

# EVELYN WAUGH STUDIES

Vol. 49, No. 1

Spring 2018

---

## CONTENTS

- [Evelyn Waugh's Yugoslav Mission: Politics and Religion](#) 2  
Milena Borden
- ["Just You Look at Yourself:"](#) 26  
[Relativisation of the Authentic Image of Manliness in \*Vile Bodies\*](#)  
Toshiaki Onishi

## REVIEWS

- ["In my beginning is my end:"](#) 41  
*A Little Learning. The Complete Works of Evelyn Waugh.*  
Edited by John Howard Wilson and Barbara Cooke.  
Reviewed by Jeffrey Manley

## NEWS

---

## Evelyn Waugh's Yugoslav Mission: Politics and Religion

Milena Borden

In Evelyn Waugh's only government Report, "Church and State in Liberated Croatia" (30 March, 1945), the novelist presented documentary evidence for his concerns about the alliance of Britain with the Yugoslav leader Josip Broz Tito during the Second World War, recording the killing of 17 Catholic priests as human rights violations. In 2016, the National Archives of Croatia and the Institute for Croatian History in Zagreb confirmed, for the purpose of this article, the identities of these individuals. Their full details and what is known about their fates, as reported by these official bodies, are published here, in Appendices 1 and 2, for the first time.

The article argues that Waugh's views in his Report reflected his moral, religious beliefs and that they were vindicated by the post-Cold War history of Yugoslavia and Europe. In seeking to explain an understanding of Waugh's political outlook, it discusses why and how he went beyond the aim of his military mission.

The background research uses Waugh's diaries, letters, political, polemical writings and biographies of him. The political and historical context rests on the history of the Second World War in Croatia, the activities of the Special Operations Executive (SOE) in Yugoslavia and the Vatican's policy. It locates specific representations of this external context within two of his novels: *Love among the Ruins* and *Unconditional Surrender*, the third part of the trilogy *Sword of Honour*.

### **The Mission (MACMIS 1943-1945) in its Political Context: Waugh against British Policy in Yugoslavia**

On 16 September 1944, a US Army airplane flew out of Isle Russe, Corsica, in "brilliant sunshine" and touched down on the military airfield of Topusko in Croatia. The passengers were Captain Arthur Evelyn St John Waugh and the son of the Prime Minister, Major Randolph Churchill. This was the second time the pair had tried to land in the area as part of the expanded British military mission in Yugoslavia led by Brigadier Fitzroy Maclean. During the first attempt the plane crashed and the team was forced to return to Italy to recover from their injuries.<sup>1</sup>

During the mission, Waugh collected evidence about the persecution of Catholic priests in order to write the Report, now retained in the British National Archives.<sup>2</sup>

The mission was directed by the 1943 shift in the Churchill government's support for Yugoslavia, from the pro-Royalist Chetniks led by the Anglophile Dražha Mihailović to the pro-Soviet communist partisans' leader Tito, as advised by the SOE's centre in Cairo. Waugh and Randolph Churchill were sent to the region in pursuit of the policy.

As the Report reveals, Waugh did not object to the policy as such, but argued that a nuanced understanding of the situation on the ground was needed. He claimed that partisans were persecuting Catholics in Croatia and that Britain should not support Tito unconditionally. In other words, Waugh thought that Tito's anti-Catholic policy should not be accepted as part of the price of the alliance to defeat the Nazis. Organised over nine sections, with a "Synopsis" and an "Introduction," much of Waugh's Report is a political analysis based on his understanding of the war in the Balkans during the period between the advancement of Tito's partisans in Yugoslavia in 1941 until March 1945.

The relationship between Tito's partisans and the British was complex. The partisans viewed the Croats and the Croat clergy in particular as being pro-fascist and collaborators with the pro-Nazi Ustaše regime of General Ante Pavelić in the 1941 Independent State of Croatia (NDH, Nezavisna Država Hrvatska). Waugh believed that this was not entirely true. He thought that politics were used as a pretext to persecute the Croats because they were Catholic; an "inconvenient" religious group in the new Yugoslavia. He argued that the Catholic Church was popular among local communities in Croatia and the partisans resented this because they wanted to create an atheist communist state. The killing of Catholic priests, according to him, was political revenge; seizing innocent victims without trial, staining their names by mixing them with real fascists and war criminals, and in numerous cases killing them.

Waugh wanted the British government to intervene to protect the Catholic Church in Croatia as a building block in whatever would be left in place after the destruction of the old order. But in the autumn of 1944 the government was focused on the immediate conduct of the war for victory with Prime Minister Winston Churchill wanting to become a fully confident ally of Stalin and Tito. In distinction, Waugh believed that British policy should not seek to make

short-term allies at any cost, but rather to win the long-term war of preserving religion as a key aspect of the old Europe for the future. Crucially, he wanted Britain to protect European moral values not just from German Nazism but also from faithless Soviet communism. Waugh feared that by neglecting all factors considered to be extraneous to winning the war, Britain and the Allies would open the door to the influence of a materialistic, atheist ideology, which would ultimately lead to the decline of European civilization.

### **Collecting the Facts**

Although Waugh left us no detailed account of exactly how he gathered the information for the Report, it is possible to reconstruct the process from his diaries, letters and the history of the mission. In section 7 Waugh accounts for 87 Catholic priests killed by the partisans and 9 imprisoned. Of these he had the specific names of 17 priests whom he reported as killed between 1941 and 1945.<sup>3</sup> He also reported the names of 14 other individuals engaged in politics to explain the context of the conflict.<sup>4</sup> It is quite clear that his main sources of information were the accounts of the local Catholic priests with whom he spoke, most probably in a mixture of Latin, French and/or Italian. Waugh's notes proved to be accurate. The 31 names were cited with fewer than five small mistakes due to orthographic differences between the Croatian and Serbian transliteration of names. While based in the small village of Topusko, approximately 100 km. south of the capital Zagreb, he visited 14 parishes: Niksic, Sibenik, Mostar, Unesic, Potravlje, Zlopolje, Sinj, Brstanovo, Koprno, Vojnic-Gardun, Svinisce, Makarska, Korilla and Dubrovnik.

### **The Response of the Foreign Office**

Waugh was discharged from the mission before submitting his Report to the Foreign Office.<sup>5</sup> The Foreign Secretary, Anthony Eden, referred the Report to Sir Ralph Stevenson, the British Ambassador to Belgrade. Stevenson wrote back less than a month later, just a week after the end of the war, with a substantive 11-point assessment rejecting Waugh's recommendation for British intervention in Yugoslavia. The Ambassador did not deny the factual credibility of the

Report, and also, to a certain extent, the argument made, but he was convinced that Waugh was biased:

The issue can not be treated with true impartiality either by Catholics and non-Catholics and Captain Waugh is no exception to the rule. ...The new régime is determined to restrict the activities of the Catholic Church in Yugoslavia to a minimum .... To expect a concordat mutually satisfactory to two such irreconcilable bodies as the National Liberation Movement and the Catholic Church is beyond the bounds of reason.<sup>6</sup>

Stevenson argued that the Croatian Catholic clergy, collectively, was motivated by Balkan-style patriotism and could not be judged by Western standards. Even if this was so, it is difficult not to see from his assessment that, facts aside, there was a wide gap between what Waugh wanted and what the British government was prepared to do. For Waugh, Tito's coming to power was a catastrophe, whereas for Stevenson it was *realpolitik*.<sup>7</sup>

### **Waugh, Catholicism, Pope Pius XII and Croatian Nationalism**

In 1945, for Waugh, the war in the Balkans was part of a bigger battle, between the ideologies of Nazism and communism in Europe, that he wanted to be clearly recognised by both church and state. In political terms Waugh was a radical conservative and a fervent anti-communist, but he was also a British soldier and a deeply committed Catholic fortunate enough to live in England, which protected him from the dilemmas faced by European Catholics during the war. Catholics in Croatia had to live in a Nazi puppet state and Waugh was aware that they were exposed to accusations of collaborationism *per se*. He defended them by writing that the great majority of the Croatian clergy "went about their duties, recognizing the authority of the *de facto* Government, doing nothing to subvert it, but using their influence to mitigate barbarities" as their leader Archbishop Alojzije Viktor Stepinac of Zagreb wanted them to do. Such was Waugh's understanding, but it was not unproblematic.<sup>8</sup> As noted by Stevenson, the British knew about collaboration between the Croatian clergy and the Ustaše regime in practice and in specific regions. Stepinac did support the establishment of the pro-Nazi state and was allegedly anti-Semitic. He tried to oppose the Ustaše's violent racial policies and sheltered Jews in Zagreb, but did not criticize openly the Ustaše massacres of Serbs and Jews that happened between 1941-43.

Literature about him abounds, but academically balanced works appeared after Waugh's lifetime and especially after Tito's death in 1981. Stella Alexander questioned the perception that he was an outright supporter of the massacres,<sup>9</sup> while Ivo Goldstein argued that, true, there were collaborators among his priests, but there was also evidence that during 1941-55 many Catholic priests were not blinded by religious hatred against the Serbs and the Jews, and actually tried to criticize the Ustaše regime.<sup>10</sup> Most recently, Ivo Banac argued that politically the Catholic Church had almost no alternative but to support officially the NDH.<sup>11</sup> What emerges from these debates is that Waugh was actually less biased than previously thought.

On the other hand, however complex the Croatian situation on the ground, the chief Catholic policy maker was the head of the Catholic Church, Pope Pius XII. Although he remains a contradictory and controversial statesman during one of the most trying periods in the life of the Church, twentieth-century British, American and European scholars have come to agree about one thing: that his priority was to defend the unity of the Church in the face of communist atheism.<sup>12</sup> What we also know is that Pius XII decided to not confront Hitler or his puppet regimes in Eastern Europe and the Balkans. Most studies in this area focus on how much did the Pope know about the Nazi atrocities against the Jews and why did he not speak in their defence, which may have saved more lives. Virtually all histories of the Second World War in the Balkans acknowledge that he knew about the Ustaše atrocities,<sup>13</sup> but it has been less discussed that the Pope also kept silent about the Catholics being persecuted. The political historian Michael Phayer emphasised this by arguing that papal diplomacy failed not only Europe's Jews but also the Polish Catholics.<sup>14</sup>

The most comprehensive insight into Pius XII's policy in the Balkans and Croatia can be found in Charles R. Gallagher's political biography of the American Catholic priest and diplomat Joseph Patrick Hurley, the Vatican's representative in Yugoslavia (1945-49) who went against his line of *modus vivendi* towards Tito. Hurley was present at Stepinac's trial in 1946, and one day after the verdict was made public he successfully petitioned the Vatican to excommunicate Tito, a baptized Catholic. It appears that by the time Waugh wrote his Report, Pius XII already had a record of non-intervention in Croatia in relation to the Ustaše massacres.<sup>15</sup> How much Waugh knew about this is unclear. The diary entry about his audience with the Pope on 2 March 1945 to present the Report's findings is short: "I left him convinced that he had understood what

I came for.... That was all I asked.”<sup>16</sup> He left us no account of what he thought the Vatican had done, or should have done, in Croatia. Yet his silence cannot be simply ignored. It is hard not to assume that Waugh applied a different standard to church politics than to government policy. He wanted the politicians to act on his recommendation of a clearly moral nature but failed to leave us any evidence if he expected the Pope and the Vatican to do the same.

### **Evaluating the Report**

Between 1945 and 1953 Waugh wrote to the press on five occasions against Tito and about the British missions in Yugoslavia, including in a review of the biography “Tito Speaks” by the communist partisan and future Yugoslav dissident Vladimir Dedijer.<sup>17</sup> Waugh’s position remained unchanged: “[Tito] was busy then, as now, in the work for which he has a peculiar aptitude – hoodwinking the British.”<sup>18</sup> Maclean did not change either and favoured Tito until the end. He believed that in military terms, as based on the evidence in the military reports he was receiving, Tito’s partisans were making the better contribution to the Allied war effort than the Chetniks. In his memoir he discussed the Yugoslav mission at length but mentioned Waugh only once, saying that he was of an “adventurous disposition.”<sup>19</sup>

In 1946 David Martin, a British intelligence officer who was chief of the SOE (1942-43), published his revisionist memoir arguing against the alliance with Tito. It is not known if Waugh read it. In 1945 George Orwell made a substantial comment about the British press coverage of the Yugoslav mission in the preface to *Animal Farm*, “The Freedom of the Press.” However, it was not published until 1971, five years after Waugh died. Discussing manipulation of the truth, Orwell wrote:

A particularly glaring case was that of Colonel Mihailovich, the Yugoslav Chetnik leader. The Russians, who had their own Yugoslav protégé in Marshal Tito, accused Mihailovich of collaborating with the Germans. This accusation was promptly taken up by the British press: Mihailovich’s supporters were given no chance of answering it, and facts contradicting it were simply kept out of print. In July of 1943 the Germans offered a reward of 100,000 gold crowns for the capture of Tito, and a similar reward for the capture of Mihailovich. The British press ‘splashed’ the reward for Tito, but only one

paper mentioned (in small print) the reward for Mihailovich: and the charges of collaborating with the Germans continued.<sup>20</sup>

Twenty years after Tito's death, however, Yugoslavia collapsed and historians started re-examining Churchill's alliance, perhaps to compensate for, or help explain, the upsurge of ethnic nationalism in the 1990s. Amidst the new theoretical studies of religion and nationalism under communism and some established historians trying to disentangle legend from history in the media, the name of James Klugmann (1912-77) occupied a particular place. Hugh Thomas, historian of the Spanish Civil War, discussed how Klugmann was a "determining influence" in the case of the Yugoslav partisans.<sup>21</sup> Noel Malcolm, a historian of medieval and modern Balkan history suggested that he was a key personality in the British alliance with Tito with an unusually high status in Cairo. Malcolm argued that in retrospect, the British support for the partisans assisted the establishment of communist Yugoslavia with a very unsatisfactory political arrangement for its nationalities, with an ultimately disastrous effect. He writes:

It is hard to imagine that a Western-allied constitutional monarchy would have inflicted as much suffering, murder and economic stultification as Tito's regime did. What is now abundantly clear is that the imposition of communism solved none of Yugoslavia's national problems, and merely encouraged them to rankle and fester. The suppression of national feeling has made it take new and more virulent forms.<sup>22</sup>

Klugmann was a British-Jewish Cambridge communist associated with the spy circle of the Cambridge Five.<sup>23</sup> In 1940 he was enlisted as a private in the Royal Army Service Corps and soon afterwards recruited to the SOE in Cairo in the Yugoslav section. His appointment was objected to by MI5 but approved by the SOE. Twenty-two years after Klugmann's death, in 1999, the publication of the Mitrokhin KGB archives established officially that he was a communist spy and the Moscow recruiter of John Cairncross.<sup>24</sup> In 2015, his biographer Geoff Andrews investigated the relevant archives and concluded that Klugmann had indeed manipulated military information in favour of Tito's partisans.<sup>25</sup> He also revealed that Waugh met Klugmann in Bari, presumably between 8 and 15 July 1944, when he briefed him before embarking on the Croatian mission. Klugmann was openly left wing, a member of the British communist party since 1933 and, according to Andrews, Waugh was "disgusted by the cynicism



of the MI5 in appointing a communist at the SEO.” Klugmann thought that Waugh was “insufferable.”<sup>26</sup>

## **Fiction and History**

Andrews identified Waugh’s representation of Klugmann in *Love among the Ruins* and in *Unconditional Surrender*.<sup>27</sup> It is a significant contribution to the understanding of how Waugh intentionally created a satirical theme and a pattern to express Klugmann through representative characterisation directly related to the author’s point of view about the history behind the fiction. Among caricaturing, allusion and real life references, Waugh’s Klugmann is disguised in a light manner but persistently kept in focus close to the real person.

In *Love among the Ruins*, the main character, Miles Plastic, works at the Health Service’s Euthanasia department, where the ballet dancer Clara appears as a patient and a priority case. She has previously undergone the “Klugmann Operation,” effectively a sterilisation surgery, with the unwanted side effect of growing a beard. Miles falls in love with her and her beard. Clara becomes pregnant by Miles, but decides to have an abortion, and also to carry on with the reverse “Klugmann Operation.” Miles is devastated, and at the end of the story he comes to symbolise the perpetual distraction of “the Modern Man” by “the State” policies, the end of human love, marriage and childbearing. The “Klugmann Operation” becomes a metaphor for the dehumanising effect of the state control, which causes the total degradation of those who believe in communism. It is also possible that the ballet element is a reference to Stalin’s directorship of the Bolshoi Theatre in 1948.<sup>28</sup> Dr. Beamish, the Director, observes the patient Clara:

‘Klugmann’s Operation, I suppose?’

‘Yes.’

‘It does go wrong like that every now and then. They had two or three cases at Cambridge.’

‘I never wanted it done,’ explains Clara... ‘It was the Head of Ballet. He insists on all the girls being sterilised.’<sup>29</sup>

Although the “Klugmann’s Operation” is described with grim humour and makes only a fleeting appearance in *Love among the Ruins*, it is actually the focal point and the hidden reason for the downward spiralling story mirroring the way Waugh viewed the Yugoslav mission as a forerunner of Europe’s decline.

In *Unconditional Surrender*, Klugmann is Joe Cattermole. He is the 32-year old officer who briefs Guy Crouchback in Bari before he flies out to Croatia. They are of the same generation and were both Oxford undergraduates, as revealed in their introduction to each other:

‘Balliol 1921-24,’ [Joe] said.

‘Yes. Were we up together?’

‘You wouldn’t remember me. I led a very quiet life. I remember seeing you about with the bloods.’<sup>30</sup>

Joe, like Klugmann, is very academic and hard working. As an All Souls College post-graduate he published a heavily ironised philosophical treatise, “An Examination of Certain Redundancies in Empirical Concepts known as Cattermole’s Redundancies.” Joe passionately lectures new military arrivals like Guy in political strategy and admires the Yugoslav partisans, which is what Klugmann did: “The Jugs love him,” and “Joe loves the Jugs”, says Brigadier Cape. In appearance, Waugh likened Klugmann to the subjects favoured by the 16<sup>th</sup>-century Spanish religious artists: “tall, stooping, emaciated, totally unsoldierly, a Zurbarán ascetic with a joyous smile.”<sup>31</sup> But above all, Joe, like Klugmann, is a fanatical Titoist who manipulates the military intelligence evidence in favour of the partisans.

Joe delivers a heavy political brief to Guy about the shift in Churchill’s policy and how to switch the weaponry supply from the pro-Royalist Chetniks to the pro-Russian Yugoslav partisans. This happens in two stages. Firstly, Guy sees “a set explosion” on Joe’s map showing how the partisans are expanding the “liberated areas.” Joe points out that this is not known because of the “royalist government in exile squatting in London: The partisans are holding down three times as many troops as in the whole Italian campaign. Besides von Weich’s Army Group there are five or six divisions of Chetniks and Ustachi... There must be half a million

enemy over there.’”<sup>32</sup> Secondly, Joe explains that the British had to re-divert the supply of equipment from the Chetniks to the partisans:

‘We had to arm ourselves with what we could capture. Until quite lately those men in Cairo were sending arms to Mihajlovic to be used against our own people. We’re doing a little better now. There’s a trickle of supplies. But it isn’t easy to arrange drops for forces on the move. And the Russians have at last sent a mission – headed by a general. You can have no idea, until you’ve seen them, what that will mean to the partisans. It’s something I have to explain to all our liaison officers. The Yugoslavs accept us as allies but they look on the Russians as leaders. It is part of their history – well, I expect you know as well as I do about pan-Slavism. You will find it still as strong as it was in the time of the Czars. Once, during the sixth Offensive, we were being dive-bombed at a river crossing and one of my stretchers bearers – a boy from Zagreb University – said quite simply; ‘Every bomb that falls here is one less on Russia.’... There are no politics in war-time; just love of country and love of race – and the partisans know we belong to a different country and a different race. That’s how misunderstandings sometimes arise.’<sup>33</sup>

Finally, Cape says to Guy: “Neither you nor I are going to make our home in Jugoslavia after the war,” which is what Churchill said to Maclean when they met in Cairo a few days after the Teheran Conference in 1943.<sup>34</sup>

It is not known if Waugh actually met Klugmann again on his way back from Croatia, but Guy meets Joe for the second time a year later in Bari. Joe is said to have risen in rank and is in charge of the office handed over to him by Cape. Guy enquires about the plight of the Jewish refugees from Begoy. Gilpin, another officer, informs him that they all escaped miraculously except the Kanyis, with whom Guy is especially concerned. He learns that they were denounced for involvement with a British officer (Guy) in order to sabotage the “Mission.” Then Gilpin reveals to Guy that Joe obtained a confidential report from Cape about his involvement with the Kanyi couple, which was “compromising the Mission:” “It’s lucky Cape had handed over to Joe before we got the report. You might have found yourself on a charge. But Joe’s not vindictive. He just moved you where you couldn’t do any harm. Though I may say that some of the names you sent us as displaced persons at Dubrovnik are on the black list.”<sup>35</sup> This episode hints to

Waugh's discharge from the mission with the Kanyis tried by "a People's Court" as a reference to Tito's post-war trials.

There are also three more occasions in the novel when Waugh represents the secret collecting of the evidence for the Report. Guy goes to Sunday Mass after having received the news that Virginia was killed. He makes a little parcel of food, which he takes back to the church to give to the priest. There they converse in Latin, arranging a time for the next day for Virginia's mass. Then Guy leaves the presbytery and turns into the adjoining church where he looks around, and also prays: "When he turned he saw Bakic standing behind him, watching intently: 'What do you want?' 'I thought maybe you want to talk to somebody.' 'I don't require an interpreter when I say my prayers,' Guy said." Further on Guy goes to church after an intense political discussion the previous night with Franc De Souza who told him what he knows from Joe about Tito's secret meeting with Churchill in Italy. Two partisans follow him and then claim that Guy was passing a note with information against them to the priest: "'They've had the priest up and examined him. The old boy's lucky not to be under arrest or worse.'" Finally, just before leaving Begoy, Guy is "walking the autumnal countryside...with the spy limping behind him. The church was locked up; the priest has left... 'What's become of him?' Guy asked of Bakic. 'He gone some other place. Little village more quiet than here. He was old. Too big a house for one old man.'" <sup>36</sup>

## Epilogue

In 1948 Waugh wrote: "I am so weary about having been consistently right in all my political predictions for ten years. It is so boring seeing it all happen for the second time after one has gone through it in imagination."<sup>37</sup> He would have been 88 years old when religious and ethnic persecution destroyed Yugoslavia in 1992 and it might safely be assumed that he would not have been surprised by it. Maclean, who remained a friend of Tito and attended his funeral in 1980, continued to defend Churchill's alliance. Hugh Trevor-Roper, an Oxford enemy of Waugh, described the British alliance with Stalin's Russia (of which Tito was a part) as "self-defensive" in origin: "To each party it was the sole means of survival. Apart from that one overriding need, there was no rational trust, no identity of aim."<sup>38</sup> It is most unlikely that during the 1990s either

of them would have remembered what Waugh had so passionately wanted: another way for the post-war Europe.

Yet history seems to have vindicated Waugh in his argument that religious freedom was incompatible with communism in Yugoslavia and elsewhere in Eastern Europe. The Catholic Church under Pope John Paul II played a huge role in the fall of communism. In 1979 the Polish-born Cardinal Karol Wojtyła returned to Poland, only months after he begun his ministry in Rome. During this carefully organised visit, he called for belief in the Christian past and future of Poland without fear, then a communist country.<sup>39</sup> Ten years later, the political reputation of the Catholic Church reached a historic peak when it's arch-enemy, the communist system, collapsed in 1989. The Berlin wall, built during Waugh's lifetime, was demolished 45 years after he wrote the Report. *Sword of Honour* was translated into Croatian in 1993; in 1994 John Paul XII visited Croatia and in 1998 he beatified Cardinal Stepinac. By then the country was independent and officially Catholic. In September 2017, the Croatian parliament voted to remove Tito's name from the capital's square. If at the time Waugh stood removed from the political and intellectual trend, today his profound belief in principled politics is a model of integrity in dissent.

Notes

<sup>1</sup> *The Diaries of Evelyn Waugh*. Ed. Michael Davie. London: Weildenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.

577. See Donat Gallagher, "Captain Evelyn Waugh and the Special Operations Executive (SOE)," *Evelyn Waugh Studies*. 43.2: (2012).

<sup>2</sup> NA FO 371/48910 "Description: Position of Orthodox and Catholic Churches in Yugoslavia: Relations between the Churches in Yugoslavia and the Partisans." Code 92 File 1059 (to paper 8060). Date: 1945"; NA (Copy), British Library Evelyn Waugh Archive MS Add 74226.

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix 1.

<sup>4</sup> See Appendix 2.

<sup>5</sup> The full details of Waugh's discharge from the mission, and the implications of this for avoiding potential charges under the Official Secrets Act, are reviewed in Gallagher, Donat, and Carlos Villar Flor. *In the Picture: The Facts behind the Fiction in Evelyn Waugh's Sword of Honour*. Amsterdam: Costerius, 2014. 271-76.

<sup>6</sup> Stevenson's dispatch is attached to the Report in NA (Copy), British Library Evelyn Waugh Archive MS Add 74226, "Mr. Stevenson to Mr. Eden, 17 May 1945."

<sup>7</sup> Gallagher disagrees with Stevenson's response. See Gallagher 284-93.

<sup>8</sup> It appears that Waugh met Stepinac and concluded that he did not hold the pro-German views of which he was accused at his trial in October 1946. Evelyn Waugh, Letter, 11 December 1946. Private Collection of Alexander Waugh.

<sup>9</sup> See Alexander, Stella. *The Triple Myth: A Life of Archbishop Alojzije Stepinac*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1987.

<sup>10</sup> Goldstein, Ivo. *Croatia: A History*. Trans. Nikolina Jovanović. London: Hurst, 1999. 132-40.

<sup>11</sup> Banac, Ivo. *Hrvati i crkva : Kratka povijest hrvatskog katoličanstva u modernosti*. Zagreb: Profil, 2013. 85-94; 214.

<sup>12</sup> For an insightful summary of the debates, see 4-5 chapter *Historiography* in Pollard, John. *The Papacy in the Age of Totalitarianism, 1914-1958*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2014. Lewy, Guenter. *The Catholic Church and Nazi Germany*. London: Widenfeld & Nicolson, 1964, is a post-war classic on the topic.

<sup>13</sup> See Tomasevic, Jozo. *The Chetniks: War and Revolution in Yugoslavia, 1941-1945*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1975. 359–96, and Ramet, Sabrina. *The Three Yugoslavias: State Building and Legitimation*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2006. 113-62.

<sup>14</sup> See Phayer, Michael. *Pius XII, The Holocaust, and the Cold War*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana UP, 2008).

<sup>15</sup> Gallagher, Charles R. S.J. *Vatican Secret Diplomacy: Joseph P. Hurley and Pope Pius XII*. Chelsea, MI: Sheridan, 2008. 154–66.

<sup>16</sup> *Diaries* 618.

<sup>17</sup> *The Essays, Articles and Reviews of Evelyn Waugh*. Ed. Donat Gallagher. Boston: Little, Brown, 1984. “The Voice of Tito,” 435–40.

<sup>18</sup> *The Essays*. “Our Guest of Dishonour.” 426.

<sup>19</sup> Maclean, Fitzroy. *Eastern Approaches*. London: Jonathan Cape, 1949. 470.

<sup>20</sup> George Orwell. “The Freedom of the Press.” *TLS*, 15 September 1972. “Collection Items.”

[www.bl.uk/collection-items/orwells-proposed-introduction-to-animal-farm](http://www.bl.uk/collection-items/orwells-proposed-introduction-to-animal-farm)

<sup>21</sup> Thomas, Hugh. “King’s Move.” *The Spectator*. 31 July 1999.

[archive.spectator.co.uk/article/31st-july-1999/20/kings-move](http://archive.spectator.co.uk/article/31st-july-1999/20/kings-move)

<sup>22</sup> Malcolm, Noel. "How Britain Blundered in the Balkans." *The Spectator*. 10 July, 1992.

*archive.spectator.co.uk/article/11th-july-1992/11/how-britain-blundered-in-the-balkans*

<sup>23</sup> See Boyle, Andrew. *The Climate of Treason: Five who Spied for Russia*. London: Hutchinson, 1979.

<sup>24</sup> See Andrew, Christopher. *Vasili Mitrohin: The Mitrochin Archive II: The KGB and the World*. London: Penguin, 2015.

<sup>25</sup> Andrews, Geoff. *The Shadow Man: at the Heart of the Cambridge Spy Circle*. London: I. B. Tauris, 2015. 140-149 in Chapter 12, "Comrade or Conspirator?"; Bailey, Roderick. (Routledge: 2005). "Communist in SOE: Explaining James Klugmann's Recruitment and Retention." *Intelligence and National Security: Special Issue on SOE*. Ed. Neville Wylie. 20: (2005). 72-97.

<sup>26</sup> Andrews 239.

<sup>27</sup> Andrews 266.

<sup>28</sup> See Власова, Е.С. *1948 год в советской музыке*. Москва: Классика-XX, 2010.

<sup>29</sup> Waugh, Evelyn. "Love among the Ruins: A Romance of the Near Future (1952)." *The Complete Short Stories*. London: Penguin, 2011. 448.

<sup>30</sup> Waugh, Evelyn. *The Sword of Honour Trilogy: Unconditional Surrender*. New York, NY: Knopf, 1994. 633.

<sup>31</sup> See Boyle, 62, for Klugmann's "flabbiness and limpness" in Cambridge.

<sup>32</sup> General Maximilian von Weichs oversaw the German retreat from Yugoslavia commanding the 2<sup>nd</sup> Army Group F in the Balkans in 1944.

<sup>33</sup> *Unconditional Surrender* 635.

<sup>34</sup> Maclean 402.

<sup>35</sup> *Unconditional Surrender* 705.



<sup>36</sup> *Unconditional Surrender* 669, 676, 696.

<sup>37</sup> *The Letters of Evelyn Waugh*. Ed. Mark Amory. London: Phoenix, 2009. 313.

<sup>38</sup> “Introduction” by Hugh Trevor-Roper in Bethell, Nicholas. *The Last Secret: The Delivery to Stalin of over Two Million Russians by Britain and the United States*. New York, NY: Basic, 1974.

<sup>39</sup> See John Paul II’s speeches and homilies in Poland, 2 -10 June 1979:

<https://www.fjp2.com/en/john-paul-ii/online-library/homilies>.

Appendix 1

References of the names in quotation marks of the Catholic priests (17) reported as killed in order of appearance in Evelyn Waugh's Report, followed by the details submitted and identified in the Croatian State Archives unless otherwise stated and provided to this author.

1. "Ivo Kranje"

Ivan Kranjc, born in Voglajna (Slovenia) in 1915. Parish priest of Nunić (Zadar archdiocese). Killed by Chetniks in Bukovica on December 24<sup>th</sup>, 1941.

In PETAR BEZINA, *Progoni biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 1941-1992*. Split, 2000. 85.

2. "Ante Cvitanovic"

Ante Cvitanovic, born March 17<sup>th</sup>, 1889, in Podaca (Split-Dalmatia County). Parish priest of Potravlje (Makarska diocese). Died (shot or thrown into a pit) on Vješić gora (Kamešnica) October 27<sup>th</sup>, 1944; missing never found.

In PETAR BEZINA, *Progoni biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 194.-1992*. Split, 2000. 376.

3. "Vladimir Pavlov"

Vladimir Pavlov, parish priest of Zlopolje. It is assumed that he was liquidated together with Ante Cvitanović on Vješić gora (Kamešnica) at the end of October 1944; missing never found.

In PETAR BEZINA, *Progoni biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 1941-1992*. Split, 2000.

4. "Dr. Josip Ghijic"

Dr. Josip Olujić, born 20th January 1888, in the village of Opanci. He was a scientist and a teacher of natural sciences (mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, paleontology). Olujić's work in natural sciences reflected his holistic profile. Although he graduated and received his

PhD diploma abroad (University of Fribourg), his work and overall activities are related to Sinj, where he worked as a professor at the Franciscan classical high school. Liquidated in October 1944. His remains were found in 2013 in a pit in Križnjača (Kamešnica).

See: [http://www.matica.hr/media/uploads/prirodoslovlje/Prirodoslovlje\\_2011\\_web-smanjeno.pdf](http://www.matica.hr/media/uploads/prirodoslovlje/Prirodoslovlje_2011_web-smanjeno.pdf)

5. “Ante Romac”

Ante Romac, parish priest of Brstanovo, of the Franciscan Province of the Most Holy Redeemer. Born October 8<sup>th</sup>, 1900 in Glavice (Sinj). He was briefly in prison and then disappeared on October 27<sup>th</sup>, 1944. It is assumed that he was liquidated (and thrown into a pit) on Vješić gora (Kamešnica); missing never found.

In PETAR BEZINA, *Progoni biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 1941-1992*. Split, 2000. 377.

6. “Father Ivan Romac”

Father Ivan Romac, parish priest of Unešić (Drniš) of the Franciscan Province of the Most Holy Redeemer. Born October 8<sup>th</sup>, 1900 in Glavice (Sinj). Shot after Mass in the village of Koprno, 17 May 1944 (Day of St. Pascal). Allegedly buried on the island of Visovac.

In PETAR BEZINA, *Progoni biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 1941-1992*. Split, 2000. 377.

7. “Father Joseph Culin”

Josip Čulin, born 1 February 1916 in Dugopolje. Shot while on parish duty in his church at Vojnić-Gardun, near Trilj on 20 September 1942. Buried in Dugopolje.

In ANTE BAKOVIĆ. *Hrvatski martirologij XX stoljeća*. Zagreb, 2007. 152-53.

8. “Father Muko Basic”

Mirko Bašić, born 9 January 1895 in Tugare (Makarska); priest in Podgrađe. He was actively helping the partisans; shot on his doorstep on August 21<sup>st</sup>, 1942.

In PETAR BEZINA, *Progoni biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 1941-1992*. Split, 2000. 58.

9. "Father Ivan Stanic"

Ivan Stanić, parish priest of Svinišće. Born on 3 March 1897 in Omiš. Tried at "People's Courts" as "Ustashe and denouncer" and executed on the mountain Mosor, 26 May 1943.

In PETAR BEZINA, *Progoni biskupa, svećenika i redovnika Splitske metropolije i Zadarske nadbiskupije 1941-1992*. Split, 2000. 59.

10. "Canon Nikolas Delić"

Born 2 February 1889 in Makarska. According to one document from November 25 1944: as a member of the Ustashe movement he was sentenced to death (by firing squad), stripped of civil and political rights; subject of confiscation of property, by the military court of VIII Corps Command for Biokovo-Neretva areas. According to another source he died on November 4 1944 in Vrgorac (Splitsko-dalmatinska county).

In *Partizanska i komunistička represija i zločini u Hrvatskoj 1944–1946. Dalmacija*, prir. Mate Rupiće i Vladimir Geiger, Slavonsko Brod-Zagreb 2011. 227-28.

11. "Father Dominic Sulenta"

Dominik Šulenta (father Šimun, mother Ivanica Morović), born on November 20th, 1900, Drašnice near Makarska; guardian of the Franciscan Monastery in Makarska. The partisans entered Makarska on October 21, 1944 and Fr. Dominic Šulenta was arrested very soon afterwards. Together with the other detainees he was taken to a mountain slope in Kozice near Vrgorac where they were killed on November 4th, 1944 in the cemetery of St. Elias.

In Petar BEZINA, *Franjevci provincije Presvetog otkupitelja žrtve rata 1942-1948*. Split, 1995. 116-20. 135.

12. "Father Franjo Boric"

Frano Borić, born on September 19th, 1900 in Podgora, near Makarska. During the war he was the parish priest in Čvrljevo (near Unešić), then in Lećevica (in the Split area), and then

he went to serve at the Franciscan Monastery in Makarska. When the partisans entered Makarska October 21, 1944, they arrested him with a group of people and killed them in a place called Kozice, near Vrgorica, November 4th, 1944; all buried in the cemetery of St. Elias.

In Petar BEZINA, *Franjevci provincije Presvetog otkupitelja žrtve rata 1942-1948*. Split, 1995. 114.-115.

13. "Father Petar Petrica"

Petar Perica, born June 27th, 1881 in Kotišina near Makarska; a Jesuit priest of the Catholic society "Crusaders." He was arrested and killed on October 26, 1944 on Daksa, a small island in front of the port of Gruž in Dubrovnik.

In Joško RADICA, *Sve naše Dakse. Hrvatski jug u vrtlogu Drugog svjetskog rata i jugokomunističke strahovlade*. Dubrovnik, 2003. 227, 229, 231, 254, 260.

14. "Father Maryjan-Blazic"

Marijan Blažić, born March 25th, 1897 in St. Mateju (Blažići) near Kastav; a Franciscan monk of the Franciscan Monastery of the Friars Minor in Dubrovnik. He was taken from Dubrovnik and killed on October 26, 1944 on Daksa, a small island in front of the port of Gruž in Dubrovnik.

In Joško RADICA, *Sve naše Dakse. Hrvatski jug u vrtlogu Drugog svjetskog rata i jugokomunističke strahovlade*. Dubrovnik, 2003. 227-29, 231-32, 240, 248, 254, 258-60, 280, 284, 740.

15. "Father Bernardin Sohol"

A musician. No information found.

16. "Father Djure Krecan"

Registered in Joško RADICA, *Sve naše Dakse. Hrvatski jug u vrtlogu Drugog svjetskog rata i jugokomunističke strahovlade*. Dubrovnik, 2003. 227-29, 231-32, 240, 248, 254, 258, 259-60, 280, 284, 740.

17. "Father Toma Tomasic"

Professor Toma Tomašić, born August 17, 1881 in Baščanska Draga on the island of Krk; a monk of the Franciscan Monastery of the Friars Minor in Dubrovnik; He was taken from Dubrovnik and killed on October 26 1944 in Daksa, a small island in front of the port of Gruž in Dubrovnik.

In Joško RADICA, *Sve naše Dakse. Hrvatski jug u vrtlogu Drugog svjetskog rata i jugokomunističke strahovlade*. Dubrovnik, 2003. 227, 231, 240, 242, 254, 747.

Appendix 2

References of the names in quotation marks of the Catholic priests (14) reported in the political analysis of Evelyn Waugh's Report, followed by the details as identified in the Croatian State Archives unless otherwise stated, and provided to this author.

1. "Father Beckman." Full name Josip Böckmann. Born February 14, 1910 in Rudolfstahl (later renamed to Bosanski Aleksandrovac), a village in northern Bosnia and Herzegovina; appointed as a vicar of Prijedor in 1942; arrested by the partisans 22 December, 1944; tried by the People's Court and sentenced to death on 16 February 1945; executed 17 February 1945; buried in the cemetery of Greda near Sanski Most.

2. "Friar Bubuk." Full name Miroslav Buzuk. Born March 15, 1906 in Briševo near Prijedor (Bosnia and Herzegovina). Appointed as a vicar of Sasina (1943-1944) diocese of Banja Luka (deanery of Bihać); arrested by the partisans on December 17, 1944, tried by the People's Court and sentenced to death on February 16, 1945; executed on February 17, 1945; buried in the cemetery of Greda near Sanski Most.

In Branko Bokan. *Sanski Most u NOB-u 1941-1945. godine*, svezak III, Sanski Most, 1980. 260-62.; Anto Orlovac. *Banjolučki martirologij. Svećenici banjolučke biskupije – žrtve ratova dvadesetog stoljeća*. Banja Luka – Zagreb, 1999. 17-19.; Anto Orlovac. *Prijedorski mučenički trolist. Župa Prijedor i njezina tri župnika mučenika za vjeru u 20. stoljeću*. Prijedor, 2005. 86-105.; Anto Orlovac. *Leksikon pokojnih svećenika banjolučke biskupije*. Banja Luka, 2011. 59-61.

3. "Father Filipovic." Full name Miroslav Filipović, also known under the name of Majstorović (as it is written in the Report). Born June 4, 1915 in Jajce (Bosnia and Herzegovina). Franciscan friar who became active in the Ustase movement from the mid-1930s; served as a commander in the concentration camps of Jasenovac and Stara Gradiška (October 1942–March 1943); excommunicated by the Catholic church in Croatia in 1942; returned by the British army from Austria to Yugoslavia in 1945; sentenced to death by the People's Court and hanged in July 1945.

In *Tko je tko u NDH. Hrvatska 1941-1945*. Zagreb: Minerva, 1997. 114-115.; Jure Krišto, *Sukob simbola*.

4. "Father Brkljacic." Served as a Ustase officer in Jasenovac. Ivica Brkljačić was a Ustaše officer who worked in the Jasenovac camp; after the war he was tried, sentenced to death and executed.

In *Tko je tko u NDH*. Ed. Marko Grčić. Zagreb, 1997. 49.

5. "Father Jose Bujanovic." Prefect of Gospić accused of participating in a massacre of Orthodox peasants, and also of exhorting Ustaše to acts of terrorism. Full name Josip (Jole) Bujanović. A military chaplain and prefect who survived the war.

In *Tko je tko u NDH*. Ed. Marko Grčić. Zagreb, 1997. 56.

6. "Professor Zunic." Expelled by Archbishop Stepinac. Full name Ismet Žunić. An Islamic theologian and poet who disappeared in 1945.

In *Tko je tko u NDH*. Ed. Marko Grčić. Zagreb, 1997. 437.

7. "Bishop Garic of Banja Luka." Full name Jozo Garić. In 1941 intervened on behalf of the detained Orthodox Bishop Platon but failed to save his life.

In *Tko je tko u NDH. Hrvatska 1941-1945*. Zagreb: Minerva, 1997. 127.; Anto Orlovac. *Banjolučki martirologij. Svećenici banjolučke biskupije – žrtve ratova dvadesetog stoljeća*. Banja Luka – Zagreb, 1999. 75-76.

8. "Bishop of Djakovo." Full name Antun Akšamović, died October 7, 1959.

In *Hrvatski biografski leksikon*. 1, A-Bi. Zagreb: Jugoslavenski leksikografski zavod, 1983.

9. "Bishop of Cetinje." Full name Josip Marija Julijo Carević. He was the bishop of Dubrovnik/Ragusa. In May 1945 he was ambushed by the Partisan units, tortured and killed.

In *Tko je tko u NDH*. Ed. Marko Grčić. Zagreb, 1997, 65.; Josip Marija Carević: biskup dubrovački (1883-1945). Ed. Želimir Puljić i Mile Vidović, Dubrovnik-Metković, 2002.



10. "Father Basio." Full name Marijan Blažić. Born March 25, 1897 in St. Mateju (Croatia). Franciscan monk of the Franciscan Monastery of the Friars Minor in Dubrovnik. He was arrested in Dubrovnik and killed on October 26, 1944 on Daksa, a small island in front of the port of Gruž in Dubrovnik.

In *Joško RADICA, Sve naše Dakse. Hrvatski jug u vrtlogu Drugog svjetskog rata i jugokomunističke strahovlade*. Dubrovnik, 2003. 227-29, 231-32, 240.

11. "Mgr. Ritiog, Dean of St. Mark's in Zagreb." Spoke personally to Waugh. Full name Svetozar Ritig, a priest and a politician who worked with Jewish refugees and was sympathetic to the partisans; died in 1961.

In Margareta Matijević. «Političko, crkveno i kulturno djelovanje Svetozara Rittiga (1873-1961).» Doktorska disertacija (PhD dissertation; unpublished), Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, 2011.; Miroslav Akmadža, "Svetozar Rittig - svećenik ministar u komunističkoj vladi Hrvatske," *Godišnjak Njemačke narodnosne zajednice*. 15.1 listopada (2008): 101-15. ([http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id\\_clanak\\_jezik=67845](http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=clanak&id_clanak_jezik=67845)); Miroslav Akmadža. "Prilog poznavanju političkog djelovanja mons. Svetozara Ritiga", *Historijski zbornik*. LIV (2001): 137-58.; *Tko je tko u NDH*. Ed. Marko Grčić. Zagreb, 1997. 347.

12. "Father Salacan" of Kotor who joined the partisans. Full name Ante Salacan, a parish priest who survived the war and died in 1990.

In *Šematizam Biskupije Dubrovačke*. Ed. Ivan Šimić. Dubrovnik, 2006.; Dubrovnik: Naša Gospa, 2009. 62.

13. "Father Petan" of the Maribov diocese, in Sibenik; joined the partisans. Full name Janez (Janko) Petan, a parish priest from 1945 until 1972.

14. "The Bishop of Kotor," resident and Vicar of Apostolic of Dubrovnik (1944). Full name Pavao Butorac. He was accused of being a sympathiser of the Ustaše.

## **“Just You Look at Yourselves:” Relativisation of the Authentic Image of Manliness in *Vile Bodies***

Toshiaki Onishi

In a similar vein to *Decline and Fall*, *Vile Bodies* -- originally titled “Bright Young People” --- is the story of the extraordinary adventures of Adam Fenwick-Symes, who becomes panic-stricken in the unconventional world of the Bright Young Things.<sup>1</sup> Critics have discussed Evelyn Waugh’s satirical portrayal of the unruly and flippant group, heavily influenced by avant-garde movements such as Futurism and Vorticism and the attack on Britain’s conventional value system during the inter-war era.<sup>2</sup> In the young man’s world, Adam, who has “nothing particularly remarkable about his appearance” (10) and is deprived of his autobiography by a censor when he returns from Paris, as if predicting his tragic end, resembles Paul Pennyfeather in his lack of subjectivity. George McCartney emphasises that these protagonists are “stubbornly superficial,” and they do not reveal “their psychological interiors” (76). A. Clement also makes a shrewd comment on Adam’s lack of consideration of “the meaning of existence” and “the meaning of inwardness” based on “essential things of life,” and because of it, he argues, Adam sinks into “alienation and loss of identity” in a raucous world (50). However, does his superficial personality only reveal Waugh’s satirical viewpoint of his volatile generation?

Unlike Paul, an outsider to this unstable society who has the opportunity to contrive his mock funeral and a “happy ending” to escape from his hardships and live again at Oxford, Waugh portrays Adam as one of its insiders, unable to escape the chaotic situation in the final chapter, “Happy Ending” (186). At the battlefield, weak-willed Adam, unconsciously following the discipline of manliness, is ironically heralded as a manly hero who could be awarded the Victoria Cross on the home front. In contrast to *Decline and Fall*, this ironical and rather eschatological ending indicates that the novel serves to foreground the deadly function of masculine ideology’s imposition on men.

To focus on Waugh’s representation of the ideology of a normative gender code, it is necessary to analyse the moment when Mrs. Ape, the queer masculine American evangelist (“squaring her shoulders and looking [except that she had really no beard to speak of] every inch a sailor” [8]), utters at a raucous party of the Bright Young Things: “*Just you look at yourselves*”

(84). Her pompous speech, inappropriate to the occasion, creates an awkward moment for the guests because they cannot help feeling insecure about their subjectivities. However, as Lady Circumference's remark -- "What a damned impudent woman" (85) -- drowns out the effect of Mrs. Ape's enlightening words, her targets regain their festive, merry feelings straight away and continue clinging to their superficial lives. This scene reveals the paradox within the guests' psyches that although they are convinced that they have rejected the voice of the normative code, their identities are based unconsciously on their internalisation of the ideology of the establishment.

In order to re-evaluate the relevance of the strong presence of Mrs. Ape and the meaning of Waugh's representation of normative gender ideology, this paper pays attention to the ways in which he depicts the voice of the norm of manliness that encircles the unruly world of the Bright Young Things in *Vile Bodies*. In contrast to the uncritical acceptance of heroic masculinity in this era, Waugh's ironical depiction of Adam, a parody of the soldier-hero, relativises the authentic image of manliness during the inter-war decades as the process of constructing masculine ideology is self-reflexively described in the novel. The introspective gaze into male subjectivity in *Vile Bodies* is thus important for the analysis of male characters drawn in the 1930s.

The Bright Young Things challenged the authoritative patriarchy that permeated their entire lives and searched for an alternative identity beyond the rigid dichotomies of heterosexuality. In order to assert the validity of their existence, the younger generation needed to commit symbolic patricide. As Modris Eksteins notes: "[In] the quest for a new fluency and harmony was involved a profound rebellion against an older generation, against the fathers who had led their sons to slaughter. . . . Patricide and the act of moral reclamation that the murder of the father entailed fascinated the new literary generation" (259-60).

However, it is important to emphasise that in *Vile Bodies*, Waugh, focusing on the rebellious younger generation, carefully depicts the voice of the normative code. For instance, in order to repress such idiosyncratic attitudes, the *Evening Mail* in *Vile Bodies* has to emphasise the relevance of both "purity" and "sobriety" (64) in the public and private spheres and denounce young men's horrendous behaviours against the normative code in both, because the disturbance of normative gender roles is inextricably linked with the decline of the British Empire. During the interwar period, the celebration of ideal "manliness," as Ina Zweiniger-Bargielowska

observed, reached a peak as Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany came to promote “racial regeneration” (596). In 1930s Britain, physical health and sturdiness as ideals of “manliness” were widely disseminated, as seen in magazines such as *Health and Strength* and *The Superman*, which welcomed “a renewed interest in physical culture” (601), and the Festival of Youth, an event held in the presence of King George VI and Queen Elizabeth at Wembley Stadium in July 1937. In the literary world, Martin Francis asserted, “interwar boy’s literature was frequently more violent than its predecessors, with the hero using his physical strength, rather than his wits, to overcome his enemies” (644). In this context, as noted by John M. MacKenzie, the code for young men was “to take precise forms obeying orders from elders and superiors, training in firearms, acceptance of violence as part of the natural order, preparation for war and a strict separation of sexual roles” (176). Men had to be more beautiful and stronger than ever following World War I to struggle against the fear of degeneration and of the enemies who threatened the stability of the empire. In this context, “effeminate” men were excluded from the “healthy” heterosexual world as one of its enemies in order to strengthen the patriarchal value system.

As Waugh’s contemporary, Christopher Isherwood deftly stated this psychological repression in *Lions and Shadows* (1938): “[W]e young writers of the middle twenties were all suffering, more or less subconsciously, from a feeling of shame that we hadn’t been old enough to take part in the European war. The shame, I have said, was subconscious: in my case, at any rate, it was suppressed by the strictest possible censorship” (46). It can be said that this sense of shame related to their anxiety around male subjectivity. Feeling “guilty excitement,” young Isherwood regarded war as “The Test” of one’s courage, maturity, and sexual prowess. He craved to be “a Man,” but at the same time, he felt terrified that he should fail (*Lions* 46-47). Although not as bold as Isherwood, George Orwell, in his essay “My Country Right or Left” (1940), retrospectively expressed anxiety with regard to “manliness:” “[M]y particular generation, those who had been ‘just too young,’ became conscious of the vastness of the experience they had missed. You felt yourself a little less than a man, because you had missed it” (135). These feelings emphasise the considerable influence of the shared image of ideal “manliness” at that time.

Interestingly, *Vile Bodies* reiterates the traumatic scars of the First World War through the depiction of the dissipated way of life of the younger generation. Against the bloom of the

worship of youth during that decade, Waugh reiterates the working of ideology in his description of the world surrounding young men, embodied as voices from the *ancien régime*. For instance, it is on “Armistice Day” (55) that Adam visits his fiancée Nina Blount’s house to announce their engagement and, rather significantly for him, borrow money from her father. At lunchtime, he also hears the news that two servants in the house were killed in action. Around Adam’s life, Waugh delineates the aftermath of the war in detail. The most relevant example appears in the description of Shepherd’s Hotel (where Adam resides), which is full of the relics of traditional masculinity. It is “a happy reminder” of “the splendours of the Edwardian era” (30):

Lottie’s parlour, in which most of the life of Shepherd’s centres, contains a comprehensive collection of signed photographs. Most of the male members of the royal families of Europe are represented (except the ex-Emperor of Germany, who has not been reinstated, although there was a distinct return of sentiment towards him on the occasion of his second marriage). There are photographs of young men on horses riding in steeplechases, of elderly men leading in the winners of ‘classic’ races, of horses alone and of young men alone, dressed in tight, white collars or in the uniform of the Brigade of Guards. There are caricatures by ‘Spy,’ and photographs cut from illustrated papers, many of them with brief obituary notices, ‘killed in action.’ There are photographs of yachts in full sail and of elderly men in yachting caps; there are some funny pictures of the earliest kind of motor car. There are very few writers or painters and no actors, for Lottie is true to the sound old snobbery of pound sterling and strawberry leaves. (31)

In the promiscuous world of the Bright Young Things, the landscape they live in and see remains conventional. In the hotel, there are numerous materials reinforcing the authority of the patriarchy, the empire, and conventional masculinity. Such materials, praising kings, soldiers, and sportsmen for their masculine power, silently hail individuals who appreciate them as conventional men. Artists regarded as effeminate are excluded.

In *Highland Fling*, Nancy Mitford, a contemporary of Waugh, depicts the shared discourse among the older generation that artist as an occupation is “doubtful” in comparison with soldiering. Such young men are talked about behind their backs: “‘Ah, yes, he failed for the Army, and was chucked out of the City, so they sent him to the Slade’” (22).

Again, in Lottie's parlour, the young Italian, who powders his nose and is called "Italian queen" (51), is the target of Lottie's condemnation: "Don't stand there wiggling your behind at me. Take it away quick or I'll catch you such a smack" (51). This little episode reminds us of William K., a hotel porter, who possessed face powder, scented handkerchiefs, and two photographs of himself in women's costume and was "sentenced to nine months' hard labour and a whipping after being arrested on Piccadilly in 1924" (Houlbrook 149). As Matt Houlbrook remarks, "cosmetics were a fascinating yet dangerous sign of men's ability to cross the boundaries between masculine and feminine by simply transforming their appearance" (148).

In *Vile Bodies*, Waugh highlights the hidden influence of Edwardian masculine ideology that permeated the society of interwar Britain. This influence sometimes appears in material objects and at other times as imperceptible and intangible things because it acts as an ideology. Thus, the internalisation of the voice of power makes individuals its subject; simultaneously, internalised ideology constructs the conscience in the mind of the subject. For instance, such interpellation surfaces as reproachful mutterings. In the grumblings among the previous generation, young men are unfavourably compared with the masculine old and denounced for their "effeminacy." Such comparisons became a normative discourse that infiltrated their lives during the interwar period, a masculine ideology stringently requiring Adam to be an "*always-already subject*."

Furthermore, Chapter Eight in *Vile Bodies*, in which the Bright Young Things' party on an airship is described in parallel with a magnificent party of the father's generation, is noteworthy in this context. In contrast to the portrayal of young men, who feel like vomiting on the unstable airship, Waugh clearly delineates the stability of aristocrats wearing first-class clothes and officers wearing medals on their chests in "Anchorage House" -- "anchorage" for the tradition or "the age anchored" -- where the solemn atmosphere of the nineteenth century, even if it is superficial, still remains. They are part of the generation that performatively represents the value system of the British imperialism that sent their sons to the deadly battlefields of the Great War. In this magnificent party, Mr. Outrage, the Prime Minister, as his name symbolically implies, harshly criticises the values of the Bright Young Things: "They had a chance after the war that no generation has ever had. There was a whole civilization to be saved and remade -- and all they seem to do is to play the fool" (111). For him, the Bright Young Things have a

responsibility to reconstruct the British society after the unprecedented, devastating tragedy of the First World War. Given the sense of brokenness of the concept of manliness, Mr. Outrage must stress the recovery of Edwardian patriarchy based on the conventional idea of manliness in his hope of reviving European civilisation. He is a symbolical character embodying the “outrage” of the older generation over the dissolute lives of the younger.

However much Waugh wrote explicitly and implicitly on the influence of the normative gender ideology, he was deeply concerned about the absence of an idealised father figure, reflecting his alienation from his own father. His ironical descriptions of masculine ideology not only disclose the younger generation’s unfittedness to gender norms but also criticise the older generation through emphasis on the absence of “idealised” masculine figures. Mr. Outrage, who has an adulterous Japanese lover, the Baroness Yoshiwara, is not a masculine representative because of his anxiety over his impotence. Moreover, through Miles’ relationship with his absent father, Waugh indicates that children inherit family weaknesses, including sexual problems. The fathers are weak; poor Throbbing is patently as impotent as Mr. Outrage. Through the satirical depiction of the older generation, Waugh discloses the masculine ideology as being without substance. His emphasis underlines that such a man can deceptively perform the “outrage” of authority.

The conversation between Fanny Throbbing and Kitty Blackwater, Miles’s mother and her sister, reveals the widespread anxiety about the decline of the idealised father:

‘My dear, [Miles] looks terribly *tapette*.’

‘Darling, I know. It is a great grief to me. Only I try not to think about it too much – he had so little chance with poor Throbbing what he was.’

‘The sins of the fathers, Fanny . . .’ (23)

They deprecate Miles’ queerness with the French word “*tapette*.” According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, *tapette* appeared as an adopted word for the first time in *Vile Bodies*. It appears in Aldous Huxley’s *Point Counter Point* (1928), but there it is used as French. This clarifies that among the society of Waugh’s generation, the word “*tapette*” had already entered everybody’s vocabulary as a criticism of those who deviate from the normative code. The word

euphemistically represents their sadness that Miles does not carry himself like an English gentleman. Through this conversation, Waugh reveals the psychic relation between the absence of masculine fathers and the young men's "effeminacy." The young men's acquisition of masculine subjectivity is influenced by the internalisation of their fathers' ordering them to be men. The reproachful phrase, "the sins of fathers," implies that fathers have a responsibility to raise their sons with masculine qualities and at the same time convicts their sons' queerness as a sin from the standpoint of authority.

Adam is also haunted by the absence of his father. Although Lottie does not know his dead father, she compares Adam to him whenever possible: "Just like your poor father" (64). The absurdity of this has been regarded as illustrative of Waugh's humour, demonstrating the easy misunderstanding of people's personalities; however, such a repetitive emphasis on the absence of "poor" fathers indicates that sons do not have a model of ideal manliness. They cannot take hold of the ideal father image that should be internalised in their mind. The son mentally abandoned by the father cannot assume the father as his model in establishing his identity as a man (Corneau 13). Therefore, Adam's unconscious desire for the culturally prevalent ideal of manliness is intensified. In this way, attracted by an image of "the manliness" floating without reality and having failed to internalise his father as his superego / norm, Adam drifts to the battlefields of the World War, where his admiration for manliness is finally smashed.

Considering the "bogus" influence of masculine ideology, it is also worthwhile focusing on the scene at the raucous party of the Bright Young Things held by Lady Metroland, in which Waugh's depiction shows the existence of the internalised code in their minds. At the party, Mrs. Ape (her name a mockery of human beings), who is represented as a dubious evangelist, gives a speech as follows:

'Brothers and Sisters,' [Mrs. Ape] said in a hoarse, stirring voice. Then she paused and allowed her eyes, renowned throughout three continents for their magnetism, to travel among the gilded chairs. (It was one of her favourite openings.) '*Just you look at yourselves,*' she said. (84)

Her words inevitably make all of the guests, both old and young, uncomfortable. All of a sudden, their hidden thoughts, which have been recognised as empty by previous critics, come to light.



Through the reflexive words of Mrs. Ape, a mood of self-reproach moves rapidly over the gathering. The remark creates an awkward moment because the guests cannot help feeling anxious about their subjectivities, which they have ignored so far:

Magically, self-doubt began to spread in the audience. Mrs Panrast stirred uncomfortably; had that silly little girl been talking, she wondered. . . .

There were a thousand things in Lady Throbbing's past . . . Every heart found something to bemoan. (84-85)

This scene harshly reveals the unstable subjectivity of not only the protagonist but also of the Bright Young Things as a community. According to the insightful observation of R. Neill Johnson, the guests must feel a sense of “shame” and face “the possibility that they are not who they thought they were” under the gaze of Mrs. Ape (10). For the first time, they realise their “emptiness” (10) through their internal struggle with their identities. However, it should be emphasised that through the words of Mrs. Ape, Waugh's satirical gaze focuses on the idle attitude of those who have refused to turn the reflexive gaze on themselves—on their own “emptiness.” If they can feel a sense of “shame,” they must, *a priori*, be “always-already subjects” who have already internalised the psychological landscape to feel “shame.” In other words, Waugh's satire is not about their lack of subjectivity but their refusal to reflexively gaze into their subjectivity.

Paradoxically, the “awkward moment” vanishes as soon as they hear “the organ voice of England” and “the hunting-cry of the *ancien régime*.”

But suddenly on that silence vibrant with self-accusation broke the organ voice of England, the hunting-cry of the *ancien régime*. Lady Circumference gave a resounding snort of disapproval:

‘What a damned impudent woman,’ she said.

Adam and Nina and Miss Runcible began to giggle, and Margot Metroland for the first time in her many parties was glad to realize that the guest of the evening was going to be a failure. It had been an awkward moment. (85)

The need for the Bright Young Things to continue clinging to their superficial lives must be an acquired defect arising from the conventional code internalised in their minds. Lady Circumference's cry urges her audience to recognise the existence of the code they have internalised unawares in their psychic landscapes. In this scene, Waugh reveals the paradox that their identities are based unconsciously on their internalised ideology of the Establishment even though they seem convinced that they have rejected its normative code. While they thoroughly ignore the normative code of traditional England in forging their alternative subjectivities, the only way to preserve their sanity is to rely on the voice of the good old values. As long as they reject conventional norms, they cannot maintain their existence, which makes their subjectivities "bogus." Thus, Mrs. Ape's speech becomes a harsh criticism of the Bright Young Things' void of escapism. The words "*Just you look at yourselves*" serve as the voice of the conscience, urging the young men to focus their reflexive gaze on themselves. It is the only way for them to escape the sense of being "bogus." However, the Bright Young Things fail to ponder the formation of their subjectivities because of their emphatic rejection of the conventional value system. From a historical perspective, as the Bright Young Things could not establish an alternative value system through the full rejection of deep-rooted tradition, their deviation from that normative code never succeeds in *Vile Bodies*. In the end, Miss Runcible dies in a car accident, Miles has to escape from his own country, and Archie Schwert is arrested on suspicion of being a spy during wartime. Their failures are caused by their own unawareness of their oppression by the conventional value system.

Through his satirical depiction of young men's rejection of masculine ideology and disregard for the process of establishing their subjectivities, Waugh emphasises the necessity of opportunities for "self-accusation." His attitude on this matter can be recognised as what Judith Butler calls a "reflexive turn of the subject" (115); he notices that it is the only way to discover an alternative subjectivity. If they fail to do so, the existence of the Bright Young Things becomes invalid and their lives "bogus." Adam, who just giggles at Mrs. Ape's undoing, is surely one of those unmindful of the formation of their subjectivity.

As a result, the party held for Mrs. Ape brings great changes to Adam's life. Simon Balcairn, the *Daily Express* gossip columnist known as "Mr. Chatterbox" who invents stories about the absurd lives of the Bright Young Things, concocts a story about Mrs. Ape's speech

being highly religious. Because of this story, he is ostracised from the society and finally commits suicide. Adam takes over his work and the mantle of “Mr. Chatterbox.” As soon as he gets deeply involved in his new job, he makes light of his subjectivity. He quickly creates a number of fictitious characters such as “Captain Angus Stuart-Kerr” (95), the outstanding hunter and dancer, and “Imogen Quest” (96), his greatest invention. Despite their fictional existences, they begin to have a great influence in society and everybody comes to admire them. “Imogen Quest,” in particular, shows “signs of a marked personality” (96) and becomes “the final goal” (97) for those who attempt to rise in the world. While Adam’s version of “Mr. Chatterbox” depicts unrealistic characters as ideal persons, the public believes that they are real and desire to emulate them. This satirical description of Adam’s constant desire to build reality through fiction underlines the fact that it cannot but actualise the process of constructing and fictionalising norms and authority.

Parting from the unconventional world of the Bright Young Things, Adam, who was given a masculine name from the beginning, goes to the battlefield in an unconscious attempt to fulfil the codes of manliness, where he receives a letter from his ex-fiancée, Nina:

*Dearest Adam — I wonder how you are. It is difficult to know what is happening quite because the papers say such odd things. Van has got a divine job making up all the war news and he invented a lovely story about you the other day how you’d saved hundreds of people’s lives and there’s what they call a popular agitation saying why haven’t you got the V.C. so probably you will have by now isn’t it amusing. (186)*

In this letter, it is obvious that, in a similar manner to Adam, Van became “Mr. Chatterbox” after him and concocted heroics for Adam for which he should be awarded the Victorian Cross. The image of the hero constructed by “Mr. Chatterbox” remains a stereotypical officer institutionalised in the militarisation of British imperialism from the end of the nineteenth century to the First World War, a period when battles were regarded as trials for innumerable men to prove their manliness. Although Adam feels a sense of meaninglessness on the battlefield, his exploits are fabricated and he becomes part of the fiction that he once wrote. Frederick L. Beaty interprets Adam’s end on the battlefield from the perspective of social satire as Waugh’s “disillusionment with the society of his day” (66). In addition, considering the author’s real-life divorce, Robert R. Garnett asserts that the melancholy of *Vile Bodies* as a black

comedy is deeply associated with the previous novel (74). However, given the existence of the conventional value system behind young men's raucous ways of life, Adam's aimless enlistment in the army is evidence that it is impossible for them to completely escape from conventional regulation and, rather importantly, discloses their inner discrepancy on a massive scale. It is a parody of the hero image that ideologically justified patriarchy and the concept of manliness in Western culture before the First World War that Waugh depicts at the end of *Vile Bodies*. Through the repeated demonstration of "Mr. Chatterbox's" "realisation of the fiction," Waugh's satirical relativisation of the conventional image of manliness and reflexivity in male subjectivity is actualised in the final chapter.

The episode with Mrs. Ape shows the importance of gazing reflexively at the self, and the ending, when Adam becomes a virtual image of manliness on the battlefield, reveals that such a conventional image of man is not essential but rather constructed by the ideological functions of the normative code. The Bright Young Things, as portrayed by Waugh, do not have a hold on their existence in a society that orders men to pursue the manliness of the soldier-hero. It is important to pay attention to the fact that throughout *Vile Bodies*, Waugh emphasises the centrality of the concept of manliness in young men's society. He succeeds because he maintains a certain distance from both the old and the young generations.

In his satirical novels, Waugh acknowledges the masculine ideology influencing the young men and creating their conscience and reflexively ponders his own subjectivity. In other words, it is Waugh's attempt to bring the unnamed masculinity of the time to light. His satire makes it possible to visualise the subconscious fear of young men, which enables him to place the reflexive gaze on himself.

Extreme ways of reinforcing the code of ideal "manliness" paradoxically disclosed society's anxiety about men becoming "effeminate." In contrast to the abstract but ideologically strong image of the soldier-hero on the battlefields, men who found it difficult to live in the patriarchal society of post-war Britain began to doubt the image of the stereotypical manly figure and found their enemy in the kernel of their psychological landscapes, although this enemy remained unnamed. Alison Light offered an insight into the problem of masculinity in the interwar period: The figurative mutation from a masculine empire to a "feminine" insular country required a revision of the concept of "manliness" (8). Light's discussion of a feminised

masculinity during the years between the wars challenges us to reanalyse the characters depicted by male authors in this era. The tension between the authoritative image of “manliness” and the broken image of men can be regarded as a figurative confrontation between the outward gaze reinforcing an imperialistic ideology of masculinity and the inward gaze linking the decline of the empire to anxiety over broken masculine identities. While male subjectivity is conventionally guaranteed as long as people are indiscriminately subject to the ideological code, authors of satire, especially Waugh, started to doubt its validity in this period and focused on the formation of their male subjectivity in relation to the social code. As suggested by Light’s observation that “manliness” came to be considered reflexive and “inward-looking” (8), satirists at that time were awakened to the psychic life of power that dominated their male subjectivity. The generation that came of age after World War I came to realise the existence of something inside themselves prohibiting them from being “effeminate” and ordering them to be men.

Manliness began to be discussed as a gender only in the 1970s. Until then, it belonged to an invisible domain. Therefore, the act of gazing reflexively into male subjectivity is quite relevant to deconstructing the validity of normative gender ideology. Before Elisabeth Badinter, parodying the words of Simone de Beauvoir, observed that “One is not born a man, one becomes a man” (26), in 1992, Waugh made great advances in exploring the objectification of the process of becoming a man. Thus, *Vile Bodies*, published in 1930, should be regarded as an important watershed work in history from the perspective of male gender. Waugh repeatedly tells us, “*Just you look at yourselves.*”

Notes

<sup>1</sup> About Waugh's representation of manliness in *Decline and Fall* and its historical background, see Toshiaki Onishi, "The Psychic Prison of Manliness: A Reflexive Gaze onto the Male Subjectivity in *Decline and Fall*." *Studies in English Literature*. 56 (2015): 57-73.

<sup>2</sup> For an exemplary literary approach to the intertextual relationship between Waugh and the avant-garde movements, see Brooke Allen and Archie Loss.

<sup>3</sup> In this paper, the following words are used in the discourse of the post-war era as below: "Masculinity," the ideology requiring men to follow the concept of "manliness." "Manliness," the conventional value system established during the Victorian and Edwardian eras in the service of British imperialism which praised the sturdiness and stoicism of an ideal man as a patriarch and a soldier. "Effeminate," men displaying sexualities deviating from the rigid binary view of sexuality and gender roles in the Victorian and Edwardian eras, and who were thought to threaten the validity of the imperialistic patriarchy.

Works Cited

- Allen, Brooke. "Vile Bodies: A Futurist Fantasy." *Twentieth Century Literature*. 40.3 (1994): 318-28.
- Badinter, Elisabeth. *Xy, on Masculine Identity*. Translated by Lydia Davis. New York, NY: Columbia UP, 1995.
- Beatty, Frederick L. *The Ironic World of Evelyn Waugh: A Study of Eight Novels*. DeKalb, IL: Northern Illinois UP, 1994.
- Butler, Judith. *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection*. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 1997.
- Clement, A. *The Novels of Evelyn Waugh: A Study in the Quest-Motif*. New Delhi: Prestige, 1994.
- Corneau, Guy. *Absent Fathers, Lost Sons: The Search for Masculine Identity*. Translated by Larry Shouldice. Boston, MA: Shambhala, 1991.
- Eksteins, Modris. *Rites of Spring: The Great War and the Birth of the Modern Age*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.
- Francis, Martin. "The Domestication of the Male? Recent Research on Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century British Masculinity." *The Historical Journal*. 45.3 (2002): 637-52.
- Garnett, Robert R. *From Grimes to Brideshead: The Early Novels of Evelyn Waugh*. Lewisburg, VA: Bucknell UP, 1990.
- Houlbrook, Matt. "'The Man with the Powder Puff' in Interwar London." *The Historical Journal*. 50.1 (2007): 145-71.
- Isherwood, Christopher. *Lions and Shadows: An Education in the Twenties*. London: Minerva, 1996.
- Johnson, R. Neill. "Shadowed by the Gaze: Evelyn Waugh's 'Vile Bodies' and 'The Ordeal of Gilbert Pinfold.'" *The Modern Language Review*. 91.1 (1996): 9-19.
- Light, Alison. *Forever England: Femininity, Literature and Conservatism between the Wars*. London: Routledge, 1991.

Loss, Archie. "Vile Bodies, Vorticism, and Italian Futurism." *Journal of Modern Literature*. 18.1 (1992) 155-64.

MacKenzie, John M. "The Imperial Pioneer and Hunter and the British Masculine Stereotype in Late Victorian and Edwardian Times." *Manliness and Morality: Middle-Class Masculinity in Britain and America, 1800-1940*. Edited by J. A. Mangan and James Walvin. Manchester UP, 1987. 176-79.

McCartney, George. *Evelyn Waugh and the Modernist Tradition*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, 2004.

Mitford, Nancy. *Highland Fling*. London: Capuchin, 2010.

Onishi, Toshiaki. "The Psychic Prison of Manliness: A Reflexive Gaze onto the Male Subjectivity in *Decline and Fall*." *Studies in English Literature*. 56 (2015): 57-73.

Orwell, George. *George Orwell: Essays*. London: Penguin, 2000.

Waugh, Evelyn. *Vile Bodies*. London: Penguin, 2000.

Zweiniger-Bargielowska, Ina. "Building a British Superman: Physical Culture in Interwar Britain." *Journal of Contemporary History*. 4.4 (2006): 595-610.



## REVIEWS

### “In my beginning is my end”<sup>1</sup>

*A Little Learning. The Complete Works of Evelyn Waugh.* John Howard Wilson and Barbara Cooke, eds. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2017. 676 pp. £65, \$85.

Reviewed by Jeffrey Manley

Evelyn Waugh's last book (*A Little Learning*) ironically becomes one of the first to be published in his *Complete Works*. On the other hand, for those starting a scholarly review of his work, it is a good place to begin. He had planned that the autobiography would take up three volumes and intended that this volume cover the years up to 1930. It would have included his marriage, divorce and conversion to Roman Catholicism. As it turned out, this one covers his childhood and education but only makes it to 1925, ending with his aborted suicide attempt during his teaching job in Wales. He seemed to be avoiding the traumatic period of his brief marriage to and break-up with Evelyn Gardner.

The second volume of the autobiography (which was tentatively entitled *A Little Hope*) never got beyond the fragment of an introductory section linking it to the first volume. This fragment is published here in a 6-page appendix. As explained in the editorial introduction, one of the reasons he got no further was the decision of Waugh's UK publisher to put back release of volume 2 until the print run of the first volume had been exhausted. A portion of the large Chapman & Hall first printing of volume 1 (20,000 copies) remained unsold at Waugh's death, and C&H never did a second printing. This delay gave Waugh an excuse to avoid the problem of composing a narrative for what was probably the most difficult part of his life.

Consistent with other *CWEW* volumes containing fiction or non-fiction writing published in book form, this one begins with a history of the book's writing. In this case, the writing was less straightforward than for most of his other books. Waugh was here working from distant memory and not imagination, immediate experience or research. And his memory was already beginning to show signs of weakness. In the earlier chapters, he had the benefit of family records

---

<sup>1</sup> Eliot, T. S. "East Coker." *Lapham's Quarterly*. 7.4 (2014): 63-64.

or his own diaries, but when he got to Oxford, the diaries stopped (or had been destroyed) and he had to rely on memory alone, his own and those of his friends from whom he sought help. This process is described in the chapter of the introduction called “The History of the Text.”

He began writing in 1961 but was interrupted several times by family matters such as marriages and births of grandchildren. He also reprised his trip to British Guiana, accompanied by his daughter Margaret. This was then written up as articles for *The Sunday Times* (after being rejected by the *Daily Mail* which had originally commissioned the articles and sponsored the voyage). He later made a trip to France, especially to have the solitude needed to write the autobiography, but instead came back with nothing written. The result was a shorter book than was expected and delivered later than was planned.

Then comes the history of publication. In this and other volumes the discussion is limited to publication within Waugh’s lifetime, when he had the opportunity (often taken up, in Waugh’s case) to modify the contents of various printings and editions. But in the case of this book, there was only one edition in his lifetime. One would assume that would make this discussion less complex than may have been the case with other books. There were, however, several hiccoughs in the late stages of editing the final text that may not have been encountered with earlier volumes. For example, the UK printer set a final copy in pages before proofs had been made up and circulated for final corrections. This made the last set of edits more delicate than usual and some errors slipped through both to the prepublication extracts and the final printing.

The actual publication details of the book are also provided. Extracts were published in the summer of 1964 by both *The Sunday Times* in the UK and *Esquire* magazine in the USA. The contents of these are described and their editorial differences from the book noted. The separate book editions were published simultaneously by C&H and Little, Brown in September 1964, and were identical. Photos of the dust wrappers are provided, but the print quality is rather poor and they offer only a suggestion of what the originals looked like, with little of the detail.

The editorial introduction also considers the historical context of the book’s production, including interviews on TV and radio where Waugh had discussed some of the biographical details that ultimately worked their way into the book. In addition, there is a brief discussion of how attitudes toward homosexuality affected the book in a period before it was decriminalized a

few years later. Care was still needed when discussing homosexuality of living persons. This proved problematic in one case where Dick Young (the model for Capt. Grimes) at first agreed to be named. When he later changed his mind, the name was changed in the text to Capt. Grimes. Finally, there is a discussion of the reforms in the Roman Catholic Church as part of the Second Vatican Council, ongoing at the time. These reforms deeply affected Waugh, and the editors believe that they contributed to the book's nostalgic mood. Indeed, progress on the book was delayed to the extent needed for the writing of a major article on the church reforms. This was called "Same Again Please" and appeared in a September 1962 edition of *The Spectator*.

There is also a brief section entitled "Context of Waugh's Other Work and Literary History." Under "other work" most of the discussion revolves around how *ALL* relates to the story of *Decline and Fall*, much of which was based on Waugh's school-mastering experience. Oddly, not much is said of *Brideshead Revisited*, despite that novel's early chapters being set in Oxford. Waugh's friend and fellow novelist Anthony Powell would have found this omission wholly appropriate since he thought that novel and the Oxford chapter of *ALL* were wholly unrealistic depictions of Waugh's actual experience of Oxford life. In her recent book, *Evelyn Waugh's Oxford* (2018), co-editor Barbara Cooke goes into this question in greater detail and explains how Waugh's descriptions of Oxford in *Brideshead* are filtered through his own perceptions of how he wished those times had been.

In the section on literary historical contexts, the editors consider how Waugh's autobiography compares to those of contemporary writers. This focuses primarily on those of Vladimir Nabokov, Sylvia Plath and Seamus Heaney. Also considered here are possible influences on Waugh's book by other autobiographical works such as those of his brother and father, as well as Osbert Sitwell's 5-volume work.

The heart of the introduction is a discussion of the book's critical reception. In Waugh's case, the existence of Martin Stannard's 1984 volume in the *Critical Heritage* series would prove helpful in this effort. But the editors extend their range to reviews and essays beyond those published in Stannard's volume. They include brief references to reviews by Anthony Powell (*Daily Telegraph*), Alan Pryce-Jones (*NY Herald Tribune*) and John Gross (*NY Review of Books*), as well as several others, that were not reprinted in the *Critical Heritage* volume.

More importantly, the section includes a fairly detailed consideration of the critical reception expressed by Waugh's correspondents in their letters to him regarding the book. He gave such comments more serious consideration than those reflected in the published reviews, and in several cases altered future editions of his books to address concerns expressed by his friends. The same was true in this case. To take one example, Graham Greene expressed displeasure with Waugh's description of him in the text: "he looked down on us (and perhaps on almost all undergraduates) as childish and ostentatious" (167, lines 1129-32). Greene's objection to his description is clearly set out in the narrative (lxii). Waugh substantially rewrote Greene's description, as is also explained in the narrative: "at Oxford [Greene] kept his own, far from austere set & held aloof from us." The narrative goes so far as to explain how Waugh wrote the change in specially bound copies of the book that he retained or gave to family members.

However, if the book's main function is to prepare an appendix to track changes in the text during its preparation and then to some extent afterwards as Waugh made post-publication changes, in this it is, I am afraid, less successful than in its narrative passages. The page where the above reference to Greene appears in the first edition can be used as an example. There is a reference in the narrative to Appendix B (Manuscript Description and Textual Variants, usually abbreviated, rather dauntingly, as "MDATV"). If one looks at that section, the change described in the text can be discerned, but details are quite difficult to determine. There are references to documents denominated TMS1a, TMS1b, TE, TS and UK1a. Some of these are defined in a list entitled "Abbreviations used in MDATV" (253-57). A "TMS" is defined as typed copy of an AMS which is in turn defined as "Autographed manuscript of main text." A "TS" is any typescript other than a TMS. To find definitions for the other abbreviations, one must look elsewhere. "UK1a" is a copy of the book that Waugh marked up with the new language. The other two exceed my descriptive powers (253-54). Quite simply, to use this complicated system to track something is a task that will likely be undertaken primarily by those scholars familiar with this system. The problem for the non-specialist is that the system attempts to identify and retain more detail than is necessary.

To be fair, objections to the complicated nature of the MDATV in this volume may be a bit misrepresentative. As is explained in the introduction, the amount of archival material available for this book exceeds most, if not all, of the others, and Waugh's writing skills and

facilities as well as his memory were beginning to falter when drafting was undertaken. This probably caused more revisions than had previously been the case.<sup>2</sup>

To conclude this discussion, while I cannot claim any computer expertise, my limited experience with the “track changes” function of a word processing program would suggest that, with a little imagination and training, a program could be written (or may already exist) that would allow one to track changes through the drafting stages of a book. This would surely be more accessible than the printed version we have here. In the end, it might well require less labor than the preparation of detailed texts such as those in the MDATV appendices. It certainly should not cost any more and could well cost far less. Alas, it is probably too late to change over for the printed versions but when (and if) the time comes for preparation of digital texts, a computerized format for manuscript development should be given careful consideration.

The book also contains contextual notes in a separate appendix. These are usually narratives identifying a person, quote, place or event referred to in the text. They are quite straightforward, helpful and easy to use. No decoding is necessary. In the case of the Greene reference discussed above, the contextual note refers one back to the page in the introductory narrative where the description of Greene appears, as well as his letter of complaint and Waugh’s response to it, and finally to the MDATV entry. However, because the marginal page and line references to both contextual and MDATV notes are in identical typeface, it is often easy to become confused between them. If one had been in bold-face type, that confusion could have been avoided.

To end the story of the modified Greene reference, I was curious to know whether the change that Waugh wrote into the specially bound copy was ever implemented in print editions. Since there was no reprint of *ALL* in his lifetime, this falls beyond the scope of the *CWEW*. I am happy to report, however, that in the 1973 UK paperback edition published by Sidgwick & Jackson, that revision was made (192) according to Waugh’s instructions (although no revision is

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, in the case of Rossetti, *CWEW*, Vol. 16, only one manuscript text other than the printed versions exists. Although the printed texts of that book and *ALL* are nearly the same length (170 vs. 192 pages), the MDATV for *Rossetti* weighs in at 34 pages vs. 226 for *ALL*. That for *Vile Bodies* (*CWEW*, Vol. 2) is 136 pages.

indicated on the copyright page).<sup>3</sup> The Penguin edition currently for sale on Amazon.co.uk also reflects this change.

This volume also includes a valuable bonus. In Appendix F, it collects most of the print and broadcast interviews of Waugh. Many are being reprinted or transcribed for the first time. Some cover several pages, others only a paragraph. All are clearly identified as to the source. Since several come from publications which were short-lived, long out of print or archived, if at all, in obscure locations, this is a very valuable tool. They are printed in an easily readable and accessible fashion and arranged in chronological order. While there is no narrative introduction to these and contextual references would have been helpful in some cases as to how and why the interview was arranged, there were obviously space constraints on what was otherwise going to be one of the longer volumes. A quick read through the interviews shows that there were relatively few until 1948.<sup>4</sup> The number began to expand in the latter part of that year when Waugh started two tours of the USA. The first was for research for an article for *Life* magazine on the Roman Catholic Church in America. Waugh consciously decided to keep publicity to a minimum on that tour, and the only “interview” recorded was at Boston College where he spoke to a group of students in the presence of a reporter from the student paper.

On the way home, he was cornered by a reporter, likely from the *Evening Standard*. This was on the “last day of a recent, happy visit to the USA” and was probably at the docks in Southampton where he arrived on 28 December (the resulting unsigned article appeared in the

---

<sup>3</sup> According to the 1986 *Bibliography of Evelyn Waugh* by R. M. Davis, *et al.*, that was the next edition issued after the first UK and USA hardcover editions. The bibliography dates it to 1974, but my copy says that it was “published in this edition in 1973.”

<sup>4</sup> Waugh wrote an article in 1948 entitled “The Gentle Art of Being Interviewed.” This first appeared in the USA edition of *Vogue*, July 1948 (*EAR*, 356). In the article, Waugh describes a shambolic interview conducted in his Stockholm hotel room by a female reporter who arrived unannounced. The result appeared a few days later in the *Dagens Nyheter* for 20 August 1947 in an article entitled “*Kyrkogård hobby för Huxleys apa: här på besök*,” translated as “Huxley’s Ape Makes Hobby of Graveyards: Here for a Brief Visit” (*Diaries*, 686). In his *Vogue* article, Waugh expressed his disdain for those careless people who allowed themselves to be trapped and interviewed by unscrupulous reporters, and then, ironically and with a good deal of self-deprecation and humor, explains how it happened to him. And, as noted below, happened again about a year later.

*Standard* on 30 December). In it, Waugh unloaded several annoyances he had experienced in the USA, such as overheated rooms, windows that wouldn't open, iced water, loud radios, bubble gum and loquacious natives. That article is reproduced in this volume (505) and, after making it onto the wire services, cascaded across America, appearing in papers in advance of his lecture tour in early 1949. Although he sought to explain away his criticisms in an article entitled "Kicking against the Goad," that appeared in the 11 March 1949 issue of *Commonweal* just as he was about to return to England (*EAR*, 371), at the numerous interviews intended to promote the lectures in nearly every city where he gave one between New York, New Orleans and Minneapolis-St Paul, he was forced to be on the defensive against reporters who asked him to explain his unkind words about their readers. But as he probably discovered, there is no such thing as bad publicity if you're selling books or tickets to public events, and the negative articles did not have any noticeable effect on the audiences who crowded his lecture room. Indeed, they may have contributed to the large size of the crowds.

Several of these interviews also appear in the *CWEW* collection. By the time this experience was behind him, he had developed a keener sense of how to handle interviews. This experience shows through in the BBC radio interviews of 1953 where he gave better than he got from a team of hostile radio commentators. He became constantly more professional, developing a kind of public personality, right up through the BBC's *Face to Face* interview of 1960 followed by that with the *Paris Review* a few years later. His final TV interview in 1964 on the BBC *Monitor* series shows a bit of a falling off, but this may be because, as explained by the interviewer, novelist Elizabeth Jane Howard, he insisted on seeing the questions in advance and even writing some himself. The answers were therefore longer and less spontaneous than in his previous BBC appearances.

At the end of the interview appendix, the editors mention two interviews during the USA lecture tour for which they were unable to negotiate terms for inclusion comparable to those agreed by other newspapers and broadcast media (584). These are from the *Baltimore Sunpapers*. It is unfortunate because, although brief, those reports, plus another contemporaneous interview in the same papers with Laura Waugh, contain some interesting material not available in other articles relating to the tour.

There are also additional uncollected interviews reported from the lecture tour appearing

in other papers.<sup>5</sup> Some idea of these may be had by referring to an article in *Evelyn Waugh Studies* entitled “‘Something Entirely Unique:’ Evelyn Waugh’s 1948-49 Tours of North America, Part 2, The Lecture Tour, and Part 3, Baltimore,” by John McGinty and Jeffrey Manley, *EWS* 44.1 and 44.2 (Spring and Autumn 2013).

High marks should be given for the production of this volume. The introductory narrative, the text of *ALL* and the appendices are well produced and clearly printed. I found no typos or misprints. The MDATV, as noted, seems overwhelmed with information in this case, but it is accurately presented and consistent with the uniform system adopted for all volumes. Moreover, the inclusion of the interviews is a much welcome addition to the book. If the other volumes come up to the standards achieved in this one, the project will be a major scholarly success.

---

<sup>5</sup> “Impressions of a Necrophile,” by Mary van Rennselaer Thayer, *Washington Post*, 13 Feb. 1949; and “Evelyn Waugh Lauds Minnesota Writer: One of America’s Best,” by Ed Crane, *Minneapolis Morning Tribune*, 10 March 1949.



## NEWS

### Hotel Taitu Restored

Evelyn Waugh fan and veteran freelance journalist Ian Gill recently visited Ethiopia, where, he writes,

I had the great pleasure of lunching in the restored Taitu Hotel which, was, of course, the Liberty Hotel of Waugh's masterpiece, *Scoop*.

The hotel was badly damaged in 2015 but I am wondering if you are aware that it has been restored as a heritage project as closely as possible to the original, according to the assistant manager with whom I spoke.

[...]

I am just wondering if any members of the Evelyn Waugh Society have visited the Taitu recently and whether they in general approve of the restored hotel's historical authenticity?

Best regards,

Ian Gill

See the photos below. Anyone with input should write to Mr. Gill directly at [iajgill@gmail.com](mailto:iajgill@gmail.com)







## **John H. Wilson Jr. Evelyn Waugh Undergraduate Essay Contest**

Submissions are welcome for the John H. Wilson Jr. Evelyn Waugh Undergraduate Essay Contest. Essays (normally limited to 20 pages or 5000 words) are invited on any aspect of Waugh's life or work and will be judged by the *Evelyn Waugh Studies* editorial board. The winning essay will be published in the journal, and the author will receive a prize of \$500. Deadline: 31 December 2018. Email submissions to [jpitcher@bennington.edu](mailto:jpitcher@bennington.edu) or [Patrick.Query@usma.edu](mailto:Patrick.Query@usma.edu).



## James Hugh Macdonald's *Happy Warriors*

While there are already reviews elsewhere, and the event was posted by The Society during its run at Upstairs at the Gatehouse, Highgate, from the 28<sup>th</sup> of March until the 22<sup>nd</sup> of April, theatregoer Penny Bowden was also kind enough to send the editors her thoughts after seeing it for the first time, which we include below.

Happy Warriors is a must to see, not the least because this is the first offering from the man who now holds the record as Britain's oldest playwright, 91-year-old former soldier, diplomat, politics lecturer and journalist James Hugh Macdonald who started writing it after the death of his wife ten years ago.

It is based on the true story of the time during World War Two when Randolph Churchill and Evelyn Waugh, who knew but didn't really like each other, were billeted together in a farmhouse in the former Yugoslavia with just an 80-year old peasant cook to look after them. Randolph had been sent there at the behest of his father to beef up the Yugoslav army battling it out with the Germans.

The only other facts the playwright knew for sure were that Randolph got on Waugh's nerves, that in an attempt to get him off his back he got him reluctantly to agree to read the Bible in a week -- only for Randolph to quote passages of it back at him *ad infinitum*, thus driving him more bonkers -- and that the waspish Waugh used his rapier wit to give back as good as he got.

That nucleus of truth is skillfully expanded and embellished upon by the playwright, who retains the cook in his play, but makes her into a young, angry revolutionary resentful that she has to look after two capitalist toffs when she'd rather be off killing Germans. The trio keep you chortling as they comically wind each other up while dodging air raids and the slings and arrows of each other's verbal assaults.

Marvellous performances from Simon Pontin as the caddish, grandiose, whisky-guzzling,

cigar-smoking (when he can get his hands on one) Randolph and Neil Chinneck as the long-suffering Waugh. The icing on this beautifully baked cake, though, is Martha Dancy as the cook whose comical appearance and mispronunciation of practically everything, especially "Randolopey"'s name, as she bangs around serving yucky-looking food, is just a joy to watch.

An interview with the playwright: <https://www.thereviewshub.com/interview-91-year-old-james-hugh-macdonald-on-his-debut-play-happy-warriors/>

## **Evelyn Waugh and the Battle of Crete**

Dominic Green (see, *inter alia*, this recent article: <https://www.weeklystandard.com/dominic-green/from-memory-to-myth-the-adventures-of-patrick-leigh-fermor>), contacted the editors to gauge interest in a possible group trip to Crete, in 2019.

He has been kind enough to sketch out two options: An eight-day tour with a close focus on Waugh, *The Sword of Honour*, and the Battle of Crete; and an eleven-day tour which also includes the other literature of wartime Crete (Xan Fielding, Patrick Leigh Fermor, William Moss, Dilys Powell), and the major Minoan site (Knossos) and museum (the Heraklion Archaeological Museum). On experience, Dominic would recommend the eleven-day option, for two reasons:

The Leigh Fermor Society tours attracted PLFS members from the US, Australia & New Zealand. Some of them were making their first and probably only visit to Crete. There's much more to the island than the events of 1941, and visitors may want to see as much as possible. Knossos, despite Sir Arthur Evans' generosity with the concrete, is a major site, and the Heraklion Archaeological Museum's Minoan collections are unparalleled.

Arguably, no other theatre of war produced so much literature per capita. Adding Dilys Powell, Xan Fielding, Billy Moss and Leigh Fermor allows us to cover the bigger story in which Waugh landed in May 1941. Specifically, this will allow us to contextualize some of his judgments on the Battle of Crete itself. Generally, he has found that even obsessives and experts appreciate a bit of variety now and then.

Dominic's job as Tour Leader would be to make sure that everything happened on schedule. He would also do general guiding, but the specialists would do the military and historical sides, and any government-owned sites: Chris White, the leading battlefield historian of Crete, and Costas Malamakis, who has identified hundreds of 1941-related sites and directed the Historical Museum of Heraklion. Maria Ververakis is a wonderful guide to the Minoans.

Ten is enough to benefit from minimal economies of scale, and twenty is the maximum before things become unwieldy and impersonal. If there's a very strong response, it would be preferable to run successive groups of fifteen, rather than one group of thirty. The Society will contribute to defray the cost. If you are interested in reserving a place, please let Antony Vickery ([admin@evelynwaughssociety.org](mailto:admin@evelynwaughssociety.org)) know so an estimate can be assembled.

## **Evelyn Waugh Society**

The Waugh Society has 188 members. To join, please go to <http://evelynwaughsociety.org/>.

The Evelyn Waugh Discussion List has 80 members. To join, please visit

[http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Evelyn\\_Waugh](http://groups.yahoo.com/group/Evelyn_Waugh).

The Evelyn Waugh Society is also on Twitter: <https://twitter.com/evelynwaughsoc>.

The Waugh Society is providing an RSS feed: <http://evelynwaughsociety.org/feed>.

And the Waugh Society's web site has opportunities for threaded discussions:

<http://evelynwaughsociety.org/forums/>.

## **Submission Guidelines**

Essays as well as notes and news about Waugh and his work may be submitted to *Evelyn Waugh Studies* by mail or email to ([jpitcher@bennington.edu](mailto:jpitcher@bennington.edu), [patrick.query@usma.edu](mailto:patrick.query@usma.edu)). Submissions should follow MLA style and be no more than 5000 words in length. Since most readers will be familiar with Waugh's work, authors should minimize unnecessary quotations and explanatory references. All submitted essays are first screened by the Editors and if deemed acceptable for publication are then sent to Associate Editors for further review. Authors should expect to be notified of the editors' final decision within twelve weeks of submission.

---

**End of *Evelyn Waugh Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 1**

**[Home Page](#)** (Evelyn Waugh Society)

**[Back Issues](#)** (University of Leicester)