustrated once more from a later but revealing text by Hugh Kenner. After many prominent books creating the idea of modernism, Kenner produced a home-grown, 'American' version, containing such diverse figures as Faulkner, Fitzgerald, Hemingway, Carlos Williams, and even the Wright Brothers and Benjamin Lee Whorf.²⁶ Indeed, it finally emerges that US modernists were ahead of the rest: Faulkner 'left the "closed" novel behind' and has been followed by Nabokov, Pynchon and Barth; and if we now ask 'What are words for anyway?', 'in part it is because the American Modernists did their work thoroughly'. This may be true, but Kenner's argument about why the cultivation of experiment and innovation in modernism is 'peculiarly adapted to America's sense of reality' is revealing. In the United States, he says, 'language is something arbitrary, something *external* both to the speakers who use it and to the phenomena they hope to denote. Its norms are not imposed by history, they are elected, and if they turn out to be misleading us we can elect some new ones.'²⁷ This is absurd both as a theory of language and in its evident allusion to the US ideology of electoral democracy; in the wake of the Vietnam War and Watergate it seems especially deluded. But Kenner has more: 'The New World felt itself detached from European necessities. Two millennia's resources are simply available, for free election.'²⁸ The achievement of US freedom is extended from the constitution to the ransacking of the world's cultures (even as the world's material resources are consumed in disproportionate degree by countries of the Western Alliance).

The establishment of US modernism proceeded on two fronts: the production and identification of new work, and the appropriate interpretation of earlier work. The latter was mainly the task of academic criticism. The academic wing of US modernism (corresponding to the Leavisism of British anti-modernism, and often, I think mistakenly, elided with it) was New Criticism. It drew upon modernist critical suggestions, like T. S. Eliot's theory of 'impersonal' poetry and Pound's definition of the image as 'an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time', to develop the strand in modernism which imagined the poetic text as autonomous. New Critics opposed the judgement and even the understanding of poems by reference beyond them, proclaiming 'the heresy of

paraphrase', 'the intentional fallacy' and that 'a poem should not mean but be'. Their origins were in the 1930s and the South - quite a different context from that in which US modernist painting and literature flourished. None the less, the maximum influence of New Criticism was later, so that the two movements converged and validated each other. In 1949 Rene Wellek and Austin Warren observed: 'A healthy reaction has taken place which recognizes that the study of literature should, first and foremost, concentrate on the actual works of art themselves.'²⁹ By 1962 Wilbur Scott was writing, in his introduction to a collection of essays representing *Five Approaches to Literary Criticism*: 'Without question, the most influential critical method of our time is the formalistic. It . . . is, in fact, the method one almost automatically thinks of when speaking of contemporary criticism.'³⁰

New Criticism was modernist also in that it was always liable, in the last analysis, to claim that the literary text embodies a profound truth about the supposed human condition, often in the specific guise of the alienated modern condition. So John Crowe Ransom states in his seminal essay, 'Criticism Inc.': 'The critic should regard the poem as nothing short of a desperate ontological or metaphysical manoeuvre. . . . The poet perpetuates in his poem an order of existence which in actual life is constantly crumbling beneath his touch.'³¹ Such a claim would appear to conflict with the idea of the literary text as autonomous, since the poem is said to make metaphysical and existential *reference*, even if in some non-propositional form; but paradox was prized by New Critics. The Frankfurt School strove to develop a coherent aesthetics and cultural analysis at this point. More often, New Criticism and modernism, alike, shuffle inconsistently between the idea of non-referentiality and the idea of a profound insight into the supposed modern condition.

Overall, a new set of aesthetic priorities and a new cultural history were being formulated, in conditions and for purposes that were, initially, specific to the United States. This movement was accomplished partly (of course, only partly) through the construction of what we now recognize as modernism. For, I would emphasize, the 'modernism' of the first thirty years of the century, which we now see and dispute over, is a creation of the 1950s. To be sure, it depends upon texts produced earlier in the century, but the selection and description of those texts and the defining of the concept began, to all intents and purposes, in the 1950s. The term 'modernism' was not generally available, as we now use it, until about 1960;³² as will appear shortly, key 1950s texts in the establishment of 'modernism' were written without the benefit of a current word for it. It should be clear, therefore, that the present discussion does not aspire to resolve questions about the politics of modernism as an early-twentieth-century phenomenon, or as a set of principles and practices. It is concerned with what modernism was *made to be* in the United States during the Cold War, and by British intellectuals who contributed to that making and fed it back to Britain. Nor does it matter, for the moment, whether we, or earlier commentators, prefer to distinguish some post-1945 work, or post-1960 work, as 'post-modernist', or whether it is all 'modernist'. Each of those ways of construing the situation may assert the importance of US cultural production (creative and critical) in terms of a significant relationship with European modernist writing

and art of the early part of the century - a relationship either of continuity or of significant posteriority.

It was as a US construct - often recognized explicitly as such - that modernism was recentred in Britain from the end of the 1950s. In the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, English literature was promoted throughout the world in conjunction with British imperial power and constituted in an intricate negotiation with and through that power. As world hegemony passed to the United States, the principles and practices of global, i.e. US, modernism were fed back into the canon and practices and principles of English studies. In the first edition of Cleanth Brooks's *Modern Poetry and the Tradition* (1939), modern and especially US poetry is promoted as a break with tradition ('One cannot participate fully in the poetry of John Crowe Ransom, for example, and continue to enjoy Shelley on the old basis'). But twenty-five years later, in a new introduction, Brooks regrets that he dismissed English Romantic poetry so briskly, for his critical strategy, after all, 'can be applied to the poems of a Wordsworth as well as to those of an Eliot, to those of a John Keats as well as to those of a John Donne'³³ (no one is to escape). Bernard Bergonzi remarks: 'The emergence of modernism as a literary category coincided with the explosion of the academic study of modern literature.'³⁴ He might have added that it coincided with the ascendancy of North American critics and institutions in English studies.

Cultural power normally follows economic, political and military power, and as with rock 'n' roll, Coca-Cola and blue jeans, the 'American' way of doing things, of seeing things, seemed impossible to ignore. Walter Lippman's prediction of 1946 came true: 'Fate has willed it that America is from now on to be at the center of Western civilization rather than on the periphery.'³⁵ The United States possessed institutional power (in English sty dies, wealthy and prestigious universities, foundations and publishers); and it seemed more vibrant, modern and important. Alvarez believed that the European intelligentsia sensed 'under all that turmoil and chic' (the reservation is a characteristic device for mediating US culture to the British) 'the stirrings of a genuinely advanced sensibility. American artists, that is, seem involved in exploring and defining areas of experience which have not previously been expressed in the arts.'³⁶ John Wain, while deprecating what he saw as 'the formlessness, the lack of settled tradition, the feeling that nothing is built to last' of the United States, readily acknowledged 'the exhilaration'.³⁷ For while US influence obviously undermined the autonomy of British culture, it also promised release from traditional mores and local structures of wealth, class and cultural capital. As such, it might appeal even to writers and critics who had embraced, or might have been expected to embrace, a Movement/Leavisite orientation.

CONDUCTORS

Cultural change occurs in long-term, general and uneven ways, but it is manifested through a multitude of individual decisions. The reintroduction of modernism to Britain in the late 1950s and early 1960s was advanced crucially

by well-placed individuals, who were drawn towards US culture and served as conductors, feeding back its framework of perceptions.

There were hints of non-Movement, non-Leavisite attitudes in British literary and academic circles in the mid-1950s - for instance, aspects of the poetry of Thorn Gunn and Ted Hughes and of the novels of Iris Murdoch and William Golding, Lawrence Durrell's *Alexandria Quartet* (1957-60), the vogue of Colin Wilson's *The Outsider* (1956) and the successful production of *Waiting For Godot* (1955; though London theatre pursued its own trajectory and this was perhaps just modernism forty years late). Gunn went to live in California in 1954 and negotiated his release from the British situation by arguing with Yvor Winters.³⁸ But these were separate phenomena, they did not cohere into a tendency. US commentators saw this and reported back rather unsympathetically on the strange state of British literary life.³⁹ Fundamentally, modernism was reintroduced to Britain from the United States, and the conducting agents were British writers and academics whose success - often in a Movement or Leavisite vein - had given them access to the US orbit. I shall discuss, necessarily briefly, the contributions of Donald Davie (ex-Movement poet and academic), Al Alvarez (ex-Leavisite academic and literary journalist), Frank Kermode (professional academic) and Stephen Spender (already part of the literary establishment). The range of their accomplishments and institutional roles indicates the scope and intensity of the change they helped to effect.

Davie's book *Purity of Diction in English Verse* (1952), arguing for the values of lucid communication, became something of a manifesto for the Movement;⁴⁰ in *Articulate Energy* (1955) he sought to show what is at issue when we accept the symbolist proposition that in poetry syntax turns into music. But by April 1956 Davie was displaying a divided attitude to Eliot's *Four Quartets*. On the one hand, he still hoped for 'quite a different sort of poem in the future, a sort of poem more in harmony with what was written in Europe before symbolism was thought of. On the other hand, he admired Hugh Kenner's 'brilliant' exposition of the *Quartets* and acknowledged that it would be futile 'to pretend that the symbolist revolution never happened'⁴¹ (notice that Davie has not used the term 'modernism'). By July 1957 Davie was writing of Pound's *Cantos* as 'this great poem', particularly because 'it has created and put into action a language which is literally international', unlike subsequent English poetry which, Davie now believed, 'has committed itself to the status of being no more than a marginal pleasure, a deliberately and self-confessedly *provincial* utterance'. He disagreed with Amis and Larkin over their disparagement of 'culture' and 'tradition' and accused Leavis of leading the way into 'an extreme provincialism'. Where, then, is the capital, the metropolis? Of course, it is the United States. Poets there, if anything, have gone too far in the opposite direction, being too experimental and cosmopolitan.⁴² So Davie went to be visiting professor at the University of California in 1957-8, and sought opportunity to write on 'Hugh Selwyn Mauberley' for the generally Leavisite *Pelican Guide to English Literature (The Modern Age, 1961)*. He believed that without his intervention 'Pound's achievement would go unremarked' in Britain, and that 'Mauberley' 'registers the death of England as a live cultural tradition' and the shift to 'the English-

speaking nations in North America'.⁴³ He had accepted the main tenets of US modernism.

In 1973, in *Thomas Hardy and British Poetry*, Davie was still arguing the pros and cons, but his awareness of power relations was sharper. He reiterated his sense of the sheepishness of the line of poetry that runs through Hardy and Larkin, but suggested, on the other hand, that the 'wholesale appropriation of foreign authorities' in US poetry might reflect 'the imperious rapacity which created just those banana republics that American poets are ashamed of, and inveigh against'. He observed, also, that 'the Englishman supposes he is trying to operate in some highly specific historical situation, conditioned by manifold contingencies . . . whereas the American poet . . . is sure that he is enacting a drama of which the issues are basically simple and permanent'.⁴⁴ Davie does not quite say that the former approach is that of a culture that is aware of its subordination, but that at least it retains some possibility of developing a political analysis; whereas the latter approach represents the difficulty of a dominant culture in realizing the relativity of its own perceptions.

Alvarez had been associated with the Movement in the early 1950s and he retained Leavisite principles.⁴⁵ But by 1956 he had been for two spells in the United States, and in *The Shaping Spirit* (1958 - written with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation) he appeals particularly to R. P. Blackmur (New Critic and modernist - the book is dedicated to him), and also to Hugh Kenner. Alvarez regrets 'the current sense of depressed limitation in poetry' in England and declares: 'English literature now, in the 1950s, is safely back on the track that seemed to have been abandoned when *Prufrock and Other Observations* appeared in 1917; it is back in the old way of traditional forms, traditional language and more or less traditional sentiments.'⁴⁶ For this, curiously, he blames Auden (a Leavisite move, both in its target and in the assumption that literary history proceeds in isolation from other kinds of history). But above all, in a preface to *The Shaping Spirit* Alvarez invokes US modernism - here identified, provisionally, as such: "'Modernism" - in inverted commas - has been predominantly an American concern, a matter of creating, almost from scratch, their own poetic tradition. It has affected English poetry peculiarly little.'⁴⁷ The special US conditions are those we have already heard of: freedom from tradition and the 'profound sense of alienation' with which 'artistic imagination in the States works'.⁴⁸

In his introduction to the Penguin anthology, *The New Poetry* (1962), Alvarez reiterated his analysis, accusing most English poets and especially Larkin of being in retreat from the 'new areas of experience' opened up by 'the great moderns' and rendered even more pressing by two world wars, concentration camps, genocide and nuclear war (all bundled together to form the modern condition).⁴⁹ Alvarez was far more optimistic about US poets such as Robert Lowell and John Berryman. However, by 1967 Alvarez saw signs (long present, I think) that this line of US poetry had 'resurrected traditional experiments' and therefore was 'harmless'; and that 'the cosmopolitan bias in American poetry has been abandoned in favour of something altogether more chauvinistic'.⁵⁰

We recognize Frank Kermode's area of concern in *Romantic Image* (1957)

from his opening exposition of two interlinked beliefs: 'in the Image as a radiant truth out of space and time, and in the necessary estrangement or isolation of men who can perceive it'.⁵¹ What is so striking, is that although Kermode has not yet the term 'modernism', he presents a modernist canon and critical principles as already accepted, agreed and beyond question: 'the unanimity of the witnesses is impressive'; the critic 'cannot give up the autonomy of the symbolic work of art'; if a new poetic emerges, 'it will still, of course, be Symbolist'; 'the one thing nearly everybody seems to be agreed upon is that the work of art has to be considered as a whole, and that considerations of "thought" must be subordinated to a critical effort to see the whole as one image; the total work is not *about* anything - "a poem should not mean but *be*" - which is simply a vernacular way of saying what modern critics mean when they speak of it as "autotelic".⁵² Kermode's assumption that modernism is, in 1957, the only conceivable way of thinking about literature is partly, I daresay, a strategy, a way of helping to bring about that state of affairs. But it occurs mainly because his frame of reference, outside the historical texts of romanticism, symbolism and modernism, is almost entirely North American. He shows no awareness of *Scrutiny* or the Movement (though he was personally acquainted with Wain as early as 1951).⁵³ The contemporary critics to whom he appeals include M. H. Abrams, R. P. Blackmur, Cleanth Brooks, John Crowe Ransom, Allen Tate, Philip Wheelwright and W. K. Wimsatt; to represent the position that he considers now untenable he chooses not Leavis but Yvor Winters.

Kermode is especially committed to re-reading English literary history in the light of modernist principles; being primarily an academic, he is more concerned with past writing than the other conductors discussed here. He offers as anticipators of the poetic image not only the romantic and symbolist poets we would expect, but also Wordsworth, George Eliot and Matthew Arnold. And 'the next step', he proposes, is to recover 'poetry of the past which has been excluded by earlier symbolist assumptions', including that of Spenser and Milton, who will be found to have, in his own manner, pure images.⁵⁴

I disagree with Frank Lentricchia's view of *Romantic Image* as a book that hastened the death of New Criticism. In a way, Kermode did relativize New Criticism and modernism by showing their historical origins, and he did propose integrating 'the poetic imagination with general human intellectual capacities'.⁵⁵ But, at the same time, by merging New Criticism explicitly with modernist concerns Kermode gave new coherence and authority to both. Furthermore, and crucially, Kermode's historicizing is never radical, for the texts he historicizes are made always to display an excess of profundity, bespeaking a wider and deeper significance than the historical moment could produce or contain. This strategy is characteristic of modernism and critical commentary from within its orbit. It may be observed already in Kermode's introduction to the New Arden edition of *The Tempest* (1954), and especially in his reaffirmation of the continuity and inevitability of modernism, *The Sense of an Ending*. Observe how, in this sentence as in many others, Kermode declines to place a historical limit on the uses of the idea of Apocalypse that are his theme:

Its recurrence [i.e. the recurrence of Apocalypse] is a feature of our cultural tradition, if not ultimately of our physiology, for in some measure our ways of thinking and feeling in the midst, and our historical position, always at the end of an epoch, are determined.⁵⁶

We must notice the syntactical difficulty here, and a slight quaintness ('middest'), contributing to a gnomic manner. But, crucially, there is the indeterminacy of 'if not ultimately' and 'in some measure', offering yet withholding a statement about cultural and historical determination; and then a similar proposing of 'historical position', immediately discredited by the allegedly inescapable sense of being 'always at the end of an epoch'. History is deployed here as an elusive possibility, yielding implicitly to a further, unspecified mode of truth. Thus literary-critical modernism seeks, like ideology generally, to imply an authority beyond history, ideology and power.

Kermode's cultivation of a politics apparently without politics made him a good choice to succeed Stephen Spender as co-editor of *Encounter* in 1966 (Spender became corresponding editor). His appointment was marked by an article by him on 'modernisms', asserting a continuity but also a falling off between early and current work (some enthusiasts of US modernism drew back when they saw it producing Pop Art and literature in the mid-1960s). Neither Spender nor Kermode knew that the 'Congress for Cultural Freedom' which financed *Encounter* (and similar publications in other European countries) was in fact channelling funds from the US Central Intelligence Agency. Though something like this had been suggested as early as 1955, it was not confirmed until 1966, after Conor Cruise O'Brien had been insulted and threatened with a libel action for saying so; Kermode and Spender resigned in 1967. Kermode recoiled from this episode to a new intellectual base in continental Europe - in the *nouveau roman*, structuralism and semiotics. Thus he contributed crucially to a new overlay of modernist influence, again involving interwoven literary, academic and general intellectual strands. In what respects this was to prove compatible with US modernism and how far it has constituted a challenge is matter for another article.

The degree of influence over *Encounter* exercised by the Congress is unclear. Spender himself says 'simply, the people in Paris had bright ideas about the kind of articles we should put in'. The real point is that Spender was taken up, as he has said, with anti-Communism, and had acquired 'an American point of view'.⁵⁷ As Christopher Lasch puts it, 'the editors of *Encounter* and their contributors showed an unshakeable faith in the good intentions of the American government. It was inconceivable to them that American officials were not somehow immune to the temptations of great power. The defence of "cultural freedom" was wholly entwined, in their minds, with the defence of the "free world" against Communism.'⁵⁸

For Spender, the notion of artistic and political freedom was bound up with modernism. Modernists had made individual protests against the oppressive norms of the high bourgeois society of his childhood; they had established the importance of literature in itself; they had eschewed social realism and hence, he believed, leftwing commitment; yet they had conducted a fierce critique of the

general modern condition, and hence could not be declared irrelevant. Spender opposed the idea of the artwork as autonomous, because he wanted art to 'transform' life (though he did not say in what ways). The idea tends to creep back, however, when he has to deal with the 'reactionary' politics of modernist writers: at least they 'put literature before politics'.⁵⁹ Spender's stance is typified by an (unsigned) *Encounter* editorial in 1955, where the reader was invited to ponder: 'Is the artist diviner and forerunner of a new life? Or is he the eloquent victim whose sensibility reflects those acted-upon objects we have all become today? Or is he, perhaps, the victim who, diagnosing ills, also leads?'⁶⁰ There seem to be choices here, but they are all from within the modernist conception of the uniquely sensitive artist, abstracted from any specific time or place, 'diagnosing ills' in what 'we have all become today' but not descending to particular political questions.

Spender was never involved in the mood that sustained Leavisism and the Movement in 1950s Britain. As an established man of letters, he did not have to find new ground on which to make his stand, but a way of rescuing what he could from past engagements; and his distinction made him attractive and gave him access to the US cultural apparatus. (Already in 1948 he was telling readers of the *New York Times Magazine* that 'showing Europeans the greatest contemporary achievements of American civilization' would 'win the battle for the mind of Europe'.⁶¹) Spender worked out his position in *The Creative Element* (1953): 'The creative element is the individual vision of the writer who realizes in his work the decline of modern values while isolating his own individual values from the context of society', and this had been done pre-eminently by 'the great experimenters in writing at the beginning of this century'.⁶²

By the time Spender published *The Struggle of the Modern* in 1963 (deriving from lectures at Berkeley and Washington in 1959 and 1961), the academy and intellectual journals were ready for the term 'modernism' and the distinction between 'moderns' and 'contemporaries' (which had in fact been made by Alvarez in *The Shaping Spirit*).⁶³ Bernard Bergonzi calls Spender's book 'quietly seminal'.⁶⁴ Spender finds that the current British scene is dominated by 'contemporaries' who reject modernist profundity; they are reacting against experimental writing and, dangerously to Spender's Atlanticist perspective, they are suggesting that 'Pound and Eliot were an alien incursion of American influence into English poetry'. And Leavisites, differently but relatedly, are claiming that foreign visits '- to America, for example - are simply excursions into an area of modern damnation called the "new and the unprecedented"'.⁶⁵ These attempted assertions of British cultural independence may indeed strike us as ill-considered and futile, but Spender's determination to head them off is excessive. The reason, I believe, is that 'contemporaries' and even Leavisites are likely to be concerned about politics, and Spender at this date has in view John Osborne, Doris Lessing, Alan Sillitoe, Arnold Wesker and Raymond Williams, as well as the Movement. He denigrates recent novels as 'weighed down with sociology and written by class-conscious young people concerned not with inventing values of life, but with communicating information about their working-class origins, or the Red Brick University'. This could lead to distrust of Cold War ideology and the Western Alliance - to the Campaign for Nuclear

Disarmament, for instance, which several prominent 'contemporaries' supported, though Spender does not mention it. He thinks condescension a better weapon, and it is the whole tenor of his argument. The 'contemporary' is placed as 'partisan in the sense of seeing and supporting partial attitudes' whereas 'the modern tends to see life as a whole'; the politically aware are disqualified as 'fundamentally' accepting 'the forces and the values of today'; their rejection of modernism is symptomatic of a 'prose consciousness'.⁶⁶

THE POLITICS OF ENGLISH STUDIES REVISITED

The conducting of reinvented modernism into British culture was resisted mainly on reactionary grounds. Leavis fulminated against 'the rapid assimilation of this country to America' and 'the American literature that American wealth is bestowing on the world', and disputed the superiority of US criticism. In 1967 he reprinted an essay of 1952, in which he had provided the United States with a non-modernist tradition for its literature, running from Shakespeare through Cooper, Hawthorne, Melville and James.⁶⁷ The case was put more thoughtfully by Graham Hough, another Cambridge don, significantly enough in lectures at the Catholic University of Washington, in 1959. He argued that cosmopolitanism and internationalism suit US people because of their geography and history, and that the ascendancy of modernism relates to a shift in power from Britain to the United States: 'I think there can be no doubt that a distinctively American set of literary values has emerged in recent years.' He was unconvinced by the work of Kermode and Davie.⁶⁸ Hough found modernism 'offensive': he had the sound background in classical and French literatures of a traditionally educated classical humanist, and objected to 'the barbarous, tasteless hewing up of gobbets, the gross jumbling of incompatible fragments'. He did not welcome the political and social inflexion in writing of the late 1950s either;⁶⁹ he wanted to conserve the purity of a tenuous minority culture at Cambridge and Oxford.

By the end of the decade the specific mood of the early and mid-1950s had collapsed and most younger people (including Amis and Wain, but not Larkin) quickly made terms with modernism and US culture. Since then, 'experimental' styles of writing, painting and film and an internationalist outlook have become commonplace; that these characteristics may signal a profound but general critique of the modern condition is widely accepted. In literature, Movement writing and its principles have come to seem the temporary product of special historical circumstances. Larkin remains acceptable, though rather quaint, because he was the best, and Amis is acknowledged as a good, old-fashioned, comic, popular novelist. The others have changed direction or slipped from prominence. Instead, a sophisticated eclecticism has become *de rigueur* if one is to get serious attention (consider John Fowles, the later Doris Lessing, Patrick White, William Golding, D. M. Thomas, Anthony Burgess, Salman Rushdie, Martin Amis). And the world has been scoured for latter-day modernists, who may be regarded as retaining the original vision, due to being South American, East European, Asian or African. Already by 1970 the received story was being rewritten, as Bernard Bergonzi, Malcolm Bradbury and David Lodge found two

strands in the post-war British novel, with the non-modernist as the less impressive and significant.⁷⁰

Mainly to the distress of Davie, Kermode and Spender (that was not what they meant at all), the news has travelled from high art through the pop painting and pop poetry of the 1960s into youth counter-culture (consider record sleeves) and then punk; quasi-modernist modes are now the standard currency of pop videos and cinema and television advertisements. The experimental displacements, allusions, puns, self-references, shifts of register and so on, that once provoked an affrighted and affronted bourgeoisie into censorship, ostracism and even riot, and were taken by others to signify the profoundest revolutionary challenge, now fit conveniently around *Children's ITV*, *Coronation Street* and *News at Ten*. At the same time, the classic modernist texts of the early part of the century have been widely distributed, through innumerable gramophone records and tapes, reproductions of paintings, and copies of Penguin Modern Classics. The situation is entirely different from that within which early modernists worked: the relationships with institutions of cultural production on the one hand and with readers on the other have been transformed. It is for this reason, as much as any definitive changes in the formal properties of artworks and other phenomena, that we might usefully call the present situation 'postmodernist'. Whether the tendency is partly or generally to disrupt or sustain prevailing power relations, and with what further implications, is a dispute beyond the scope of the present article.

In academic English studies attention has shifted, relatively, away from the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century realist novels and seventeenth-century witty poetry preferred by Leavisites, and towards modernist texts and anticipations of them. However, modernist-New-Critical method, with its proclaimed openness to innovation, general profundity and attention to the text-on-the-page, can be applied to any writing, so no one has really seemed to lose out. Furthermore, some links with Leavisism were made, for example by Alvarez, and Leavis had focused certain modernist writers and promoted close textual analysis. This supposed continuity, and the pervasiveness of US-derived modernism (you don't notice the air you breathe), have obscured the shift in power and the change in the political role of criticism. Terry Eagleton, in *Literary Theory*, proposes no significant break between Leavisism and New Criticism: 'New Criticism is generally taken to encompass the work of Eliot, Richards and perhaps also Leavis and William Empson, as well as a number of leading American critics'; Eagleton finds in New Criticism and *Scrutiny* alike 'the ideology of an uprooted, defensive intelligentsia who reinvented in literature what they could not locate in reality'.⁷¹ This identifies the inception, but does not address the reasons for their subsequent (respective) successes.

When the post-war consensus about the benefits and necessity of welfare-capitalism drew to an end in Britain, in the 1970s, and the political construction of English studies came into question, it was discussed not in terms of its implication in a cultural framework deriving from and tending to centre the United States, but in terms of Englishness, class power, imperialism and Leavisism.⁷² English studies has been considered, in other words, as it stood in the 1950s. But since that time it has been informed only residually by

Leavisism; its Englishness has been pressured not by imperial ambitions but by economic, political, military and cultural subordination to the United States. It is time to risk an outline sketch of the relationship between English studies, US modernism and the Western Alliance, focusing upon the crucial re-formative conjuncture, the Cold War.

If we review four major characteristics of modernism, as it has been constructed, its hospitality to NATO ideology is striking, (i) The elision of internationalism and US chauvinism has been discussed already. (2) The idea of the autonomous artwork offered a perfect Cold War aesthetic: when any disputing the virtues of US-led capitalism could be stigmatized as treachery and an endorsement of Stalinism, and the 'end of ideology' was proclaimed within western ideology, the superiority of literature was that it did not require attention to such unrewarding topics as politics and history. At the opposite pole, after all, was socialist realism, imagined as the devilish perversion of the Cold War enemy. (3) In so far as modernism is believed to manifest the 'modern condition', there is surely a sleight of hand: the condition is a presumptive, we might say presumptuous, construction of some white male intellectuals in Europe and North America, on behalf of millions of other people whose concerns are quite different. What we actually suffer under is late capitalism, produced by economic, political and military power, and by choices made by people in history. The modernist notion of a necessary, universal condition tends to obscure that. Modernist art, literature and criticism (as they have been propagated) lament the alleged condition and, by investing it with a romanticism of extremity, discourage political analysis: modernism is at the brink, it dares to stare into the abyss. (4) In respect of modernist cultivation of innovation and experiment, Fredric Jameson has suggested that modernism superseded realism as consumer capitalism superseded classical capitalism.⁷³ Already by 1960 a correlation between the rapid turnover in experimental styles and the cycle of production and obsolescence was proposed. Harry Levin, in a seminal article on 'modernism', wrote: 'The development of the arts is registered through a series of shocks to the public - which, after all, in buying cars or clothes, accepts the principle of planned obsolescence'; and Harold Rosenberg drew attention to 'the belief that the most recent art condemns earlier modes to obsolescence, as the latest model of a kitchen appliance renders earlier ones out of date'.⁷⁴ This obvious link between avant-gardism and consumer capitalism did not disconcert people as much as we might expect. Max Kozloff recalls, as an aspect of Cold War propaganda, 'the belief that American art is the sole trustee of the avant-garde "spirit", a belief so reminiscent of the US government's notion of itself as the lone guarantor of capitalist liberty'.⁷⁵ In the Free World, freedom of the spirit seemed to correlate with freedom to produce and purchase sufficient commodities to keep the market profitable.

I have disclaimed throughout any identification of *the* politics of modernism: I write of what it has been made to mean. Since its reintroduction, diverse further influences have been felt, especially from continental Europe; and such a substantial and complex concept and body of work is, of course, a place where meaning - cultural power - is contested. One politics is announced when

Spender accepts, with reluctance, that his heroes were 'reactionary'.⁷⁶ Indeed, the most significant challenge of modernist texts may have been their fascism and sexism: they really disconcert students unprepared by modernist-New-Critical premisses for such vivid political commitment. Conversely, on the left, modernism and its derivatives are deployed, as by their initial conductors, against what are perceived as established British attitudes and structures. This is the implication when Terry Eagleton remarks that 'the literary moment of modernism . . . brought structuralist and post-structuralist criticism to birth',⁷⁷ and when Colin MacCabe argues that modernist disruption of the expected movement of language and refusal of authorial position both shadows forth and promotes general political change (modernism constituted a 'revolution of the word').⁷⁸ More generally, modernism is still associated with avant-garde dissidence, and latterly with youth culture, especially 1960s counter-culture and punk. These may well be, or have been, valuable challenges to an unjust, wasteful and dangerous economic and political order. But perhaps they are deploying a tactic found in other areas of British life, and in countries throughout the world: cultural power deriving from US capitalism is invoked against local power structures. It may be that in so far as modernist styles have disrupted prevailing power relations in Britain since 1960, that constitutes a deflection *within* a general, substantial absorption into the culture of the Western Alliance.

Overall, we should entertain the thought that the *effective* politics of modernism have been as Lionel Trilling proposed in 1966. To him, modernist texts were 'anti-social', 'anti-cultural', 'subversive'. But 'when the term-essays come in, it is plain to me that almost none of the students have been taken aback by what they have read: they have wholly contained the attack'. Trilling feared that '*the* modern element in modern literature' is its susceptibility 'to being made into an academic subject'.⁷⁹ Modernism, in English studies, had merged into the ideological wallpaper.

My aim has been to show that modernism was reinvented in the 1950s in the United States, and conducted back to Britain where it became dominant in literary institutions. I have broached only tentatively, in the last few paragraphs, the larger political implications, bearing in mind that hegemony is never simply achieved, and opposition is never pure. As Raymond Williams observes, 'It can be persuasively argued that all or nearly all initiatives and contributions, even when they take on manifestly alternative or oppositional forms, are in practice tied to the hegemonic: that the dominant culture, so to say, at once produces and limits its own forms of counter-culture'; yet there may be 'significant breaks'.⁸⁰ We should expect the politics of English studies to manifest at least this much complexity. But to address it, we must forsake the nostalgic preoccupation with Leavisism and, beyond that, with British imperialism; for twenty years these have been only residual influences. The actual, recent historical development of the discipline has been dominated by the United States. Modernism and postmodernism are not just out there, in the world, the natural focus of our attention. They are concepts which construct us as practitioners of the discipline, even as we, or our immediate forebears, have constructed them.

NOTES

Written at Rhydycroesau, Koh Samui and Brighton, 1986-7. I am most grateful for the advice of Alistair Davies, Jonathan Dollimore, James Donald, Peter Nicholls and Allan White (who do not necessarily agree with my argument).

- 1 Francis Mulhern, *The Moment of Scrutiny* (London: New Left Books, 1979); Chris Baldick, *The Social Mission of English Criticism, 1848-1932* (London: Oxford University Press, 1983); Terry Eagleton, *Literary Theory: an introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1983), ch. 1; Terence Hawkes, *That Shakespeherian Rag* (London: Methuen, 1986).
- 2 Harold Rosenberg, *The Case of the Baffled Radical* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 35-8, 40. See also Bernard Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism and Twentieth-Century Literature* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1986), 90-1.
- 3 Blake Morrison, *The Movement* (London: Methuen, 1980), 31-5, 63-4, 113-16, 206-7.
- 4 Thom Gunn, *The Occasions of Poetry* (London: Faber, 1982), 174; John Wain, *Sprightly Running* (London: Macmillan, 1962), 208-9; Philip Larkin, *All What Jazz* (London: Faber, 1970), 11, 17, 119.
- 5 In Tom Maschler (ed.), *Declaration* (London: MacGibbon & Kee, 1957), 14. On Wilson and Snow, see Rubin Rabinovitz, *The Reaction Against Experiment in the English Novel, 1950-1960* (New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1967).
- 6 Martin Green, *Children of the Sun* (London: Constable, 1977), 406-65; Morrison, op. cit., pp. 63-5; Robert Hewison, *In Anger* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1981), chs 2-4.
- 7 John Holloway, 'New lines in English poetry', *Hudson Review*, 9 (1956-7), 592-3; Morrison, op. cit., 55-9; Mulhern, op. cit., 318-23.
- 8 Dick Hebdige's evocation of 1950s British jazz fans, in his *Subculture: the meaning of style* (London and New York: Methuen, 1979), 51; also Morrison, op. cit., 55-6.
- 9 A. Alvarez, *The New Poetry*, revised edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1962] 1966), 25.
- 10 Serge Guilbaut, *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art*, trans. Arthur Goldhammer (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1983). See also Christopher Brookeman, *American Culture and Society Since the 1930s* (London: Macmillan, 1984), ch. 15.
- 11 Guilbaut, op. cit., 172.
- 12 *Evergreen Review Reader 1957-1967* (New York: Grove Press), 199.
- 13 *ibid.*, 135-7.
- 14 *ibid.*, 399.
- 15 John Cage, *Silence* (Middletown: Wesleyan University Press, 1961), 73.
- 16 Calvin Tomkins, *Ahead of the Game* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), 66; see also 13-14.
- 17 Geoffrey Barraclough, *An Introduction to Contemporary History* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967), 94.
- 18 Cage, op. cit., 75.
- 19 See, for instance, Bernard Bergonzi (ed.), *Innovations* (London: Macmillan, 1968), 15-19, 134-49, 175-9.
- 20 Marshall McLuhan, *Understanding Media* (London: Sphere, [1964] 1967), 185.
- 21 *ibid.*, 37, 90.
- 22 Brookeman, op. cit., 133.
- 23 McLuhan, op. cit., 37.

- 24 See Brookeman, op. cit., 124, 133; John Fekete, *The Critical Twilight* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977), 184-5.
- 25 McLuhan, op. cit., 133.
- 26 Hugh Kenner, *A Homemade World: the American modernist writers* (New York: Knopf, 1975)-
- 27 *ibid.*, 213.
- 28 *ibid.*, 218.
- 29 Rene Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature*, 3rd edn (Harmondsworth: Penguin, [1949] 1963), 139-
- 30 Wilbur Scott, *Five Approaches of Literary Criticism* (New York and London: Collier-Macmillan, 1962), 179.
- 31 In John Crowe Ransom, *The World's Body* (1938); quoted from David Lodge (ed.), *Twentieth-Century Literary Criticism* (London: Longman, 1972), 238.
- 32 See Peter Faulkner, *Modernism* (London: Methuen, 1977), viii-ix; Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism*, xiii; and below, note 63.
- 33 Cleanth Brooks, *Modern Poetry and the Tradition*, with new introduction (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1967), xxx, xii.
- 34 Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism*, xiv.
- 35 Quoted in Guilbaut, op. cit., 128.
- 36 A. Alvarez, *Under Pressure* (BBC talks broadcast in 1962-4) (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1965), 184.
- 37 Wain, op. cit., 227.
- 38 Gunn, op. cit., 175-7.
- 39 See F. R. Karl, *A Reader's Guide to the Contemporary English Novel* (New York: Noonday, 1962); W. Van O'Connor, *The New University Wits and the End of Modernism* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963); Rabinovitz, op. cit.
- 40 Morrison, op. cit., 37-9.
- 41 Donald Davie, *The Poet in the Imaginary Museum*, ed. Barry Alpert (Manchester: Carcanet, 1977), 36-7, 41.
- 42 *ibid.*, 47, 52.
- 43 *ibid.*, 90, 92.
- 44 Donald Davie, *Thomas Hardy and British Poetry* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1973), 185-6.
- 45 On Alvarez and the Movement, see Morrison, op. cit., 43, 45, 46, 137. On Alvarez's Leavisism, see, for instance, A. Alvarez, *The Shaping Spirit* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1967), 51, 54-5, 151, 163, 189. On p. 189 he complains that US critics analyse poems but don't say what they are worth - an original *Scrutiny* objection (Mulhern, op. cit., 251-3).
- 46 Alvarez, *The Shaping Spirit*, 76, 87.
- 47 *ibid.*, 9.
- 48 *ibid.*, 12-13, 46, 50-6, 164-5, 188.
- 49 Alvarez, *The New Poetry*, 21, 26.
- 50 A. Alvarez, *Beyond All This Fiddle* (London: Allen Lane, 1968), 4.
- 51 Frank Kermode, *Romantic Image* (London: Routledge, 1957), 2.
- 52 *ibid.*, 44, 159, 160, 154.
- 53 Kermode, review of Morrison, *The Movement: London Review of Books* (5 June 1980), 6. In this review Kermode still finds little positive to say of the Movement. See also Morrison, op. cit., 26.
- 54 Kermode, *Romantic Image*, 165-6.
- 55 Frank Lentricchia, *After the New Criticism* (London: Methuen, 1983), 3-7.
- 56 Frank Kermode, *The Sense of an Ending* (from lectures given at Bryn Mawr in 1964)

- (London: Oxford University Press, 1967), 96.
- 57 Stephen Spender, *The Thirties and After* (New York: Random House, 1978), 128, 122, 126.
- 58 Christopher Lasch, *The Agony of the American Left* (London: Deutsch, 1970), 72.
- 59 *Encounter*, 4, 3 (1955), 15-22; Spender, *The Thirties and After*, 165.
- 60 *Encounter*, 5, I (1955), editorial.
- 61 *New York Times Magazine* (25 April 1948), quoted by Guilbaut, op. cit., 173-4
- 62 Stephen Spender, *The Creative Element* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1953), II, 14.
- 63 Stephen Spender, *The Struggle of the Modern* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1963), 71-8. Alvarez had written that Auden is like a journalist, 'much more "contemporary" than "modern", with all that last word, in its best sense, implies of profound originality' (*The Shaping Spirit*, 93). Alvarez's use of 'modernism', in quotation marks (9), is the next I have come across after Laura Riding and Robert Graves, *A Survey of Modernist Poetry* (London: Heinemann, 1927).
- 64 Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism*, xi.
- 65 Spender, *The Struggle of the Modern*, 216, 231.
- 66 *ibid.*, 130, 77, 130-2.
- 67 F. R. Leavis, *English Literature in Our Time and the University* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1969), 33-4; F. R. Leavis, *Anna Karenina and Other Essays* (London: Chatto & Windus, 1967), 143, 145. See also Mulhern, op. cit., 238-46.
- 68 Graham Hough, *Reflections on a Literary Revolution* (Washington DC: Catholic University of America, 1960), 93, 98, 11, 102; reprinted in Hough, *Image and Experience* (London: Duckworth, 1960).
- 69 *ibid.*, 109, 166.
- 70 See Stuart Laing, 'Making and breaking the novel tradition', in Frank Groversmith (ed.), *The Theory of Reading* (Brighton: Harvester Press, 1984).
- 71 Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, 46-7; cf. Terence Hawkes, *Structuralism and Semiotics* (London: Methuen, 1977), 151-6.
- 72 See, for instance, Peter Widdowson (ed.), *Re-Reading English* (London: Methuen, 1982), 3, 121-2, 154-7.
- 73 Fredric Jameson, 'The ideology of the text', *Salmagundi*, 31/32 (1975/76), 204-46. See also note 71 above.
- 74 Harry Levin, 'What was modernism?' (1960), in H. Levin, *Refractions* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1966), 225; Harold Rosenberg, *The Anxious Object* (London: Thames & Hudson, [1964] 1965), 252; and see chs 2, 20, 22.
- 75 Max Kozloff, 'American painting during the Cold War', *Artforum*, 11 (May 1973), 44; see Brookeman, op. cit., ch. 15.
- 76 Spender, *The Thirties and After*, 154-65.
- 77 Eagleton, *Literary Theory*, 139. However, Eagleton is not altogether enthusiastic about this: he identifies the hostility of structuralism and post-structuralism to history as, in effect, a continuation of New Criticism (146).
- 78 Colin MacCabe, *James Joyce and the Revolution of the Word* (London: Macmillan, 1979); cf. Colin MacCabe, *Theoretical Essays* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1986).
- 79 Lionel Trilling, *Beyond Culture* (London: Seeker & Warburg, 1966), 26, 4. And for a recent endorsement, see Bergonzi, *The Myth of Modernism*, xiv.
- 80 Raymond Williams, *Marxism and Literature* (London: Oxford University Press, 1977), 114.

The Cold War in South African History Textbooks. Pages 207-220. Chisholm, Linda (et al.) Preview. Dictatorship and the Cold War in Official Chilean History Textbooks. Pages 221-247. Oteñza, Teresa (et al.)
Selecting, Stretching and Missing the Frame: Making Sense of the Cold War in German and Swiss History Classrooms. Pages 361-392. Christophe, Barbara. Preview. Learning from Others: Considerations within History Didactics on Introducing the Cold War in Lessons in Germany, Sweden and Switzerland. Pages 393-421. Gautschi, Peter (et al.) Preview. Pedagogical Entanglements and the Cold War: A Comparative Study on Opening History Lessons on the Cold War in Sweden and Switzerland. Pages 423-447. Thorp, Robert. For many, it represented the end of communism and the Cold War in Europe. It also reduced the likelihood of nuclear conflict. Hope sprang up as the wall came tumbling down. Two-and-a-half decades later, former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev warned that the world is on the brink of a new Cold War. He explained why in a speech he gave in Berlin. He said the West had not fulfilled promises it made after 1989. He said: "The world is on the brink of a new Cold War. Some say that it has already begun." He also criticised the U.N. for doing so little.
In 1989, a series of major political changes in the Eastern Bloc led to the Wall coming down. Germany was reunified in October 1990. Try the same news story at these levels