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Editor’s Note

It is with much pleasure that the editorial board and I welcome Yuexi Liu to EWS as fellow co-editor. In addition to being a scholar of some repute, as evidenced not least in “Finding a Voice Through Cinema: Virginia Woolf’s Jacob’s Room and Evelyn Waugh’s ‘The Balance,’” “In the Advance Guard:’ Evelyn Waugh as a Reviewer,” and “The Group Novel: Evelyn Waugh’s Vile Bodies, Anthony Powell’s Afternoon Men, and Henry Green’s Party Going,” she is also the former Senior Editor of Exchanges: The Warwick Research Journal and a former Editor of Postgraduate English at the University of Durham. Her book-length manuscript, Exterior Modernism: Evelyn Waugh and Cinema, is currently under consideration. I am indebted to her for instantly mucking in, already providing frequent, detailed advice on this issue and the future.

Jonathan Pitcher
The Mystery of Grace: *Brideshead Revisited* as a Chestertonian Detective Story

Jacqueline Condon

G. K. Chesterton, famous both as a Catholic apologist and a mystery writer, proposed that, “The Ideal Detective Story…need not be superficial. In theory, though not commonly in practice, it is possible to write a subtle and creative novel, of deep philosophy and delicate psychology, and yet cast it in the form of a sensational shocker” (“The Ideal Detective Story” 178). While Evelyn Waugh’s masterpiece *Brideshead Revisited* is hardly a penny dreadful of cloak and dagger intrigue, this paper will contend that it nevertheless answers Chesterton’s challenge by drawing on the tropes of detective fiction and applying them to serious moral and theological purposes. In particular, Waugh is responding to Chesterton’s metaphor of the Catholic Church as a merciful “divine detective” hunting down sinners in order to save them. The novel’s exemplars of staunch Catholicism, Lady Marchmain and Bridey, attempt to take on the role of investigators in order to uphold the family’s Catholic identity. However, their efforts backfire and only drive their prodigal family members further away. They are not true detectives but only inept sidekicks. The true “divine detective,” grace itself, is nevertheless able to triumph in a moment of dramatic revelation worthy of a mystery novel, bringing about the conversions not only of Sebastian and Julia, but Lord Marchmain and Charles as well.

To say, following Waugh himself, that *Brideshead Revisited* is chiefly concerned with “the operation of divine grace” (7) is nothing new. Such an assessment has become a truism bordering on cliche among critics of the novel. Likewise, “the novel’s familiar Chestertonian subtext” (Long 52), namely, Cordelia’s gloss of “The Queer Feet,” has long been considered an important passage. However, there has been little engagement with Chesterton’s thought beyond his Catholicism, and whatever summary of the Father Brown stories is necessary to contextualize the “twitch upon the thread” passage. As of this writing, I do not know of any other scholar who has read the novel as a whole within the context of Chesterton’s broader thought. This paper will argue that such a reading is both justified and fruitful.

---

Allusions to detective stories, particularly Chesterton’s, form a motif throughout the novel. Bridey enjoys mysteries (275), and Lady Marchmain reads *The Wisdom of Father Brown* aloud to the family (128). In what Long calls “the novel’s familiar Chestertonian subtext” (52) Cordelia references a passage from the Father Brown story “The Queer Feet” (212) in order to describe divine providence to Charles. A line from that passage, “A Twitch Upon the Thread,” becomes the title of the third and final book of the novel. These allusions not only reveal the Flyte family’s taste in literature but point towards a moral and theological vision, articulated by Chesterton, that is played out in the action of the novel.

Chesterton’s singular understanding of detective stories deserves careful attention. While he acknowledges that “the common detective story…seems…to be…peopled by congenital idiots, who cannot find the end of their own noses or the character of their own wives” (“A Defense of Farce”), his mockery is always emphatically affectionate. He “was himself addicted to reading detective stories” (Clipper 121), and energetically defended the genre as a “perfectly legitimate form of art” with “certain definite and real advantages as an agent of the public weal” (“A Defense of Detective Stories”). In his view, detective stories naturally lend themselves to serious moral purposes, as they are by necessity concerned with the pursuit of truth and the reestablishment of justice (Clipper 121).

Chesterton makes the moral dimension of mystery fiction explicit with his most famous creation, the priest-detective Father Brown, whose deceptively innocent and foolish demeanor conceals a profound knowledge of the human propensity for evil. As a priest, he is as concerned with saving the souls of criminals as capturing them, and often relies on theological insights to identify the culprit (Clipper 124). For example, in “The Queer Feet,” the story that Cordelia references, Father Brown confronts the notorious thief Flambeau, not with force, but with his own spiritual peril. When Flambeau threatens to throttle him, Father Brown responds, “I want to threaten you with the worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched” (71). After hearing Flambeau’s confession, Father Brown allows him to escape and returns the stolen goods himself. In the words of Gordon Leah, “It is as if Father Brown is fulfilling a divine mission, yet able to bide his time, knowing that the master criminal who features in many of these stories can be hauled back to his just punishment” (965).
Father Brown’s characterization is not simply a clever literary mechanism for fusing Chesterton’s religious sensibilities with his fiction. Rather, he embodies Chesterton’s concept of the church as “the divine detective.” In an essay of the same name, Chesterton describes the Catholic Church as “an enormous private detective” (155), which has the prerogative of pardoning, rather than punishing, sinners. He argues that “The Church is the only institution…to create a machinery of pardon…to pursue and discover crimes, not in order to avenge, but in order to forgive them” (156). The Church may adopt inquisitive and even belligerent means to “[tear]…evil out of men” (156), but the goal is always to save rather than punish. While detective stories are primarily concerned with justice, they provide Chesterton with an image for the Church, which he maintains is fundamentally an agent of mercy.

In *Brideshead Revisited*, Lady Marchamain and Bridey seem to take Chesterton’s metaphor literally, attempting to cast themselves in the roles of detectives in order to safeguard the family’s spiritual well-being. Charming Lady Marchmain’s social graces allow her to maintain numerous acquaintances, which she uses to supervise her wayward son Sebastian. The Catholic chaplain Monsignor Bell and the ambitious young don Mr. Samgrass act as her eyes at Oxford (101). She even attempts to incorporate Charles into her network of surveillance. As Charles later recalls, “As my intimacy with his family grew, I became part of the world which he sought to escape; I became one of the bonds which held him. That was the part for which his mother, in all our little talks, was seeking to fit me… It was only dimly and at rare moments that I suspected what was afoot” (123). To become Lady Marchmain’s friend is to become one of her spies, as Sebastian knows intuitively and Charles discovers. Lady Marchmain’s program of espionage has already poisoned her relationship with her son. One night when Charles attempts to intervene while Sebastian is drunk, Sebastian tearfully protests, “Why do you take their side against me? [...] Why do you spy on me?” (129). Sebastian has learned to see his family members as inevitably threats and adversaries, and Charles soon understands why. Lady Marchmain’s surveillance has helped to bring the family to this state of division and enmity, and there is a special, if unwitting, cruelty in her attempting to use her suffering son’s best and only friend to spy on him, and in forcing Charles to choose sides.

Lady Marchmain’s well-intentioned schemes only serve to drive her son deeper into alcoholism. Sebastian drinks in order to satisfy “a deep, interior need of his, the escape from
reality” (103). Under his mother’s encroaching surveillance, his need for escape grows more intense as “he found himself increasingly hemmed in, where he once felt himself free” (103). He relies more and more on alcohol to provide the sense of freedom he craves, which in turn only increases his mother’s desire to monitor and control him. Charles uses curiously impersonal language to describe Lady Marchmain’s increasingly desperate efforts: “The machinery began to move [...] the heavy wheels stirred and the small wheels spun” (137). It may seem odd to apply such terms to a genteel and tactful woman, but in fact it perfectly expresses the Flytes’ tragic dilemma. Lady Marchmain’s machinations have trapped both mother and son in a cycle of good intentions gone wrong. The only way out for Sebastian now is to disappear entirely, losing himself in full-blown alcoholism. In De Vitis’ assessment, Lady Marchmain’s zealotry “confirms [Sebastian’s] drunkenness and loses him to the world” (48).

Like Lady Marchmain, Bridey attempts to uphold the family’s religious and moral commitments by adopting tactics reminiscent of a detective, but inadvertently repels others from the faith. Lacking his mother’s social grace, he cannot be a tactful spymaster. Instead, he takes on the role of the blunt investigator. Mr. Samgrass describes Sebastian as being “under Brideshead’s inquisitorial eye” (155). According to Charles, Bridey has a “heavy, ruthless way” (309) of presenting problems, and his speech is distinctively “odd” and “impersonal” (128). He has no compunction about asking questions on sensitive topics, such as “My mother believes Sebastian is a confirmed drunkard. Is he?” (140), and later, “Do you consider [...] that there is anything vicious in my brother’s connection with this German? [...] You say he is a criminal?” (208-209). There is even something endearing about Bridey’s straightforward bluntness. As Charles observes, “In some ways Brideshead was an easy man to deal with. He had a kind of mad certainty about everything which made his decisions swift and easy” (209). However, Charles is also repelled by Bridey’s insistence on reducing complex situations to simplistic moral statements. When, after hearing about Sebastian’s sufferings, Bridey contentedly remarks that, “There’s nothing wrong with being a physical wreck” (158), Charles replies, “If I ever felt for a moment like becoming a Catholic, I should only have to talk to you for five minutes to be cured” (158-59). Bridey is simply oblivious to the emotions of others and to the pain his authoritative bluntness creates.
Nowhere are Bridey’s faults more evident -- or more disastrous -- than in his treatment of Julia. He takes it upon himself to “make some inquiries” (188) and discovers that Rex has had a previous marriage that ended in divorce. Rather than break the news gently, Charles reports that “with characteristic ruthlessness he tossed his load of explosive without warning” (188), with the drama of a detective exposing the murderer in the final chapter of a mystery novel. As the family are unpacking the wedding presents, Bridey imperiously announces, “You’d better pack all that stuff up again […] The wedding’s off” (188). Bridey simply assumes that breaking off Julia’s engagement is his decision to make, and that it will only cause practical inconvenience. When Lady Marchmain attempts to soothe the family dispute, Bridey retorts, “There’s nothing to discuss […] The presents will have to go back. I don’t know what is usual about the bridesmaids’ dresses” (190). He is more concerned about the “least offensive way” (190) to return the gifts than the pain breaking off the engagement will cause his sister.

Bridey’s callousness confirms what Julia already suspected, that “wherever she turned […] her religion stood as a barrier between her and her natural goal” (175). At this moment of crisis, when she must openly reject her faith in order to keep her relationship with Rex, she declares, “I don’t believe these priests know everything. I don’t believe in hell for things like [divorce and remarriage]. I don’t know that I believe in it for anything” (190). In his ruthless attempt to uphold Catholic morality, Bridey precipitates Julia’s formal break with the Church.

Lady Marchmain and Bridey set out to fulfill Chesterton’s vision of the Church acting as a detective “to pursue and discover crimes […] in order to forgive them” (“Divine Detective” 156), but clearly do not succeed. Not only do they fail to bring about Sebastian and Julia’s repentance and reconciliation, but their tactics of espionage and inquisition propel the prodigal Flytes farther away from the Church. However, Chesterton’s understanding of detective stories has room for this sort of foundering. The true detective is often preceded by a series of inept colleagues who act as a foil to the protagonist’s brilliance. Chesterton himself parodies the classic formula, writing, “A policeman, stupid but sweet-tempered […] appeals to the bull-dog professional detective, who appeals to the hawk-like amateur detective. The latter […] relentlessly, link by link, brings the crime home to the Archbishop of Canterbury” (Collected Works 82; vol. 29). Chesterton was not above employing bungling detectives in his own fiction. In numerous Father Brown stories, including “The Blue Cross” and “The Absence of Mr. Glass,”
Father Brown encounters professional detectives and self-appointed experts who initially dismiss his opinion before being proven wrong themselves. Lady Marchmain and Bridey seem to fall into this category of well-intentioned but misguided sidekicks. Who, then, is the real detective?

The answer is made clear in Cordelia’s gloss of “The Queer Feet.” She muses on the apostasies that have torn the Flytes apart:

‘The family haven’t been very constant, have they? There’s [Lord Marchmain] gone and Sebastian gone and Julia gone. But God won’t let them go for long, you know […]

‘Father Brown’ said something like ‘I caught him’ (the thief) ‘with an unseen hook and an invisible line which is long enough to let him wander to the end of the world and still to bring him back with a twitch upon the thread.’ (212)

Crucially, Cordelia recognizes that it is God who “won’t let them go” (212). She casts God, not Lady Marchmain or Bridey or any earthly authority, in the role of the divine detective. It is He who will ultimately ensure their salvation. Leah writes that according to Cordelia, “God, through his Church, is able to hold the wanderers in his power, so that, though they wander for a while, He will inevitably draw them back into the orbit of His Church” (965). Because of her trust in divine providence, Cordelia does not feel the need to orchestrate Sebastian and Julia’s spiritual rescue. She can accept their apostasy with spiritual tranquility, content to “let [them] wander to the end of the world” (212) knowing that God can “bring [them] back with a twitch upon the thread” (212). Her faithful patience offers an alternative to Lady Marchmain and Bridey’s anxious sleuthing.

Cordelia’s interpretation of grace as the true detective is borne out by the conclusion of the novel. Sebastian, although his alcoholism is incurable, becomes a penitent in a monastery where he is recognized for his “holiness” (291), even “maimed as he is” (294). His very suffering and degradation bring him “near… to God” (293). Likewise, Lord Marchmain repents on his deathbed, which in turn inspires the conversions of Julia and Charles in the final pages. Grace, like the protagonist of a detective story, triumphs despite the blunders of its self-appointed deputies.

Grace is both the detective who solves the mystery and the mystery itself. In the words of Ann Slater, the novel is “primarily preoccupied by the spiritual growth of characters subject to a
divine providence of which they are profoundly unaware” (99). The suddenness of the final conversions has baffled and frustrated secular critics, and remains a challenge for any reader (Slater 126). The difficulty of the task Waugh has set himself, “to trace the operation of divine grace” (7) through the eyes of an unbelieving narrator, may simply be too great. However, the Chestertonian detective story again offers an interpretive clue. Chesterton writes, “The detective story differs from every other story in this: that the reader is only happy if he feels a fool” (“The Ideal Detective Story” 178). The author of a mystery must leave the reader in the dark until the climactic moment of revelation. Once more making the case for moral seriousness in detective stories, Chesterton goes on to say, “The essence of a mystery tale is that we are suddenly confronted with a truth which we have never suspected and yet can see to be true. There is no reason, in logic, why this truth should not be a profound and convincing one as much as a shallow and conventional one” (“The Ideal Detective Story” 178). Julia, Charles, and by extension the reader, experience just this sort of confrontation at Lord Marchmain’s deathbed. The divine providence that has been shaping their lives throughout the novel makes itself known, and the revelation is intended to be as startling and unexpected as the exposure of the killer in the final chapter of a murder mystery.

*Brideshead Revisited* is both “steeped in theology” (Slater 109) and steeped in references to detective stories. Of course, for a reader of Chesterton, there is nothing surprising about this combination. Chesterton provides Waugh with a model for dramatizing the “operation of divine grace” (Waugh 7) through the tropes of detective fiction. Like a classic mystery novel, *Brideshead Revisited* features bumbling detectives, the pursuit of renegades, and a climactic moment of revelation. However, like Chesterton’s detective fiction, the novel is ultimately a story of divine mercy rather than human justice. Reading *Brideshead Revisited* as a Chestertonian mystery allows one to make sense of and reconcile the failures of Lady Marchmain and Bridey, the triumph of grace, and the dramatic series of conversions at the end of the novel. *Brideshead Revisited* is perhaps the work that comes closest to the vision presented in Chesterton’s “Ideal Detective Story:” “a sensational shocker […] a study in the living subtleties and complexities of human character” (178) that illuminates with “the shock of truth” (180).
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Reviewed by Nicholas V. Barney

It is said of Noam Chomsky that he grinds his teeth, not while sleeping like the rest of us, but at the breakfast table with the New York Times open on his lap. The same might be said of any serious Evelyn Waugh fan who makes a chore of sitting through the latest academic attempts to place his fiction and travel writing in the crosshairs of postmodern theory and public opinion, a tribunal that Waugh no doubt would have both despised and had a field day satirizing.

While it can be nostalgic to hear that a broken record still spins, Kai Mikkonen’s Narrative Paths: African Travel in Modern Fiction and Nonfiction and the chapter therein on Waugh, “The Incongruous Worlds of Waugh’s Ethiopia,” for the most part avoids the reflexive attempts to re-modernize / post-modernize Waugh’s Africa-inspired travel writing -- Remote People (1931), Waugh in Abyssinia (1936) -- and his novels set there, Scoop (1932) and Black Mischief (1938). It saves us, at least in this sense, and unlike Scoop’s Josephine Stitch, from the banal (“It is a new word whose correct use I have only lately learnt… I find it applies to nearly everything; Virgil and Miss Britling and my gymnasium” [8]).

But the banal is never far off (is it ever?). Mikkonen sets his “Incongruous Worlds” chapter on Waugh up (one should note it’s the longest in the book, shuffling Waugh in, and not for the first time, with the likes of Graham Greene and Joseph Conrad), with promise, claiming to dispense with the thoroughly staid, though it turns out not wrong, literary critiques that “have shown how Waugh’s fiction uses and transforms the facts of his travel experience” (148). Instead, Mikkonen’s thesis claims that he will “pose the question of the relation of Waugh’s travel writing and fiction from the opposite direction: in what sense was fiction also a source of information, and even a kind of conceptual model, for Waugh’s travel books and reportages?” (148).
Evelyn Waugh Studies 13

It’s an interesting angle from which to approach Waugh, and indeed exciting given the prospect on the line of proving that the novels in play, *Black Mischief* and *Scoop*, perform a backward time-referring influence on the travel writings that predated them, *Remote People* and *Waugh in Abyssinia*. The excitement doesn’t last long though, as we find out quite early on that the answer to Mikkonen’s question is dispiritingly in the negative, leaving us with the masochistic pleasure of having our suspicions on the linear path of time’s arrow confirmed.

After giving *Waugh in Abyssinia* a thorough and succinct assessment as possessing Wavian hallmarks but being a work of mostly singular political prerogative unlike any of Waugh’s novels or travel writings, Mikkonen leaves himself only with *Remote People* on which to hedge his bets.¹ Here, he does seem to become trapped in his own backwards methodology, harboring something of the postmodern suspicion towards the meta-reality of novels themselves, twice feeling the need to remind us that *Black Mischief* and *Scoop* “are indeed meant to be read as novels,” which we only seem to know from “various extratextual sources, paratexts and the marketing,” not to mention the subheading of *Scoop*, “A Novel,” on which he quite confidently rests his case (171). Such is the realism of Waugh’s irony, perhaps.

Despite this, Mikkonen’s perspective, or what he attempts to coin a “window of focalization” (I’ll leave it to you to decide whether this commits the sin of making a distinction without a difference), isn’t quite as obtuse as his efforts to prove the fictional intentions of the novels give cause to believe. He allows Waugh to set his own context for critique, taking the author, who is quite open about his ignorance of the places to which he is traveling, as well as his fascination with “a system of life in a tangle of modernism and barbarity” (148) at his own word. Mikkonen acknowledges that the fiction and travel-writing contend with similar themes and share some techniques, “an ironic narrative voice, the pseudo-objective perspective of description, and the effect of multiple realities, that is, the effect of constructing possible worlds of different referential status superimposed on each other” (173), with the latter being the larger thrust of *Narrative Paths* as a whole.

¹ *Waugh in Abyssinia* evolved out of dispatches for the *The Times, The Graphic*, and the *Daily Express*, advocating for the historically Catholic state of Italy’s invasion of modern-day Ethiopia.
Mikkonen also points out that the stereotypes in Waugh’s African novels usually fall on the Anglo-outsiders rather than the “barbarous” (178) natives. In *Black Mischief*, Basil Seal’s unbeknownst cannibalism of his quasi-love interest Prudence at the end of his modernization program in the fictional Azania provides a good example. In this sense, “Incongruous Worlds” has definite value as a secondary source comparing Waugh’s African fiction and nonfiction, but Mikkonen fails to prove that the similarities between Waugh’s novels and travel writing are anything but the penchant of a deft ironist whose view of reality is naturally overlaid with satire and whose satire is thus often interchangeable with his nonfictional renderings of reality.

In fact, Mikkonen’s essay is breadcrumbed with annulling examples of his travel writing *qua* novel thesis, a quick list including the sparse use of dialogue in Waugh’s African nonfiction compared to the important and sometimes experimental role it takes in his fiction, the distance of characters from “the point of perception in the novel” starkly contrasted to “the constant presence of the author’s mediating consciousness in his travel books,” the equally constant and dynamic shifts between characters and points of view in the fiction, wholly lacking in the travel books, and that the novels were written subsequent to his travel writings (170-71).

Mikkonen accepts Waugh’s prejudice towards modernism and barbarism as polygamous muse. However, if it is his thesis to prove Waugh’s fiction’s impact on the travel writing, he fails to pay heed to the description of “fictional” writer John Courteney Boot in the opening page of *Scoop*: “Between novels he kept his name sweet in intellectual circles with unprofitable but modish works on history and travel” (5).

For those who did and continue to revere Waugh’s fiction over reality, the name of *Black Mischief*’s fictional African island state Azania, meaning “land of slaves,” survives in more than “lapidary form on the gravestone of Steve Biko.” 2 Followers of the South African political party the Pan Africanist Congress of Azania can now read freely from *Azania Magazine*, though a perusal of their contact section, bereft of any background information with regards to the site,

---

2 South African anti-apartheid activist who according to Christopher Hitchens in his introduction to *Scoop* apparently wrote to Waugh in the 1960s asking to annex “Azania” for the future post-apartheid South Africa.
will direct you to an address in, of all places, Rhode Island. Seems only fitting for Waugh and his “superimposed worlds” (173).
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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 2019. Email submissions to jpitcher@bennington.edu and yuexi.liu@xjtlu.edu.

The Debagging in Decline and Fall

Peter Howell,

with thanks to Dr. Lucy Rutherford, the Hertford College Archivist.

When I was up at Oxford, I think in 1964, my mother learned that I would be passing through York. She asked if I would visit an old friend of hers (a former admirer, I believe) who was at The Retreat, the celebrated Quaker mental hospital. This was John Wortley Baggally, who had been at St. Paul’s School at about the same time as my uncle (my mother went to the Girls’ School). The two families were friends. He had written Greek Historical Folksongs (1936), and Ali Pasha and Great Britain (1938), as well as collaborating on two legal works. He also produced an edition of D.R. Morier’s Photo the Suliote, a Tale of Modern Greece (1857), under the title A Tale of Old Yanina (1951).

John Baggally turned out to be very friendly, and gave me a copy of the Morier book. What really surprised me was that he told me he was the victim of a debagging incident at Hertford College, Oxford, where he had matriculated in 1920. Evelyn Waugh went up to the same college in 1922, and so would have known about the event, which plays a crucial role in the plot of Decline and Fall (published in 1928). This was admitted by John Baggally, but I was much too embarrassed to ask for further details.

I should add that I am sure that John Baggally did not provide the model for Paul Pennyfeather in any other respect.
Brideshead and the Fifth Episode of The Magicians’ Seventh Season


Scoop: The Twenty-Sixth Entry in The Modern Library Reading Challenge

http://www.edrants.com/scoop-modern-library-75/

Mrs. Roberts’ Pub To Become Housing

https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-6856299/Pub-immortalised-Evelyn-Waugh-turned-housing.html

Terry Teachout’s Personal Library


A Scribbler in Soho: A Celebration of Auberon Waugh

https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/feb/24/a-scribbler-in-soho-auberon-waugh-stubborn-archivist-sue-black-all-that-remains-review

Evelyn Waugh Society

The Waugh Society has 196 members. To join, please go to http://evelynwaughsociety.org/.
The Evelyn Waugh Discussion List has 79 members. To join, please visit 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 ipitcher@bennington.edu and yuexi.liu@xjtu.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 editor’s final decision within twelve weeks of submission.