Durham University

Durham E-Theses

The fascist element in A.M. Ludovici's defence of conservatism

Paul Ernest Scholtke

How to cite:

Scholtke, Paul Ernest (1980) The fascist element in A.M. Ludovici's defence of conservatism. Masters thesis, Durham University.

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/7431/ is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the full Durham E-Theses policy for further details.

Academic Support Office, The Palatine Centre, Durham University, Stockton Road, Durham, DH1 3LE
e-mail: e-theses.admin@durham.ac.uk Tel: +44 0191 334 6107
https://etheses.durham.ac.uk

(I) "THE FASCIST ELEMENT IN A.M. LUDOVICI'S DEFENCE OF CONSERVATISM"

(II) by Paul Ernest Scholtke, B.A. (Hons.)

(III) Master of Arts

(IV) University of Durham

(V) Department of Politics

(VI) 1980

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

14 MAY 1984

THESIS ABSTRACT

Paul Ernest Scholtke "The Fascist Element in A.M. Ludovici's Defence of Conservatism."

By the study of the writings of Anthony Mario Ludovici, his affiliates, and other fascists, it is demonstrated that it is the traditions of ideologies that are incommensurable, not ideologies per se.

That it is not logically impossible for fascism to be introduced into a party system, which it intends to succeed, through rendering the ideology of an established political party commensurable with fascism.

That fascists have attempted to render established ideologies commensurable with fascism, and have succeeded. The study of the doctrine of Anthony Mario Ludovici demonstrates the latter in relation to conservatism.

That the fascists who rendered established ideologies commensurable with fascism, like Anthony Mario Ludovici and his affiliates, contingently failed to get their innovations accepted by the adherents of established ideologies. They failed because ideologies are traditions, and the respective traditions of established ideologies are incommensurable visions of how men should be associated and authority and power distributed. Incommensurable ideologies are both cause and consequence of the political divisions of party systems whose political parties deploy them as the language of their adherence. The practical success of an innovation in any ideology is always and everywhere decided by its contingent acceptance or rejection by the custodians of the traditions of an ideology, political parties and their constitutents. Political ideologies tend to inertia because they are traditions that are incommensurable. It is this inertia that the fascists who rendered established ideologies commensurable with fascism, could not overcome.

Ludovici and his affiliates never succeeded in getting themselves regarded as conservatives because the traditions of conservatism, and the consensus among conservatives about its meanings as its traditions, created sufficient inertia that the innovations which the former sought could not be effected in the contemporary party system. If they had succeeded conservatism would have become commensurable with fascism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter:		Page:
1.	TYPOLOGY OF GENERIC FASCISM	6
	Notes	38
2.	CONSERVATISM IN THE WRITINGS OF ANTHONY MARIO LUDOVICI	45
	Notes	82
3.	PERENNIAL CONCERNS WITH ART, CULTURE AND NIETZSCHE	91
	Van Gogh	155
	Auguste Rodin	159
	Emile Zola	167
	Augustus John and Frederick Catchpole	167
	Notes	171
4.	THE DEGENERATE WORLD	191
	Introduction, Action and Struggle - The Principles of History and Life	196
	The Causes of Degeneracy:	
	1. Racial: Miscegenation and Dysgenic Mating	218
	2. Religious: The Christian Ethic, Protestantism and Puritanism	230
	3. Ideological:	
	Liberalism and Socialism	242
	Utilitarian Rationalism	246
	Socratic Humanism	255
	Feminism	262
	Rousseauan Romanticism	281
	Socialist Welfarism	291
	4. Institutional: Democratic Government	298
	Conclusion	305
	Notes	307
5.	THE WORLD REGENERATED	336
	The Revolution	336
	Introduction, Monism, Purity and Discipline - The Principles of Selective Breeding	346
	The Programme for Regeneration:	
	1. The Role of Men and Women	366
	2. The Nietzschean Ethic	383
	3. Machiavellian Realism	391

Chapter:		Page:
	4. Elitism	398
	5. Populism	407
	6. Totalitarianism	422
	7. The Order of Nature Restored: Naturalism, Primitivism and Prophylaxis	436
	Conclusions and Conspectus	453
	Notes	461
6.	LUDOVICI'S POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS	492
	Notes	515
	CONCLUSIONS	523
	APPENDIX: Anthony Mario Ludovici's Unpublished Papers and Manuscripts	526
	BIBLIOGRAPHY:	528
	Anthony Mario Ludovici: Primary Sources	528
	Anthony Mario Ludovici: Secondary Sources	551
	Anthony Mario Ludovici's Political Affiliations	554
	The Main Contemporary Newspapers and Periodicals Consulted	556
	Fascism: Primary Sources	557
	Fascism: Secondary Sources	563
	Conservatism: Primary Sources	579
	Conservatism: Secondary Sources	582
	Miscellaneous	584

STATEMENT OF COPYRIGHT

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without his prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.

CHAPTER I, TYPOLOGY OF GENERIC FASCISM

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first deals with the origins of fascist ideology before World War I; the second with the motifs of fascism, a term which gained currency after World War I.

Fascism is an ideology which occurred in liberally constituted political systems whose traditional ideologies and parties were the objects of its attack. Extreme nationalists before World War I, who were later to be regarded as fascists, attempted radical innovations in the ideologies of the party systems with which they were disillusioned. Their extreme nationalism drew from all the extremes of the party systems which they intended to succeed. They attempted to enlist the support of socialists in an authoritarian socialism; they attempted to enlist the support of conservatives in a revolutionary conservatism. Always, they attempted to reconcile what had been regarded as oppugnant political ideals in movements to overthrow the party systems which they believed, led to the degeneration of their respective nations. To enlist the co-operation of political extremes they identified themselves as the proponents of all ideologies, but never with their parties. They called themselves socialists, conservatives, liberals, or the proponents of any established ideology as circumstances prompted, with the object of uniting the political extremes, but never aligned themselves with the traditions of established ideologies. Theirs was to be a novel socialism, liberalism, conservatism, nationalism, or anarchism. It was one that linked all political extremes in militant allegiance to the nation. In continental Europe, from the latter decades of the nineteenth century, they drew upon contemporaneous movements of thought which repudiated the legacy of the Enlightenment with its rationalism, materialism, positivism, and

humanism. The influence of the changing conception of race, Darwinism, and the 'discovery' of the unconscious by psychologists was clearly evident in their militant nationalist rhetoric that was directed against established ideologies, especially liberalism and socialism, and the mediocrity of an industrial society. These proto-fascist expressions of discontent with democracy and the legacy of the Enlightenment occurred, principally, in Germany, France and Italy.

In Germany, from the latter part of the nineteenth century, intellectuals claiming to be 'radical conservatives' argued that liberalism and secularism had brought about the decay of society. Their opposition to the ideas of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution was accompanied by appeals for the militant regeneration of the nation. They extolled 'blood and mysticism' in opposition to rationalism[1]. Their advocacy of struggle and heroic action was conjoined with the anti-rationalists ideas of occult and spiritualist circules which were in the vogue towards the end of the century, such as Theosophy[2].

Many of these Volkish theorists were associated with the contemporaneous youth movements and their attempts to abandon the poisonous influence of materialism and return to nature. They linked the human soul with nature and the nature of the soul of the Volk was regarded by them, as determined by the native landscape. Thus, the Germans were praised as deep, mysterious, and profound as they lived in dark, mist-shrouded forests. Conversely, the Jews were denigrated as a shallow, arid, 'dry' people devoid of profundity and totally lacking in creativity as they were a desert people.[3] The city, because of its association with materialism and progress, symbolised decay of the Volk.

Associated with the revolt against reason was the changing conception of race. Whilst the primacy of an intuitive vitalism was to

endure, it became attached to the idea of the nation as a race and not a class or classes. At the same time the preoccupation with the decline of civilisation changed to that of its regeneration. Gobineau's racism portrayed decadence, disorder and degeneration, as the irreversible outcome of democracy and materialism, which destroyed the artistocratic and traditional society he idealised[4]. But, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, in particular, after being influenced by Wagner at Bayreuth, deployed his racist theory as one of regeneration which could be secured through the victory of the Germans and Teutons over the degenerate spirit of the Jews. Human will creates the national unity which is the indispensable condition of the creation and perpetuation of the race against the Manichean forces of degeneration[5]. His belief that intuition and instinct, not reason, are the best guides to regeneration, is typical of the mysticism and anti-rationalism that was deployed to oppose positivism at the end of the century.

The ideology of Ernst Haeckel and his Monist League, in which the laws of biology / were transferred to the social realm and the primitive forces of nature deified, was representative of these streams of thought. Radical racial nationalism was coupled with an agressive denial of the political and social assumptions of liberalism. It was claimed that the community should absorb, not liberate, the total energies of the individual. The laws of biology were presented as the standard of judgement exclusively appropriate to politics. The organic racial state would be man's salvation from what was decried as the tendency of a society governed according to liberal ideals, man's alienation in a society that is devoid of integration. In the organic racial state, man would be restored to the mystically apprehended forces of nature and of race. Class harmony was to be

secured through the cessation of industrialisation and urbanisation. This policy would enable a strong and biologically superior Germany to subdue inferior races[6].

Contemporaneously with the social strains that accompanied the rapid urbanisation and industrialisation of Germany, a vicious anti-Semitism developed that stereotyped the Jews as the instigators of liberalism and degeneracy[7]. Anti-Semitism was adopted and developed by numerous movements at the turn of the century which, drawing from both the 'left' and the 'right', expressed national grievances about the influx of foreign labour into the industrialising regions of Germany and Austria. Indeed, the programme of one of these movements, the Deutsche Arbeiterpartei, of August 15, 1904, blamed democracy and capitalism for the ills of the people, used the word 'movement' to describe itself and was presented as both anti-Marxist and anti-capitalist, anti-foreign and anti-traditional[8]. Racialism, that had already assumed a fixed relation between the physical and moral natures of men, gained credence by the impact from Russia of the Protocols of the Elders of Zion and the doctrine of the proto-fascist Union of Russian People (Black Hundreds) which, like its Austrian and German counterparts, fused political extremes[9]. As early as 1903 Ludwig Woltmann in his Politische Anthropologie synthesised the extremely incongruous beliefs of Marx, Darwin and Kant, in a doctrine justifying mass racial struggle. Like J. Lanz von Liebenfel's anti-Semitic and Nordicist Ostara association, founded in 1905, which advocated racial struggle by the Volk, they afforded the pan-Germanic circles doctrinal cohesion[10].

Paradoxically, it was in France that the ideals of the French Revolution were to be subjected to the most trenchant attacks, especially after the debacle of the Franco-Prussian war in 1870. Conservativism

was conjoined with notions from the radical tradition. Ernest Renan and de la Tour du Pin advocated a total break with liberalism and idealised a corporate state devoid of social and antagonisms. The latter, a conservative, became rabidly anti-Semitic during the Dreyfuss Affair[11]. Edouard Drumont in his very popular book of 1886, La France Juive, repeated a familiar conspiracy theory that the Jews were responsible for France's degeneration and, although a conservative writer[12], typical of proto-fascists hailing from conservativism described socialism as" very noble"[13]. They contributed to the transformation of the theory of nationalism in France from its association with reason and liberalism to its conjunction with notions of an authoritarian state attacking social injustices in the name of group solidarity. Nationalism and conservativism were synthesised with socialism.

Maurice Barres, another conservative writer[14], concerned with the relative decline of France after the Franco-Prussion war, formulated a nationalism synthesised with notions of elitism. He advanced the cult of energy, action, and bitter anti-Semitism. The desideratum of heroic regeneration was contrasted with the inaction of democracy. He conceived democracy deficient in vitality and force. His preoccupation with decadence reflected a widespread intellectual mood of the fin de siecle and the revolt against positivism[15]. During the Dreyfuss Affair Barres substituted racial for cultural rootedness and advocated a political programme of national socialism in 1898[16]. He extolled emotion against reason as the bestguide to the basic truths of our existence and assimilated man's nature to that of the animal world in his assertions that struggle was a revitalising force against decadence. He was a theoretician of that new populist and socialist 'right' that crystallised during the last years of the nineteenth century. Opposed to parliamentary democracy, he appealed directly

to the people and called for direct action to mobilise against the triumphant bourgeoisie. His anti-Semitism cemented the 'prolotariat' into the national community. French workers were to be protected from finance and capitalism.

Boulangism and anti-Dreyfusard nationalism combined the 'right' with a whole assemblage of ideas from the 'left' and amalgamated political authoritarianism, romantic anti-liberalism, and anti-Semitism. Representative of this trend was another putative conservative[17], Charles Maurrass, who contributed his virulent intellect to one of these anti-Dreyfusard nationalist movements, the Action Francaise. He thought the nation should break with democracy and attain the spirit and ideal of classicism, the static and perfect order, hierarchical, authoritarian and untainted by any foreign element. His doctrine was a panegyric of war. Anarchy, Jewry, and Germany constituted France's enemies in his Manichean vision of the world. In his glorification of heroic action, irrationalism, and synthesis of conservative and populist ideas he "drove conservativism beyond the limits dividing it from incipient fascism"[18].

France was not unique in this questioning of the whole body of institutions characteristic of industrial civilisation and those values inherited from eighteenth century rationalism. Many thinkers in the eighteen-nineties were to denigrate the world of matter and reason, materialism and positivism, the mediocrity of what they regarded as bourgeois society and the 'muddle' of parliamentary democracy. The consequence was a popular and authoritarian nationalism that prefigured the emotional and sentimental fascist ethos. It had the same cult of youth, adventure and heroism, the same hatred of bourgeois values, and the same faith in the power of the unconscious.

The same romanticism and the mystique of action and hostility to capitalism which it exhibited, were to reappear in fascism. Typical of its leaders was Paul Deroulede whose League of Patriots, founded in 1886, blamed democracy for the degeneration of the nation and whose vocabulary of revolt emptied of its humanism, universalism, and appeal to liberty, served to mobilise the masses against the Republic[19].

As the preceding thinkers changed the notion of nationalism in France, Georges Sorel and the syndicalists were to transform socialism. Sorel saw rationalism, democracy and utilitarianism as symptoms of declining strength, senility and exhaustion. He had an ambiguous relationship to both the 'left' and the 'right' as he placed his faith in the elite of the 'proletariat' to realise national regeneration. Decadence was depicted by Sorel as the natural tendency of civilisation against whichmen must perpetually struggle through the invocation of myths evoking militant action and heroism. His emphasis on myth cohered with his anti-rational evaluation of man. The Jews were anathema to Sorel as he believed reconciliation between groups, through compromise and negotiation, impossible. Together with some of his ex-syndicalist followers he collaborated in a number of extremist authoritarian reviews, to which monarchists, nationalists, militants, anti-democrats, and anti-humanitarians of all kinds contributed. Paul Bourget and Maurice Barres, two of the most extreme traditionalists, authoritarians, and nationalists in France, were onthe editorial council of L Independence, of which Sorel was co-editor from 1911-1913[20].

Revolutionery syndicalism did not have a preconceived theory or an integrated doctrine, it was presented as a philosopy of action and movement. Its revolt was linked to the wider revolt against reason

that occurred during the three decades from approximately 1890 to the early Nineteen-Twenties. During this period the assumptions of social thought, which had hitherto been rationalism, were changed to the assumptions that man and society were not characterised by reason and intelligence. It was increasingly claimed, by social thinkers, that the attribution of rationality to man and society was erroneous.[21] Henri Bergson, Vilfredo Pareto and Sigmund Freud are a few of the thinkers associated with this transformation. Fascism was the most acute expression of this revolt against reason and shared obvious similarities with revolutionary syndicalism's denegration of democracy, bourgeois society, and the capitalist economy. Italian fascism was, to an extent, a fusion of syndicalism and nationalism.

Both Sorel and the pre-war nationalists linked the extreme of 'right' and 'left' in their common attacks on rationalism, democracy, and the bourgeoisie. In France, before World War I, nationalist and socialist symbols were being synthesised in a new and strange form. In 1903 a National Socialist Party was founded by a former socialist, Pierre Biétry, and in the following year the Federation Nationale des Jaunes de France was founded advocating capital and labour collaboration, a strong state, anti-Semitism and elitism. More important, the Cercle Proudhon was founded in December 1911 and was presided over by Charles Maurras with Georges Sorel as it's moving spirit. It embraced both nationalists and syndicalists belonging to the Action Francaise. The butt of its tirades were against democracy and capitalism. Symbolic of its ideological eclecticism,

Maurrass declared there was: "a form of socialism, when stripped of its democratic and cosmopolitan accretions, would fit in with nationalism just as a well made glove fits a beautiful hand."[22] At his instigation the Action Francaise made a considerable ploy for the support of the workers promoting their dissaffection from the liberal state.

A similar pattern of events can be traced in Italy. Anti parliamentiarianism of a sytematic character had already been expressed in the elite theories of Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo Pareto in the eighteen eighties. This was indicative of the contemporaneous influence of social Darwinism which conferred respectability on anti-democratic ideas. Significantly, Robert Michels, one of these elitists, was to become a fascist after World War I as his political sympathies changed from humanitarian socialism to those of authoritarianism and nationalism. He considered the Italian Fascists to be a new and more vigorous political leadership replacing an exhausted liberal elite, who were incapable of stemming the drift towards anarchy and social decline.[23] He contributed to the climate of dissillusionment with democracy from which fascism benefitted as he claimed that it concealed the fact of minority ruling. These ideas, and those of Gustave Le Bon on the fundamental irrationality and suggestability of human nature, "became common media of intellectual exchange among the most radical elements of Italian socialism."[24]

As in France and Germany, the Italian nationalist movement turned to the workers and peasants whilst remaining militantly anti-democratic. Enrico Corradini, though vehemently anti-Marxist, considered his nationalist doctrine to be socialist as he declared to the Frist Congress of Nationalists in December 1910 in Florence, when he spoke of "our national socialism".[25] He extolled war and heroism

as necessary and salutary facts of human life unrecognised by democrats and liberals. The class struggle should be transferred to the international arena as Italy was a 'proletarian nation'. A corporate state resolving class antagonism would, he believed, create the indispensable conditions for an aggressive nationalism.

Futurism also contributed to the dissillusionment with liberalism and positivism. From the beginning it was an aspect of the new aggressive Italian nationalism that agitated against socialism and clericalism, Masonry and all international organisations. Ethical codes were reduced to such heroic virtues as war and struggle presented as the motives of progress. Blind love of danger and the inordinate worship of action were extolled in Futurist art. Intuition in its unconsious vivacity is what sends the poet down the streams of motion. They considered war and struggle to be the only remedies for personal and national degenration. But, for Marinetti indicative of the changes being made in nationalism, national regeneration " cannot be explained without the action of socialism".[26]

Italian pragmatism challenged positivism which it claimed reduced life to facts. For Giovanni Papini, the leading pre-war pragmatist in Italy, faith modifies reality - we believe and we act; we act and we transform. The anti-rational element in pragmatism was developed by men sceptical of the power of reason, and optimistic with regard to the power of belief in creating the truths by which we live. As a philosophy of action pragmatism reached its extreme limit , under Giovanni Papini and Guisseppe Prezzolini, in the blind exaltation of action, which, devoid of any criterion of ends, liberals would regard as irrational. They worshipped action as an end in itself. This form of pragmatism appeared in Futurism.[27] Action was the key word. The sphere was a

minor considerations. They called themselves philosopher wolves and professors of energy after a decade of pale lost lilies and suicides. This pragmatist exaltation of action was imbibed and developed by syndacalists and nationalists disillusioned with the affects of Italy's unification and liberal constitution. The effect was to unite the extremeties of syndicalism, which demanded a purification of the world, and nationalism which called for war.

D'Annunzio embellished nationalism by marrying it to refinement and sensuality. He borrowed the figure of the 'superman' from Nietzsche and identified this with the masterful man of action, capable of controlling multitudes and shaping events by the strength of his will. D Annunzio perceived the world through myths and symbols as visual imago follows visual image in his works, until the reader can see the scene rising before his eyes. These images were combined with an exaltation of action. One of these symbols was the 'Flame of Life' symbolising personal and national regeneration. In d'Annunzio's poetry and essays the heroic pasions, closeness to naturo, power of will are contrasted with modern degeneracy. He contrasted them with the greyness of bourgeois existence and the inaction and compromise of parliamentary government. The Arditi who came to form the nucleeus of d Annunzio's legion at Fiume were called the 'black flame' indicating fire and steel forging regeneration. His words addressed to the multitude had only the object of heroic deeds and action which could redeem Italy from degeneration, words are feminine and deeds are masculine.[28]

Syndicalism was the agency of changes in socialism that complemented those in nationalism. It was of great influence in Italian socialist circles, and saw the struggle against liberal democracy as the first

and most important objective of socialism. Ardent rebellion was to be led by the elite of activists. Before World War I syndicalism and nationalism, Enrico Corradini observed, had a "common love of conquest", they were both "imperialist".[29] The writings of Agostino Lanzillo, who considered war and struggle to be a source of human redemption, reveal the same contiguity between syndacalism and nationalism.[30]

The political career of Mussolini, and many other fascists, was representative of this phase of intellectual history when the legacy of the Enlightenment was opposed and the political extremes fused. Mussolini's pre-war beliefs were a synthesis of policical extremes; the anarchism of Max Stirner[31], which fitted well with his eccentric 'socialist"belief that society is a field of struggle; nationalism; authoritarian and elitist categories of thought derived from his knowledge of Pareto and Nietzsche[32]. His avowal and development of the doctrine of fascism was but a nominal transition from his pre-war beliefs - one of name. Indeed, the ideology that was to be called fascism after World War I was, to an extent, the result of international changes that occurred during the preceding decades. The significance of World War I is that it was a catalyst. The important conclusion to remember about the preceding part of this chapter is that there were ideologists before World War I who had already evolved fascism by transforming the meansings of existing ideologies and linking them with all political extremes in an aggressive nationalism. True, they were unsuccessful, and this I maintain is because they still consider/ed themselves to be making transformations in existing ideologies and not acting independ ntly of them. They were attempting to make transformations in existing ideologies that neither could sustain, because they are traditions whose inertia

they could not overcome. Only World War I provided the dissillusionment with their traditions upon which fascism could sustain an identity independent of traditional ideologies, and succeed. It is the motifs of fascism, which gained currency after World War I, that I shall proceed to describe.

Typically, fascists described the world as degenerate and committed themselves to the militant regeneration of the nation. The liberal regime was seen as decayed, rotten, and would have to be totally eradicated. They considered that they had plumbed the depths of what they regarded as the sickness of liberal bourgeois democracy. Gilles, a novel written by the French fascist Pierre Drieu La Rochelle takes decay as its theme and abounds with images of death, annihilation, and putrefaction. The mood of those intellectuals who were to become fascists was one of dissillusion and despair. The heroic ex-servicemen in Celine's Journey to the End of the Night trying to flee decadence realises that decay and putrefaction is all-pervasive and disavows his youthful idealism.[33] Indeed, the works of intellectuals associated with fascism are filled with imagery of a decadent and diseased civilization. They portrayed the world as divided into the Manichean forces of degeneration and those of regeneration. Indeed, the 'demonological tradition' has been traced through such apocalyptic myths as the Protocols of the Elders of Zion into the structure of fascism.[34] The British Fascists, a group founded in 1923 by Miss Rotha Lintern-Orman, conceived the forces of degeneration as; "Communism, Socialism, Anarchism, free love, atheism, and the trade unions, which the members tended to lump together into a single mysterious entity."[35] In contrast the realism of fascism is evident in its vitalism. Fascists regarded their ideology as one of life and movement. They described themselves

as 'movements' rather than 'parties' as they challenged what they considered to be the inertia and degeneration of traditional political structures. Fascists saw themselves as liberating the world from what they regarded as the bourgeois spirit, and awakening a desire for regeneration that was simultaneously spiritual and physical, social, moral, and political. They proclaimed themselves as engaged in a revolution to save the nation and inaugurate a new era of national self-assertion. It was presented as a counter-civilisation, a "fascist century"[36] as Mussolini called it, or a "new civilisation"[37] as Oswald Mosley called it. Mussolini claimed that fascists would make a total break with the nineteenth century, the "century of the individual", and inaugerate the collective century, the century of the State.[38] In every possible way fascists opposed themselves to the ancien régime. The militant regeneration of man that fascists proposed was frequently depicted as rejuvenation of the body, since for fascists man's psyche is wholly dependant on the condition of his body. Fascists substituted for what they denounced as the pacific ideals of liberals, the militant ideal of the barbarian knights of the Middle Ages. As an alternative to the economic man of liberal and the Marxist materialism, they offered a brand of neo-idealism, that put the spiritual above the material.

Ex-servicemen played a leading role in the fascist movements. The combatant and heroic qualities that fascists extolled and their advocacy of perpetual struggle appealed to them as guardians of the nation's heritage and greatness. Their intention was to mould society as a fighting unit, inculcating in it the fighting soldier's heroic virtues of discipline, sacrifice, self-denial, and brotherhood. They considered themselves above preceding generations, parties, classes. The elite of the fascist revolution would be naturally

selected through battle and conquest as they considered themselves a militant order distinguished by sacrifice, devotion, and self-denial. Leon Degrelle, leader of the Belgian Rexists, considered himself one of "the handful of heroes and saints that will undertake the Reconquest."[39] They developed a cult of duty, sacrifice, and heroism. Mussolini said of fascism; "We are against the easy life". For the fascists, life meant "duty, elevation, conquest," it was "serious, austere, religious".[40] Life was a struggle which entailed strength, willingness to serve, obedience, authority, self-denial. Adventure and living dangerously through the cult of strength were the ideal ways to live in sympathy with health, blood and virility. War put man to the test and made potent his primal virtues and basic instincts. "War is my fatherland", said Gilles the hero of the novel by the same name by Pierre Drieu La Rochelle.[41] Fascists substituted the ideal of the primitive instincts and the primal emotions of the barbarian for the sophisticated rationalist humanism of the civilisation they were rebelling against. This was the corollary of the cult of war and physical danger, brutality, strength and sexuality, which treated anyone who believed in reasoned arguments with contempt. Man was to be reconciled with nature, saved from a lingering death and physical decrepitude by exalting his body and sexuality. The ideal of virility, for Robert Brasillach, who was not peculiar among fascist satirists, was best portrayed by sexual imagery. The energy and virility of fascist man is contrasted with what they regarded as the impotent bourgeois, liberals and socialists. Power, speed, vigour, toughness, solidity and effectiveness were to be fascists qualities and it is no coincidence that the value placed by the futurists on modernity was readily incorporated into fascism. "We are the party of speed"[42], Pierre Drieu La Rochelle

declared to convey the activists spirit of the fascist movement, whilst Mussolini chose the phrase; "Fascism is a dynamo."[43] The fascist belief in the omnipotence of the will and the capacity of the strong man with faith to triumph over natural obstacles, had, as its corollary a devaluation of the whole sphere of Utilitarian motives. Sacrifice in the service of the nation was to be absolute. According to Mussolini fascism "conceives of life as a struggle"[44] and: "believes neither in the possibility nor the utility of perpetual peace."[45] As in d Annunzio's speeches at Fiume, and the key note of futurist propoganda, the strong and the heroic have an absolute right to rule. Ardengo Soffici desired a "plunge into refreshing barbarism" and the restoration of the condition of "the rudimentary and savage hoards of prehistoric times."[46] Hitlers autobiography, Mein Kampf, is an elaboration of these notions. The survival principle is a fundamental law of nature as it was related to individuals and nations, as nature destroys the weak in order to give place to the strong. Curzio Malaparte applied these notions to government. He believed modern states are amorally captured and defended by successive elites who cynically manipulate power.[47] Central to fascism is a belief in virility and force and, as a consequence, a hatred of decadence. The nationals had greatly declined in courage and masculinity from earlier times, when they had been rugged, virile fighters. The Jew was evil, because he symbolised rationalism, liberalism, materialism and hedonism. Robert Brasillach declared that the only justice there is in this world is "that which reigns by force".[48] For Alfred Rosenberg: "combat is the father of all things".[49] Pierre Drieu La Rochelle equated passion with force and national regeneration which could be best served by fascism, the most anti-rational and forceful of all European ideologies.[50] He wrote: "Life is always a goddess of war, covered with barbaric ornaments and waving her bloody lance."[51] He glorified mans animality, an espousal of a kind of neo-primitivism.

Frenchmen were decadent, because they had been taught to value dis embodied rationalism over physical instinct, the cerebral over the primitive, civilisation over animality. Political problems were analysed by him in terms of animal struggle. If all warfare were abolished, one of mans major ties with nature would be severed, and one of his major sources of virility destroyed. History, he believed, was not a constant progression towards greater human progress, happiness and wisdom, but instead it was a cyclical process marked by repetitive struggle which left the nature of things unaltered. Human struggle did not creat a utopia but gave man an opportunity to express the vital forces within him. Characteristically, he called his sytem of thought the 'Philosophy of the Force'. Great leaders embodied force in their very persons and practiced it in their actions. Regeneration could only be achieved through the will: implemented in terms of virility, courage, athleticism, and action. He urged that a society dedicated to inaction should break with its main characteristic by reconditioning the body and restoring thought and action to their proper relationship. By glorifying force he hoped to undermine what he dismissed as the debilitating rationalism and pale idealism that had dominated modern Europe until fascism.[52]

Fascists emphasised pragmatism and action in their struggle to save the nation. Their ideology creates the image of action, life, and movement. Theirs was an ideology subordinated to action and pragmatism. As Mussolini wrote to Michele Bianchi on the occasion of the opening of a fascist school of propoganda in Milan in the summer of 1921:

> Italian fascism on pain of death, or worse, suicide, must give itself a body of doctrines. They will and must not be shirts of mail that bind us to eternity - for tomorrow is mysterious and unpredictable - they must constitute a norm of orientation for our

for our daily political and individual activity.[53a]
Mussolini promulgated an ideology that would be closely linked to action, both by inspiring and reflectingit.He developed the theory of the unity of thought and action. Fascist called themselves movements and had an immense thirst for action, and not just action aimed at overthrowing the established order, but action for action's sake. All were to act with blind passion and to think of life in terms of fist fights and machine gun fire where the very principle of life could be rediscovered in action and struggle. In the fascist view man rediscovered his essence in extreme situations where risk could be exalted against security, inspiration against rules. Indeed, intellectually the core of Italian fascist ideology was a belief in the primacy of unreflecting action, life andinspired creativity over reason and 'dead' systems of thought. Fascism was claimed as a movement liberating itself from intellectual preconceptions, in which practice was subject to theory instead of the converse. The social Darwinist concept of the life force, and the survival of the fittest, were converged with activism to form a movement of dynamism. According to Jose Stroel: "you must come on board, let yourself be carried by the torrent; in other words you must act. The rest will take care of itself."[53b]

Giovanni Gentile, saw law and institutions in a negative light, as obstacles to the free activity of the spirit, as he thought the State existed only as an internal reality which was constantly created through action. Violence appeared as creative spontaneity freed from legal and institutional regulation. These ideas served as justification for the avoidance of rational discussion and Mussolinis reluctance to commit himself to a clearly defined doctrine. According to C. Pellizi: "the thinker of fascism is

and remains Benito Mussolini, since he has thought and thinks Fascism in making it."[54]

Accompanying their plea for direct action, fascists exalted feeling, emotion, and violence, which were to replace European rationalism. They developed a cult of the body, health, and the outdoor life, as an alternative to a civilisation that conceived education as an education of the intellect. For the Belgian Rexist Jose Streel fascism was a "state of mind", "something spiritual and mystical."[55] It was against eighteenth century rationalism, which forms the basis of liberal ideology with its imagery of natural rights, individualism, matter and reason, that the fascists rebelled. For Mussolini Gentile, feeling "was prior to thought and the basis of it."[56] They opposed what they dismissed as the dry and grey argumentation of liberal politics with appeals to feeling which were part of the great campaigns to conquer souls and hold them. Essentially populist in its appeals and its essence, fascism addressed itself to the sentiments, deeply rooted prejudices and intuitions, - not to mans rationality. Rational appeals are accessible to the minority; They are also subject to criticism. Reasoning invites examination, speculation, and disagreement. Feelings can be shared, arguments seldom, and then only by few. Intellectual argument and its associated deliberation is by definition an agent of division, where toleration and compromise prevail, not unanimity. Fascism acquired the character of an anti-intellectual reaction which pitted the powers of feeling and emotion, and anti-rational forces of every kind, against the rationality of democracy. It claimed to have rediscovered instinct, the cult of physical strength, violence and brutality. Taken together the attention paid to scenarios by all the fascist movements, the care lavished on decor, the great ceromonies, the parades, made up a new liturgy and political style where deliberation and discussion were supplanted by song, torches,

and march pasts.

Fascism assumes the anti-rationality of human nature - that human action and will is guided by instinct, intuition, and feelings. Society is founded on non-rational factors. The peculiarity of fascist ideology is that it does not possess a coherence that is consciously systematic but has an unconscious coherence. Its emphasis on myth accompanies its anti-rational plea. All political and historical ideas are myths as historical interpretations are fictional constructions destined to dissappear before the deeds of the moment which break through the temperal pattern of history. Common action is all: ratiocination and discussion otiose. The inherent vagueness of fascist ideology, when considered in practical terms, accords with the Sorelian notion of 'myth', which in order to mobilise the masses should be distant and incapable of immediate realisation. Vilf redo Pareto, whose social and political thought contributed significantly to the movements of thought which crystalised in fascism, made a significant reflection on the mythical nature of fascism just before his demise after the accession to power of the Fascists in Italy . He claimed the the sucess of fascism would depend on its affording a satisfactory "faith".[57]

The immediate success of Italian fascism was advanced rather than hindered by its lack of definition. The open-ended character of fascist ideology facilitated the winning of converts. Novel among political movements it deliberately intended to exploit anti-rationality. The promptings of the unconscious, the race, the blood, the revealed faith, are armoured against critical examination by the assertion that they are 'higher' forms of knowledge which reason is inherently unable to appreciate.

The sources of certainty are held to be collective or supernatural creations, hence the inability of the individual to criticise them. Emphasis on myth was explicitly acknowledged by Pierre Drieu La Rochelle : "A man who disbelieves in his acts and who enchains his acts according to one myth is very succinct."[58] The ideal is : "To find nihilism before ones tabula rasa, and where supported, abolish every category of the limiting decrepitude of reason turned on rationalism and of morals turned on hypocracy."[59]

Alfred Rosenberg also extolled mysticism and 'inwardness' instead of reason. as each race has a unique soul the task of the twentieth century was to creat a myth to regenerate the race. The life of a race cannot be comprehended by a "logically developed philosophy" of cause and effect, but as a "mystical synthesis, an activity of soul, which cannot be explained rationally."[60] His policy towards art was that non-degenerate art subsisted in the suprarational creation of forms and patterns that have a simple and unsophisticated relationship to very aspect of the life of the Volk; particularly as this life represented the unfolding of the collective subconscious into concrete forms, patterns and relationships.[61] Gregor Strasser spoke of the "unconscious sentiment"[62] of the people opposed to rationalism, the characteristic of urbanisation. Hitler preferred that the patriot sought the "life forces, the irrational impulses"[63], rather than the degenerate reason of civilisation.

This reliance on the non-rational has led many to claim that fascism is less a doctrine than a faith, mystical, cloudy, and freqnetly not just non-rational but consciously anti-rational. Anti-intellectualism was a dominant note of the movements as they opposed rationalism, the idea that by abstract reasoning man is able to arrive at one and the same truth. Fascism looks inward to the

Instinct or soul and is addressed to the feelings, not to the intellect. The fascist ethos is emotional and sentimental; at that level the ends of action count less than the action itself. All European fascisms give the impression that the movement was open ended in a continuous Nietzschean ecstasy. Primo de Rivera, the founder of the Spanish Falange, believed that "people have never been moved by anyone save the poets"[64], whilst Leon Degrelle, the Belgian fascist leader, called Hitler, Mussolini and Codreanu "poets of revolution"[65]. Hitler thought feeling decided more accurately than reason[66], and James Drennan called fascism "an insurrection of feeling", as "the opposition between fascism and social democracy is the opposition between life and theory, man and intellect, between blood and paper."[67]

Fascists considered manipulation of total power by an elite as the agency of national regeneration. Potentially, all members of the nation were equal but the elite were outstanding because of their service to the nation. This provided the rationale for totalitarianism, the system in which the yearning for leadership and authority crystalised into monolithic unity where no pluralism was tolerated and no sector of society was immune to the ultimate definition and control of the elite. As the distinction between the fascist movement, the state and society was ambiguous so the leaders would be a 'natural elite' drawn from all ranks of society. As Hitler declared: "No, my party comrades, we shall not discuss the growth of a new upper class. We shall create it, and there is only oneway of creating it, battle."[68] The 'leadership principle' as understood by fascists meant the unrestricted authority of every leader over his subordinates and the latter's unquestioning obedience replacing the democratic principles of parliamentary representation andshared responsibility.[69] Furthermore, this

elitism was to be popular as fascists postulated the absolute identity between people and leadership which was substituted for the liberal dualism between state and society.[70]

All the French fascist movements had an authoritarian and intolerant tone as they emphasised the necessity of a disciplined unity which overrode class differences and political divisions.[71] The 'natural elite' for Lt. - Col. Casimir De La Rocque, the leader of the Croix de Feu, were simply the war veterans.[72] Gottfried Feder spoke both of a community of the Folk and the rise of a new elite, but was ambiguous as to the distinction between the two.[73] Finally, R. W. Darre took the notion of a 'natural' biological elite to its extreme: "one cannot very well create 'aristocracy' without somehow subjecting it to the principles of breeding."[74] The duty of the elite was to sweep aside the constitutional, procedural, and other obstacles to the instantaneous attainment of popular desires. The destruction of liberal institutions is a necessary means for protecting the nation and effecting the popular will as they are seen as in the grip of the 'enemy'. Plebiscitary democracy, or populism, was to liberate the nation from corruption and intervening institutions between the government and the society such as the legislature, the older political parties, and the courts. All these must be abandoned as they have been corrupted by the 'money power' or other alien and non-popular influence.[75] An authoritarian one party state disregarding a liberal constitution in direct contact with the popular will is regarded by fascists as necessary for liberating the people from the alien or other Manichean corrupting influence. Typical of this are the writings of Ezra Pound who thought constituional democracy was "under orders from the usurocracy".[76]

In its efforts to reconcile populism with elitism fascism conferred upon the modern world a theory of government that was intolerant of all opposition - totalitarianism. Fascism was called totalitarian as it attempted to encompass the whole range of human activity within the State. It would penetrate every sector of life as it intended to create a new type of society and a new type of man. The individual was considered a function of group life. As Mussolini said: "the fascist view of life stresses the importance of the State and accepts the individual only insofar as his interests coincide with those of the State, which stands for the conscience and the universal will of man as an historical entity."[77] The individual had no rights as in a democracy, for nations were living organic totalities which were an end in themselves unlike individuals, and which possess a hierarchy and articulationof their own.

Fascism extolled the value of the national collectivity as it was a vision of a coherent and united people and this was the reason for its emphasis on march pasts,parades and uniforms. It comprised a national liturgy appropriate to national self-representation. Politics and life must penetrate each other, and this means all aspects of life become politicised. Literature, art, architectural, and even the environment are seen as symbolic of political attitudes.[78] The original and vital force of the people through the organisation of the State realises itself fully in the communal life of the nation. Activism was directed into destroying the existing order so that the eternal verity of the Volk ornation could triumph. Fascism would end class struggle, and inaugerate class cooperation. Indeed, wrote Marcel Deat, this was the very meaning of totalitarianism: "Totalitarianism is conciliation, a reconciliation."[79] Pierre Drieu La Rochelle

defined liberty as : "the power a man receives from being bound to other men."[80] Man's personal self-realisation can only be fulfilled through the group, and consequently he respects cohesian, discipline, and authority.

Fascism waged an implacable war against everything that tended to divide or differentiate, or which was associated with diversity or pluralism; Liberalism, democracy, parliamentarianism, multi-party systems. Unity was to find its expression in the quasi-sacred figure of the leader who embodied the spirit, will and virtues of the people. This entailed the primacy of political action. Private enterprise, for example, was only permissable if it co-incided with the national interest. The moral life of the individual was organised by the collectivity as the citizen was totally identified with the purposes of the State. Giovanni Gentile, for example, considered politics to be "pedagogy on a grand scale".[81] By insisting on the identity of thought and action he excluded all criteria whereby political action could be criticised. It could not be called authoritarian or conservative as idealogical unanimity was the end which coercion should serve. The masses were mere instruments animated by the "thought" of "a few guiding spirits - indeed one - the Duce."[82]

The British Fascists declared that they were "not altogether constitutional".[83] They disavowed identification with what they regarded as a corrupt party system and advocated unconstituional defence of the government. Government, they thought, should be omnipotent in order that it could struggle against the omnipresent forces of degeneration. The Imperial Fascist League, renegades from the British Fascists, was admiringly described as "an expression of intolerance".[84] They advocated an omnipotent

government whose deliberative assemblies would be merely acvisory.[85] Oswald Mosley, the leader of the British Union of Fascists, thought posterity would regard "as a curious and temporary aberration of the human mind that great nations should elect a Government to do a job, and should then elect an opposition to stop them from doing it."[86] Fascist or totalitarian government is intolerant of minorities as unanimity is the ideal and government is the locus of action not of deliberation or compromise. The mass are regarded as ignorent and indecisive whilst the government should be strong and decisive. Toleration is regarded as fostering the degeneration of the nation. Plurality and autonomy should be overriden on behalf of popular welfare as freedom is a collective and not an individual achievement. In the Fascist State government will have complete liberty to act and crush dissension: "'Power' is the monopoly of government."[87] The popular revolutionary elite will concentrate power, if necessary, unconstitionally[88], to control all social, political and economic activity. Total national regeneration can only be secured through unlimited authority, discipline and loyalty.[89] As they regarded the natural tendency of liberal society to be one of dissolution they thought national salvation depended on the unlimited power of revolutionary 'leaders'.[90] Total unanimity was regarded as an indispensable condition for this salvation, consequently, fascist government: "will rout out every party in the land."[91]

The fascist movements realisedthose changes of the ideological spectrum that had been attempted before World War I by 'national socialists', 'authoritarian socialists', and 'revolutionary conservatists.' Theirs was an ideological synthesis and recruitment from both the 'left' and the 'right'. They did not take party labels in parliamentary democracy to stand for serious differences of opinion. Both Hendrik de Man, President of the Belgian Workers'

Party, and Marcel Deat, socialist in the inter war years, welcomed the cessation of the parliamentary regime in 1940 as theythought it provided the indispensable condition for socialising the nation or nationalising socialism.[92] Indeed, the two largest fascist movements that developed in France, Jacques Doriot's Parti Populaire Francaise and Marcel Deat's Rassenblement National Populaire, were both largely staffed by men dissolusioned with the 'left'.[93] The fascism of planning and modernism that sought efficiency and technical progress in the interest of the community was a legacy of their socialism. In the ideology of fascism Marxism and liberal democracy are rejected for a modernised, national, and authoritarian socialism. State omnipotence required that parliamentarianism and the party system be abandoned for the militant regeneration of the nation. Many neo-socialists, like Oswald Mosley, had shifted ideologically from what they deprecated as democratic impotence to protect the nation from the international economic crises of the inter war years. The masses must be mobilised for a more compelling reality - the nation-all classes should co-operate as the opposition was no longer between the proletarian and the bourgeoise, but the nation against those alien forced that have thwarted the popular will through their control of the political parties in a democracy, such forces as the Jews and international finance. According to Jose Streel opposition was between the "workers of all classes" and "banking capitalism or hyper-capitalism".[94] Socialists must abandon their allegiance to the class struggle and militantly affirm total allegiance to the nation.

The national socialism that had been developing since the end of the preceding century had crystalised in the fascist movements

with their objective of uniting the national and the social, incorporating both socialism and nationalism in one movement, merging the 'right' and the 'left'. Mussolini, for instance, 6 months after the Fasci di Combattimento was formed, indicated that it was:

> ..a little difficult to define fascists. They are not republicans, socialists, democrats, conservatives, nor nationalists. They represent a synthesis of all the negations and the affirmations.. while they renounce all the parties, they are their fulfillment.[95]

The fluid nature of fascist ideology is indicated by Mussolini's volte-face in 1922 when he placed fascism in the content of a world wide epochal reaction against democracy, first frankly espoused the reactionary tradition which nationalism had always admitted, and advocated the restoration of a more authoritarian government.[96] Fascist ideology is fluid, open ended, and frequently inconsistent if one analyses it for formal doctrinal content. Fascism 'eclectic functionalism' is revelatory of its appeal to all social groups and political tendancies in the nation as it combines and synthesisespolitical extremes. Mussolini, after affirming allegiance to all political antinomies claimed that fascists are: "legalists and illegalists, according to the circumstances of the moment, the place and the environment."[97]

Fascists claim to be an anti-party, both antithesis and synthesis of existing ideologies. Typically, Maurice Bardeche, a contempory French fascist, claims that fascism is impossible to define outside the crises of democracy and the impotence of the party system. He claimed that it is: "the party of the nation in wrath."[98] Italian fascism was careers open to the talents, never free from ideological disunity because the numerous factions it encompassed were committed to different goals.[99] But it can be said of it what Peron said of his doctrine: "It is an ideological position, which is in the centre, on the right, or on the left according the specific

political circumstances."[100] Hendrik de Man's political career is typical of those whose disillusion with the party system leads to acquiescence with fascism. As he disavowed orthodox socialism he developed a sense of the necessity for a popular elite that would dominate an 'authoritarian socialism' which abandons democracy for the unity of the nation.[101]

The classic case of this transition is that of the 'revolutionary conservatives' of the Weimar Republic in Germany who, on the extremities of conservatism, developed under the shadow of Germany's defeat and her subsequent financial crises. Some called themselves National Bolshevists. They were extreme 'rightists', or extreme 'leftists', or indeed both. Plaintive of the inefficacy of bourgeois values they developed a conservatism that was radical. This 'movement' was to challenge the compromise and deliberation of a multi-party system. Oswald Spengler, spoke of an "instinctive socialism"[102] peculiar to Germany which is "Illiberal and anti-democratic" the representative of which was Frederick I, not Marx.[103] He desired a 'Caesarism' that would be the nemesis of the civilisation he mocked, and that "life would govern reason".[104] Ernst Junger, another of these 'conservative revolutionaries', opposed internationalism with nationalism, Pacifism with 'heroic realism', the middle class desire for security with the spirit of war and adventure which he believed was primary to life. What were traditionally regarded as the opposite extremes of the political spectrum became fused as the neo-conservative and neo-socialist ideas became thoroughly intertwined in National Socialism.

Werner Sonbart transcended conservatism and labelled his ideal 'German Socialism' in which discipline would extend 'from a single central point systematically over the entire social life'[105], imposing 'obligatory norms'.[106] Othmar Spann's 'conservatism' was also representative of this fascist fusion of political extremes.[107] These 'conservative revolutionaries' were explicitly elitist. Spengler rephrased Kant's categorical imperative thus: "Act as if the maxim you practice should become, by your will, a law for all."[108] Their ideology, like that of the National Socialist, was so eclectic that they even adopted the liberal idea of democracy in personnel selection.

Moeller van den Bruck was one of these 'revolutionary conservatives' whose attempt to transmogrify conservatism spanned many decades before World War I until the rise of the fascist movements. He believed national destiny, like that of great leaders, unfolds through struggle and that the most vital and energetic nation has a right to dominate others. France and Britain had achieved 'civilisation' andcompleted the possibility of their development whilst the Germans are a 'young' people. The biological analogy achieves its purpose in that destiny is non-rational and can only be apprehended through instinct. He thought that the race had disintegrated and that only through the nation could its destiny be fulfilled. The political extremes should be fused in contempory Germany as the social ideal willbe realised through revolutionary means but bound by conservative principles.[109] He regarded liberalism as the enemy. Life should be heroic and society authoritarian or 'Casarist.' His main impact was to come in 1923, when mass dissolusionment with the ideologies that constituted the political spectrum and the parties associated with them provided him with an opportunity to exploit the drift towards extremists nationalism, with his book Das Dritte Reich.

The chapter headings of the latter are very significant in terms of fascism, they are : 'Revolutionary'; 'Socialist'; 'Liberal'; 'Democratic'; 'Proletarian'; 'Reactionary'; 'Conservative'; 'The Third Reich.' Real revolution can only be that in which the German spirit can be embodied. It can only be made by conservatives. The ideal socialist is he who accepts the conservatives judgement on the value of a close knit and powerful national life. Liberalism is dismissed as an agency of national degeneration.[110] The only 'democracy' condoned is that consistent with national self-assertion.[111] Ideological divisions should be overcome, and unaminity achieved, by the conciliation of all ideologies with a conservatism that draws from all the political extremes. Only conservatives, who can enlist the unanimous support of the whole nation, are able to resolve the social problem which derives from the relative power of the nation. The Germans are a 'proletarian nation.' National regeneration can only be realised by: "The co-operation of the extreme Right and the extreme Left."[112]

It is significant that this discussion on the motifs of fascism has been completed on the subject of the 'revolutionary conservatives' of Germany. They demonstrate the fact that even after World War I there were attempts to transform the meaning of a traditional ideology, in their case conservatism, into fascism by synthesising it with all political extremes in an extreme nationalism. It acquires further significance in relation to this thesis as this is precisely what Anthony Mario Ludovici was attempting to do in relation to English conservatism. The 'revolutionary conservatives' and Anthony Mario Ludovici, like the 'national socialists' and 'authoritarian socialists' before , and after, World War I, were fascists. True, some of the latter wrote before the term 'fascism' gained currency, or chose not to adopt the appellation 'fascist', when it did gain

currency, after World War I. Nevertheless, the motifs of their ideology are the same as those who did, after World War I, adopt the identity 'fascist.'

Although this thesis permits only a synopsis of generic fascist ideology I think the conclusionsof this chapter accord with the abundant literature listed in the bibliography. It presents a paradigm of fascist ideology with which we can proceed to identify Ludovici's political convictions.

Notes to Chapter 1: Synthesis of Utopian Socialism

1. Keith Dixon, The Political Ideas of Critical Utopias (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1965).

2. George L. Mosse, "The Mystical Origins of National Socialism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Volume 22, No. 1, (1961), p.82.

3. Ibid., The Crisis of German Ideology, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964), p. 42.

4. Michael D. Biddiss, Author of Prophet of Hate: The political and racial Thought of Count Gobineau, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1970), p.139.

5. Maurice Edmund Chadbourn, The Foundation of the Machinist Country, 2 volumes, (London: John Lane, 1911), Volume 1: p.297.

6. Ernst Nolte, The Nationalist Origins of National Socialism, Social Evolution in Henri Heckel and the Action Francaise, (London: Macdonald, 1971).

7. Peter G. Pulzer, Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria, (London: John Wiley, 1964).

8. Andrew G. Whiteside, Austrian National Socialism before 1918, (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962), p.103.

9. Walter Sequer, Fascism and Germany: A Century of Conflict, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965), p.5122.

10. A.J. Gregor, Contemporary Radical Ideologies, (New York: Random House, 1969), p.17322.

11. Ernst Nolte, Three Faces of Fascism: Action Francaise, Italian Fascism, National Socialism, (Second Edition, New York: Signet Books, 1969), p.70.

12. Noel O'Sullivan, Conservatism, (London: Dent, 1976), p.39.

13. Maurras Barrès, La Cité d'un Jour, (Paris, 1909), pp.223 quoted in Ernst Nolte, op.cit., p.70.

14. Noel O'Sullivan, op.cit., p.3422.

15. G.L. Mosse, The Nazi in French Revolutionary Tradition, (University of Georgia Press, 1951).

16. Robert Soucy, Fascism in France: The Case of Maurice Barres, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1972), p.13.

17. Noel O'Sullivan, op.cit., p.3322.

18. Ernst Nolte, op.cit., p.123

19. Zeev Sternhell, "Paul Deroulede and the origins of modern French Nationalism," Journal of Contemporary History, Volume 6, No.4, (1971), pp.46-70.

20. H.A. Hill, "Introduction" to George Sorel, Reflections on Violence, (London: Collier-Macmillan, 1972), p.22.

21. H.S. Hughes, Consciousness and Society: The Reorientation of European Social Thought, 1890-1930 (London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1959), p.48.

22. Charles Benoit, "Notes sur le Milieu et Critères" quoted in Henry Mendras, "Georges Sorel et le Socialisme," in Joyce Gallowcliff, Trans., 10 (January 1957), p.169; quoted in Roy Pierce, "Ancient Ideology," in Walter Phillips ed. Reading A Jordan's Cattle (Ideology and the Angelous University of California Press, 1976), p.325.

23. David Roth, "From Positivism to Pluralism: the relation between theory and practice in the work of Robert Michels II - the Ancient Ideologue," Political Studies Volume XV, Number 2, (June 1977), pp. 161-181.

24. A.J. Cooper, The Ideology of Fascism: the rationale of totalitarianism, (New York: Free Press, 1969), p.54.

25. Mario Borgatta, "The Principles of Nationalism" translated in Adrian Lyttleton ed. Italian Fascisms from Pareto to Gentile (London 1973), p.147; quoted in Roy Pierce, "Ancient Ideology," in Walter Phillips ed., Reading A Jordan's Cattle, (Ideology and the Angelous University of California Press, 1976), p.329.

26. F.T. Marinetti, Speech at Milan, 14 January 1914, in S. Bial and D. Cinnoli Pagnolini - Il Duce a Roma Volume 1 (Florence, 1950), p.216; quoted in Jason Joll, Intellectuals in Politics (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1960), p.162.

27. Giovanni Gullaci, "The Pre-Adult Covenant in Italy" Journal of the History of Ideas Volume XIII, Number 1 (1952), pp. 93-94.

28. George L. Mosse, "The poet and the exercise of political power: Gabriello d'Annunzio," Journal of Contemporary History Volume 22, (1973), pp.32-42.

29. Enrico Corradini, no source given; quoted in J.J. Roth, "The Roots of Italian Fascism: Sorel and Sorelismo," Journal of Modern History, Volume 39, (March 1967), p.36.

30. Adrian Lyttleton ed., Italian Fascisms from Pareto to Gentile (London: Jonathan Cape, 1973), p. 198.

31. Adrian Lyttleton, The Seizure of Power: Fascism in Italy, 1919-1929 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p.36.

32. Claudio Pavese, Pannolini in the Making (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1958), p.113.

33. Louis Fernand Celine, Journey to the End of the Night (London: Chatto and Windus, 1934).

34. Norman Cohn, Warrant for Genocide (London: Eyre, 1970).

35. Colin Cross, The Fascists in Britain (London: Barrie and Rockliff, 1961), p.38.

36. Benito Mussolini, "Political and Social Doctrine," p.269 quoted in Renzo Stomboli, "The Left Wing Ideology," in William Harper ed., Benito Mussolini's Unity (Ideology and Its Antagonists Universality of Christianity) Rome, 1976), p.337.

37. Oswald Mosley, speeches 1C) Cognitions edited and corrected, (London, 1936), Quotation 2g quoted in Renzo Stomboli, Ibid.

38. Benito Mussolini, "Political and Social Doctrine," p.269 quoted in Renzo Stomboli, Ibid., p.330.

39. Leon Degrelle, Revolution des ames, p.146; quoted in Renzo Stomboli, Ibid., p.344.

40. Benito Mussolini, Hymn, Appendix D, 1936; quoted in Renzo Stomboli, Ibid., p.340.

41. Blasco Ibanez in Rocholle, quoted in Ethel Mannin, "The Invisible Revolution (Blasco Ibanez to Rocholle," The Nineteenth Century, 50 (July 1927), p.21; quoted in Renzo Stomboli, Ibid.

42. Blasco Ibanez in Rocholle, Chronique Politique 1936-1942 (Paris, 1943), p.12; quoted in Renzo Stomboli, Ibid., pp. 341-342.

43. Benito Mussolini, no source given; quoted in Renzo Stomboli, Ibid.

44. Benito Mussolini, "The Doctrine of Fascism"(1932) translation from Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe by Michael Oakeshott, (Cambridge, 1939); reprinted in Adrian Lyttleton ed., Italian Fascisms from Pareto to Gentile, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1973), p.40.

45. Benito Mussolini, Ibid.; reprinted in Adrian Lyttleton ed., Ibid., p.47.

46. Antonio Gramsci, Per la Verita Per Due Attacchi, Florence 1923, p.106; quoted in Adrian Lyttleton, The Seizure of Power Fascism in Italy, 1919-1929, (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p.370.

47. Curzio Malaparte, Coup d'Etat The Technique of Revolution (New York: E.P. Dutton, 1932), p.163ff.

48. Robert Soucy, no source given; quoted in Robert Soucy, "French Fascist Intellectuals in the 1930s: An Old New Left?," French Historical Studies Volume 8, Number 3, (Spring 1974), p.434.

49. Alfred Rosenberg, quoted in H Rauschning, The Germany Revolution (New York 1939), p. 164; quoted in William H. Maehovern, Three Paths to Utopia The History of Political Philosophy (2nd ed.; Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1973), p.691.

50. Robert Soucy, "Fascination and Realism in the Fascism of Drieu La Rochelle" Journal of the History of Ideas, Volume 31, No.1, (1970), pp. 73-74.

51. Blasco Ibanez in Rocholle, Chronique Politique 1936-1942 (Paris, 1943), p.149; quoted in Robert Soucy, "French Fascist Intellectuals in the 1930s: An Old New Left?," French Historical Studies, Volume 8, No.3, (Spring 1974), p.434.

52. William D. Rubel, "Vocation and Individualism: The Political Thought of Pareto and Michels," Journal of Politics Volume 27, No.1, (1965), pp. 152-170.

53. Benito Mussolini "Verso il Partito" Popolo d'Italia, August 27, 1921; quoted in Clarence K. Streit, "The Merging of Pareto's Doctrine," Journal of the History of Ideas Volume 3, No.2, (1942), p. 176.

53b. João Bissaia, Os ex-12 fortes nomes do Rex (Manaus, n.d.), p.105; quoted in Roy Stockwell, "Fascist Ideology," in Walter Laqueur ed., Fascism: A Reader's Guide, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976), p.348.

54. G. Pollini, Pensiero e milizia, (Milan 1925), p.46; quoted in Adrian Lyttleton, The Seizure of Power: Fascism in Italy, 1919-1929 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p.39.

55. João Bissaia, op.cit., pp. 102-103; quoted in Roy Stockwell, "Fascist Ideology," in Walter Laqueur ed., Fascism: A Reader's Guide, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976), p.339.

56. Benito Mussolini and Giovanni Gentile, cited in James Gregor, The Ideology of Fascism: the Rationale of Totalitarianism (New York, 1969), p.225; quoted in Roy Stockwell, Ibid., p.340.

57. Vilfredo Pareto, Scritti Sociologici, ed. G. Busino, Turin, 1966, p.1027; quoted in Adrian Lyttleton, The Seizure of Power: Fascism in Italy 1919-1929 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p.364.

58. Pierre Drieu la Rochelle, Notes pour comprendre le siècle (Paris, 1941), p.160; quoted in Adrian Lyttleton Ibid., pp. 499-500.

59. Ibid., pp.150-152; quoted in Adrian Lyttleton Ibid.

60. Alfred Rosenberg, preface to the "Race and Mythos" section of the 1930 edition of his Der Mythus des 20. Jahrhunderts; reprinted in Alfred Rosenberg: Selected Writings, edited and introduced by Robert Pois, (London: Jonathan Cape, 1970), p.84.

61. Robert Pois, "German Expressionism in the Plastic Arts and Fascism: A Confrontation of Ideologies" German Life and Letters, Volume XIV, No.3, (April 1960), pp. 204-214.

62. Gregor Strasser, "Work and Bread!"; "Arbeit und Brot!" in Kampf um Deutschland (Munich: Eher, 1932), pp. 345-378; reprinted in Nazi Ideology before 1933: A Documentation edited by Barbara Miller Lane and Leila J. Rupp, (Manchester University Press, 1978), p.139.

63. Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf (New York): Reynal and Hitchcock, 1940), p.352; quoted in Peter Viereck, Metapolitics: From the Romantics to Hitler (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941), p.9.

64. João Antonio Pinto do Rivera, quoted in Stanley G. Payne, Falange (Stanford 1961), p.40; quoted in George L. Mosse, "The Genesis of Fascism," Journal of Contemporary History Volume 1, No.1, (1966), p.21.

65. Pedro Zagalle quoted in Robert Brasillach, Pedro Zagalle (Paris, 1936), p.78; quoted in George L. Mosse Ibid.

66. Alfred Fuller, Book Buyer (New York, 1939), p.284; cited in William H. Tolleyson, op.cit., p.236.

67. Sean Brown [Secretary for Publicity], Ruth Fowler and Publicity Posters (London Sch Board, 1934), pp. 215-219.

68. Adolf Hitler, quoted in Hitler Speaks by H. Rauschning (London, 1940), p.49; quoted in Paul H. Meyer, Propaganda (London: Cooper Allen and Co., 1973), p.37.

69. Military Report, "Morale" in Personal, Communication and National Society, J. Personality Monographs, edited by G.H. Mead (New York: London and London, 1940), Volume VIII p.289.

70. Lord Northcliffe, "National Socialism," in G.H. Mead et. Mild., Volume IV p.67.

71. Robert Perry, "French Research on Class Consciousness and Moral Regeneration," Sociology, Volume 2, No.4, (Autumn 1971), p.296.

72. Gustave Le Bon, The Gulf to Public Opinion in Europe (London: Ernest Benn, 1934), p.162.

73. Barbara Miller Lane, "Nazi Ideologies Pre-Unification Germany," Social Studies, Volume VII, No.1, (March 1974), pp.10-11.

74. P.W. Ferro "Psychology Today and the Relationship of Knowledge" Die Internationalen der Wissenschaften und die Universitäten" in Journal zur Welt und Leben, (Berlin: Schulze Verlag, 1930), pp. 127-144; reprinted in Barbara Miller Lane and Leila J. Rupp ed., op.cit., p.111.

75. Victor G. Rosenthal, "Popular Influences on Modern Society" Western Political Quarterly, Volume 3, No.3, (Dec 1957), pp. 350-372.

76. Hans Freud [Sigmund Freud's son] and the Causes of the Present War (London: Victor Gollancz, 1951), p.17; quoted in Victor G. Rosenthal, "Hans Freud and Modern Society" Journal of Politics, Volume 17, No.1, (February 1955), pp. 106-107.

77. Emilio Pucciani, "Fundamental Mens", in Aspects pp. 10-11; quoted in Poor Stonehill, "Oriental Ideology" in Walter Lacqur, Europe: A Reader's Guide (Oxford and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976), pp. 345-346.

78. George L. Mosse, The Nationalization of the Masses Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich (New York: Howard, 1975).

79. Ernest Renan, La Vraie Nature (1968), quoted in Robert J. Perry, "The Nature of Society in Nazism," Journal of Contemporary History Volume 1, No.1, (1966), p.30.

80. Pierre Leon in Rochelle, Avec Barbet (1933), quoted in Robert J. Perry ibid., p.40.

81. Giovanni Gentile, Inchiesta del Fascismento Italiano (Florence, 1923), p.41; quoted in Adrian Lyttleton, The Seizure of Power: Fascism in Italy, 1919-1929 (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p.375.

82. Giovanni Gentile, Fascismo e cattolicismo, Milan 1928, pp.48-49, quoted in Adrian Lyttleton ibid., p.377.

C4. H.J.L., "The Colonial Library" [typed], No.60, January 1939, p.2.

C5. Imperial Relations Trust, [Trustees' Act, (Campbell)] June 1935, p.7.

C6. Gould Lindsay, "Memorandum to Files" [on cl. 4 of the Imperial Relations Trust Act, 1935] Gould Lindsay Correspondence, 1946], p.1.

C7. A.B. Keith, "Responsible Government," Juridical Review Volume 1, No.1, (January, 1935), p.83.

C8. William Joyce, "Notes on the Difference between Dominion and Provincial Status in British Constitutions" Juridical Review Volume 2, No.1, (January 1936), p.146.

C9. Gould Lindsay, "The Philosophy of Canada," Juridical Review Volume 1, No.1, (January 1935), pp. 43-44.

C9. P. Clarke, "Recent Dynamics," British Union Quarterly Volume 1, No.2, (April 1937), pp. 28-45.

C1. C.L. Miller, "Party State or Order State" Juridical Review Volume XL, No.3, July 1936, p.426.

C2. Leon Stenhouse, "Fascist Ideology," in Nelson Lazure ed., Aquinas A Review of Child (Ideology and Los Angeles University of California Press, 1976), pp. 325-337.

C3. Stanley Carcourse, "Neo-Socialism: A Study in Political Metamorphosis" (Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1952).

C4. Jose Strood, op.cit., p.143; quoted in Leon Stenhouse, "Fascist Ideology," in Nelson Lazure ed., Aquinas A Review of Child (Ideology and Los Angeles University of California Press, 1976), p.353.

C5. Benito Mussolini, no source given; quoted in Leon Stenhouse ibid., p.354.

C6. Adrian Hyslop, The Culture of Fascism Reading in Italy 1919-1929 (London:Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973), p.1528.

C7. Benito Mussolini, no source given; quoted in G.J. Veale, "Italy," in G.J. Veale ed., Fascism Theory (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1950), p.44.

C8. Ernesto Rodocho, [Point on que lo Fascismo (1961)]; quoted in Christopher Peter-Antonio, "Fascism in Contemporary Europe," in G.J. Veale ibid., pp. 352-353.

C9. W.L. Runcorn, "The Cools of Italian Fascism," American National Review Volume LXXXV, No.4, (April 1960), pp. 1197-1204.

100. Juan Bailey, Peron, quoted in La Prensa (Buenos Aires), September 1950; quoted in G.I. Blanksten, Peron's Argentina, (University of Chicago Press, 1953), p.292

101. P. Lodge, Beyond Marxism: The Faith and Work of Oswald Mosley (New Digest Services Limited, 1936).

102. Ernst Spranger, Persönlichkeit und Bildung (Munich, 1920), p.61; quoted in Thomas von Klemperer, Conway's Law Conservation (Princeton University Press, 1969), pp. 176-177.

103. Ernst Spranger, Ibid., p.39; quoted in Klemperer, Ibid.

104. Ernst Spranger, "Persönlichkeit und Bildung," (1919) in Politische Pädagogik (Berlin: Quelle und Meyer, 1958), p.84; quoted in Fritz Ringer, "Ernst Spranger's Political Pedagogy" (Boston University Press, 1962), p.12.

105. Karl Mannheim, A New Social Philosophy (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1939), p.103.

106. H. Schelsky, Social Conservatism and the Middle Classes in Germany 1914-1933 (Princeton University Press, 1969), p.7222.

107. J.L. Talmon, "Ernst Troeltsch and the Collision of 'Weltbild' Corporations in Theory and Practice," (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1969).

108. Ernst Spranger Der Unterricht der Volksschule Volume I (Munich, 1925), p.436; quoted in Fritz Ringer "Ernst Spranger's Educational Ideals in Germany 1909-1933" (Princeton University Press, 1973), p.235.

109. K. Mannheim, "Conservative Thought," Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1953), pp.74-164.

110. A.L. Brecht, "The Political Theory of Moeller van den Bruck," in Essays in Political Theory edited by M. Konvitz and A.L. Murphy (New York: Cornell, 1948), p. 234.

111. Moeller van den Bruck, Germany's Third Empire, translated by A. Fowler, (London: Allen & Unwin 1934), p. 132.

112. Ibid., p.199.

CHAPTER 2, CONSERVATISM IN THE WRITINGS OF ANTHONY MARIO LUDOVICI

Generic conservatism is generally regarded as the belief which denies that mans reason and will is sufficiently powerful to transform human nature and society according to some ideal of perfection. As an ideology in which imperfection is presented as constitutive of the human condition it is opposed to any arguments justifying attempts to effect total or radical change. Thus, its adherents are committed to a limited style of politics.[1] Accepting this central belief, in the main, conservatives regard existing society as the best of all possible worlds and themselves as its natural custodians.[2] Conservatism is, according to one commentator: "the rationalisation of existing institutions in terms of history, God, nature and man."[3]

As the content of conservative ideology is generally regarded as peculiar to the time and place of its origins[4] I shall concentrate on the context of modern British conservatism. I would suggest that the generic concerns of this conservativism are present in the beliefs that inequality is natural or ineliminable, and that class and structural differentiated are requisite for both national cohesion and economic success. Indeed, Robert Eccleshall is of the opinion that this is the leitmotiv that has under pinned the diversity of modern British conservative thought. It is present in all Conservative policy discussions in contempory British politics.[5] It has persisted throughout their advocacy of laissez-faire in the early part of the period; their subsequent acceptance of a State regulated economy and extension of the public sector; finally, and quite recently, their revived belief in laissez-faire through their adoption of monetarism and new misgivings about the

State as an enterprise and welfare association.[6] This judgement is reinforced by Nigel Harris's analysis of modern British conservatism which, although the period it surveys preceded the recent trend towards the re-adoption of laissez-faire by British conservatives, came to the same conclusion as Robert Eccleshall's latest survey. He affirms, for the period which he studied, that the fundamental belief in inequality provided coherence to an otherwise diverse history of successive policy and ideological changes by the Conservative Party as British society changed from one dominated by a market economy to one in which the public sector was large, and the bureaucracies associated with oligopolistic enterprises are predominant.[7] Further studies have concluded that the justification of the stratification of society is the conservative's central concern[8], or that the Conservative Party identifies itself with the existing class structure.[9] Organicism, scepticism, traditionalism, and either religious or secular grounds for believing in man's imperfection are fundamental to the ethos of conservatism.[10] One conservative wrote that the "upper classes" have been selected for their ability to govern as: "heredity is no Tory invention but a scientific fact, a class system, .. becomes at bottom a moral and real necessity."[11]

Cohering with their notions of imperfection and their belief that inequality is ineliminable is the scepticism of modern conservatism. They agree with Hume in seeing no source of redemption in reason.[12] Harold Begbie wrote of conservatism: "It is of all schools of political thought in the world the most practical. It has no liking for pedants; it is contemptuous of cranks; and it will have no truck with political emotionalists."[13] This leads to the conservative contention that politics ought to be the province of those priveliged by experience.[14] The same convictions can be

identified in the writings of Ludovici. He believed that both nature and human nature is governed by eternal laws that nobody could change.[15] Mankind is by nature conservative through its "love of safety, ... tendency to indolence, and ... preference for the known before the unknown."[16] Only the "genial innovator, or the lunatic", would deny this truth.[17] He regretted that politics had been relegated to irresponsible opportunists.[18] Ludovici despised those politicians who could procure their return to Parliament by relieving their central political organisations of any expenses in their election, and by using their own means to nurse the constituency which they select. He claimed to have heard it said by one prominent politician that he could undertake with ten thousand pounds to win any constituency in the kingdom. Ludovici called this an "abuse" of the Constitution: "that is leading more and more to the total discredit of Parliamentary institutions."[19] Ludovici thought to be a conservative meant to entertain no notions about the alleged radical goodness of human nature: "he is not prone to imagine utopias or ideal states, which, in order to be successful, must be maintained and supported by angels of virtue and self-effacement."[20] He believed the recent political history of Europe afforded abundant proof of the neglect of this conservative principle. Mere "hawkers of ideas", journalists not statesmen, pamphleteers not politicians had risen to power: Lenin, Trotsky, and Mussolini. We should not look gladly upon 'journalists' who have acceded to power for they appeal to popular tastes, which spells opportunism and irresponsibility. And the example afforded by these successful 'journalists' statesmen ought to warn the politician of the future against "so-called 'men of action'."[21] Ludovici believed that it is the role of the Conservative Party to oppose such dangerous subversives as it is among the chief duties of the Conservative Party to preserve the Constitution in Church and State.[22] He was mortified that the House of Lords, which Englishmen regarded as

"part of the bedrock of their Constitution", had been severely curtailed by the Parliament Act of 1911.[23] Through the latter both the Constitution and Parliamentary government had been imperilled.[24]

Ludovici discredited rabid anti-semitism as a device of agitators to provoke united action and common feeling against a common enemy. It pointed to a unique cause of all existing suffering, oppression, exploitation and injustice, without implicating the national himself. He called anti-Semitism "despicable" as when purely English people alone were operating in England there was chronic exploitation of the weak and defenceless.[25] Not more than seventy years after the expulsion of the Jews in 1290, a priest, John Ball, was driven to the leadership of an open revolt among the peasants as a result of the deplorable hardships they had to endure, began preaching a sort of communism which was inspired less by contemplation and thought than by the spectacle of the sorrow and want about him. Ludovici derived from this, and other instances of native oppression, two conclusions:

> ..First, that in the period 1290 to 1656 there was in the land a spirit persistently trying to break loose, which for lack of a more popular term I have called individualistic and a social, the prevalence of which, despite much legislation calculated to suppress it, constantly impeded the establishment of the mutuality essential to a sound culture; and secondly, that this spirit <u>increased rather than decreased as time went on</u> (his italics).[26]

Ludovici thought that it was not without significance that, at the very end of the 365 years of the absence of the Jews in England, that is, in the fifth decade of the seventeenth century, Thomas Hobbes, shaping his cosmogony from the world about him, as Darwin was later to do with his notion of the 'struggle for existence', arrived at the memorable conclusion that the natural

state of man was a bellum contra omnes[27]. As he believed exploitation of the English throughout the Industrial Revolution and after, was not due to the Jews, anti-Semitism was devoid of reason[28]. Ludovici regarded anti-Semitism as one aspect of man's native wickedness. He believed man's imperfections could not be eradicated by being conjoined with superior intelligence, education, or material resources[29]. Those who proclaim the contrary, "as Julien Benda has ably shown [In his anti-fascist The Betrayal of the Intellectuals], betrayors rather than saviours of their generation".[30]

Perhaps the most thorough study of modern British conservatism has identified to fundamental strands in the fabric of its ideas, these two strands are collectivism and libertarianism. The former strand is associated with: "humanitarianism; noblesse oblige; piecemeal concession; radicalism; and the reaction to economic crisis"[31]. The advocates of the libertarian strand form two groups: "the adherents of a more or less orthodox laissez faire and free trade doctrine; and the supporters of the modified position which draws a firm distinction between social and economic intervention, the former being permissable, and the latter generally is not"[32]. The following discussion of the policy of modern British conservatism constitutes a modification of Greenleaf's thesis as I synthesise it with other analyses of modern British conservatism, and my study of the thought of individual conservatives. Nevertheless, the outline of this discussion will conform, in part, to a brief study of those conservatives that Greenleaf nominates as the conservatives whose thought is the most felicitous expression of modern British conservatism.

Conservative thinkers whose policy exemplifies the libertarian strand during the latter days of the nineteenth century conceived their libertarian conservatism as a defence against the rise of socialism which, they believed, represented a threat to liberty. Conservatives

adopted what had been previously regarded as liberal values. This trend was to culminate in the systematic anti-socialist position of W.H. Mallock.

James Fitzjohn Stephens conservatism is significant in the transition by conservatives to the adoption of liberal values. He selectively incorporated utilitarianism into conservatism in his advocacy of progress and was concerned, like liberals, with efficient government and administration. However, there remained within his thought anti-democratic strands, like the assumption that power preceded liberty in that progress was in many instances the outcome of the force of a minority applied to the conduct of an ignorant and inert mass.[33]

Further evidence for the claim that conservatives adopted liberal values correlatively with the rise of socialism is afforded by Michael Pint-Duschinsky's recent study of Lord Salisbury's political thought which concluded that the ultimate reference for the latter's political thought were Benthanite principles.[34] Lord Salisbury believed that such moral and material improvement as was possible depended on the individual's free and rational exercise of his faculties. All that the statesman could afford to the poor man was to shape matters that the greatest possible liberty prevailed under the law to facilitate progress.[35]

From the latter decades of the nineteenth century conservatives adopted liberal values as a reaction to the extension of the suffrage and socialism which they believed constituted a threat to the society which they sought to conserve. Two prominent conservatives, Henry Sumner Maine and W.E.H. Lecky respectively, thought that the extension of the suffrage would either occasion tyranny by the beaurocracies of

parties whose constituents are the porpertyless[36], or "level down quite as much as it levels up."[37] Democracy would be the nemesis of liberty as political equality would be the first step to "real Equality" which it is wholly impossible establish without "destroying liberty".[38]

Lord Hugh Cecil maintained that charity, on a compulsory basis was inconsistent with the munificent ethic of Christianity as responsible agents could only realise their capacity for goodness in a system that promoted charity on a voluntary basis. Thus, conservatives could only sustain their identity as authentic Christians in a competitive system which Lord Hugh Cecil believed promoted beneficence.[39]

The Liberty and Property Defence League, founded in 1882, propogated a doctrine which was representative of this trend for conservatism to become associated with liberal values. Though the major source of its doctrine was Herbert Spencer by the turn of the century it was regarded as an association for the propogation of conservatism.[40] It harmonised the doctrines of liberty, evolution, natural selection, science, efficiency, and progress. One of its ideologues wrote:

> We should be very careful, lest in combating poverty by the aid of authority, we fall into slavery. When we invoke the aid of authority to combat evils other than poverty, we should beware lest we play into the hands of those who would involve us in slavery in their mistaken efforts to put an end to poverty.[41]

Perhaps the most sustained and coherent diatribe of collectivism to come from a conservative was that of the prolific W.H.Mallock. He was both a vigorous pamphleteer of the Liberty and Property Defence League and wrote profusely for the London Municipal Society

W.H. Mallock systematically opposed socialism by a 'scientific', economic justification, theoretical and statistical, of a capitalist elite, stressing that elite is efficiency in producing well being for all and hence social stability. The modern development of knowledge, of industrial methods and machinery, Mallock wrote, only arose from the operation of oligarchy or, in other words, from the exercise of exceptional ability by great individuals. He wrote that no community can become or remain civilised which does not reward these great men adequately.[43] His conviction was that society was essentially atomistic, spontaneously generating competition and individual achievement, rather than naturally fostering cooperation like the relations of reciprocity and dependency of the members of an organism.[44] Mallock completed his defence of conservatism against socialism by elaborating those premisses based on utilitarian psychology, the individualist nature of society, and the primary importance of competition. The presence of wealth within society, for Mallock, was like a developing solution passing over a negative which reveals inequalities but does not cause them.[45] He contradicted the Marxist axiom that capital is fossilised labour by asserting that it is rather, fossilised business ability. However, these liberal values were combined with thought of a more pessimistic and authoritarian kind. After being influenced by Robert Michels, Mallock argued that political democracy was impossible without the cooperation of oligarchy.[46]

There is abundant evidence that the libertarian conservatism of the preceding thinkers was representative of a trend for liberal values to be successfully combined with conservatism, as it is a conservative standpoint that has been sustained. Even during the depths of the economic depression of the inter-war years, when

confidence in laissez-faire was at its nadir, J.F.C.Hearnshaw maintained that adherence to the conviction that self-help afforded the only hope for popular welfare constituted the criterian of authentic conservatism.[47] And Aubrey Jones defined conservatism as the "doctrine of freedom" in the aftermath of World War II when popular acclamation of the notion of a Welfare State and managed economy were widespread.[48]

Indeed, in the post-war era libertarian conservatism has flowed rather than ebbed as many conservatives believed World War II had discredited totalitarianism. A 'neo-liberal' school has developed among conservatives which maintains that political and economic liberty are indivisible because economic and political spheres are inter-related.[49]

The two most important and systematic advocates of the libertarian strand of modern British conservatism in the post-war era have been Michael Oakeshott and Enoch Powell. The latter's advocacy of libertarian conservatism is exemplified by his belief that government intervention should be restricted to non-economic fields like defence, health, and education, as wholly autonomous economic processes are the condition for progress.[50] His conviction that the terms 'free economy' and 'free society' are inter-changable is typical of the 'neo-liberals'.[51]

The presence of liberal values within Michael Oakeshott's conservatism is so salient that he has been called a 'libertarian Whig'.[52] His libertarian conservatism is found at its most felicitous in his essay 'On the Character of a Modern European State.'[53] He contrasts two forms of associations That of 'societas' in which men are related in terms of legality and not a common substantive purpose; and

'universitas' in which men recognise themselves to be engaged upon the joint enterprise of seeking some common want. If a state is understood in terms of the latter, which Oakeshott thinks it commonly and mistakenly is, government may be said to be "teleocratic".[54] He evaluates the latter as an "inherently compulsory association" in which : "Each is the property of the association, an item of its capital resources."[55]

The libertarian conservatism of Oakeshott and powell is representative of a fair consensus among modern British conservatives. Timothy Raison reckons that Conservatives should put more emphasis on competition, which he believed the only source of social harmony and progress.[56] This has been reiterated by David Howell.[57]

Rhodes Boyson has implored his fellow conservatives that the cause of Britain's crisis is that of an overbearing government.[58] Finally, Lord Hailsham, another contempory British Conservative, has contrasted 'elective dictatorship', which he believes the paradoxical effect of modern democracies, with his ideal of limited government, the accompaniment of a society in which power is diffused. For the promotion of this liberal ideal: "conservatives... who were the natural enemies of the liberals in the nineteenth century, are, or rather should be, their natural allies in the twentieth".[59]

The progenitor of the collectivist strand of modern British conservatism and its most significant exponent was Benjamin Disraeli. As the leader of 'Young England', Disraeli advocated a popular and socially responsible Toryism appealing to the masses through paternalistic reform, though he never crystalised this inaction.[60] He identified the Tory Party as the national and democratic party.[61]

Lord Randolph Churchill developed the collectivists strand of modern British conservatism that Disraeli had initiated.[62] Moreover, Curzon's disparagement of the "war of classes" and his tirades against what he regarded as the mercenary exaltation or tyrannical coercion of the working classes by capitalists[63], was representative of the paternalism that had become established as an authentic conservative stand point by the latter decades of the nineteenth century.

Rather than provide a detailed narrative of those conservatives whose prescriptions afford a felicitous expression of the collectivist strand of modern British conservatism I think the little space that this thesis permits on Ludovici's conservative contempories is better expended on those conservatives who expressed admiration for fascism. This digression is appropriate to this context because the British conservatives that did express admiration for fascism were, like Ludovici, those whose conservatism is located in the collectivists strand. Pierse Loftus, whose conservatism is representative of the latter, complained that after Sadler, Oastler, and their friends had passed away, Toryism had become associated with plutocrats whom, he thought, had abnogated the duties that possession of wealth should entail.[64] Like a few others whose conservatism was in the collectivist strand during the inter-war years, he was to make his brand of conservatism look like fascism. He wrote that Toryism appealed "to the subconscious rather than the conscious"[65] and that the "Vocational Senators" and "Aristocracy of Talent" of a corporate state, eschewing a multi-party system is the organisation of society most conducive to popular welfare.[66]

Among British conservatives of the inter-war years, Christopher Dawson's conservatism and that of T.S.Eliot were, perhaps, the most contiguous to fascism. T.S. Eliot lamented the evanescence of what he called 'organic society' and its 'organic relationships' between people as society, he thought, had deteriorated in its inward and outward manifestations.[67] He attributed this to what he called the age of free exploitation and liberalism, that he hoped had passed.[68] T.S. Eliot believed that only in a society that possessed the ordered articulation of classicism, in contrast to the 'waste land' of contempory society, could his strictly classical ideal in literature and the arts be attained - the pre-condition for a flourishing and intergrated culture. He thought the ideologies of totalitarian states were incompatible with his values, but their practices "might be more or less tolerable "[69] for his ideal of an integrated culture. Indeed, he wrote:

> It is a part of my thesis that the culture of the individual is dependent upon the culture of a group or class, and that the culture of the group or class is dependent upon the culture of the whole society to which that group or class belongs.[70]

Nevertheless, T.S. Eliot did not advocate a uniform culture which is one of his many conservative qualifications to his admiration for fascism. Rather, culture should be stratified and the creation of hereditary co-operative classes integrated by "a continuous gradation of cultural levels", with corresponding gradations of power.[71]

Christopher Dawson hoped that fascism was the nemesis of laissez-faire.[72] He deprecated the liberal regime which it succeeded, for its immorality, irresponsibility, and individualism.[73] If totalitarian practices for creating unanimity were applied to a

revived Christianity mans salvation could be realised:

> Better perhaps that the State should organise our culture than that it should be left to the mercenary leadership of the popular press and the financial exploitation of its intellectual and moral weaknesses.[74]

He desired a controlled and authoritarian direction of culture.[75] As he thought the totalitarian regimes offered man a deeper spiritual life they were preferable to a constitutional democracy.[76]

Walter Elliot's assertion that "Toryism is not and cannot be a creed of logic"[77], and his assimilation of Bergson's notion of the 'life force' into his conservatism made it suspiciously resemble fascism. He wrote that the dry bones of organisation which the corporate state entailed had come together in the felsh of the Italian Fascist movement.[78]

It might be contended that these virtual panegyrics of fascism by conservatives during the inter-war years should be excused as contemporaneously fascism had a different meaning. This is plausable for the nineteen twenties[79] when even the special correspondent to the Daily Mail regarded Mussolini's Italy as Europes saviour from bolshevism.[80] However, it is implausable for the subsequent decade.[81]

Furthermore, the collectivist strand of modern British conservatism was in some cases reconciled withthe advocacy of a corporate state that is, the unification of what had been self governing industries by a national committee representing them and other interests, including the State.[82] They were intrigued by corporatism as a model of national unity although they were repelled by aspects of fascist

politics which had accompanied it. They wanted a form of political organisation that would establish order and hierarchy in the national life, not just in the economy. However, they saw no need for a fascist party or movement, or for a campaign to destroy an internal enemy. They believed that neither the advocacy nor the implementation of corporatist organisation necessitated fascist disregard of the established law and constitution.

Both Sir Arthur Salter, a former high ranking civil servant[83], and Hugh Sellon an aspiring Conservative politician[84], welcomed what they regarded as the end of laissez-faire and advocated extensive planning. Lord Eustace Percy, who had been Conservative Minister for Education between 1924 and 1929, claimed that the significance of the revolutions in Italy and Germany resided in their being the revolt of men who had rebelled against the sham equality of both democracy and socialism. Fascists had recreated those conditions, amongst their fellow nationals, which satisfied man's primal yearning for authority and equality. He suggested that fascist or totalitarian government afforded many examples, in which the principles of authority and equality had been realised, on which Conservative politicians should model the government of Britain.[85] Subsequently, he wrote that :
"in days of crisis... Tory principles sanction and indeed require, an exercise of leadership and compulsory authority more far reaching than the principles of any other school of thought. "[86]

Roy Glenday, economic advisor to the Federation of British Industries , outlined a system of government in which "the mass would have it's leader; the leader would act on his own responsibility. The dictatorship would have a popular foundation."[87] He advocated

a new form of communal life in which the suppression of individualism would be a necessary phase.[88] In 1935 Leo Amery, in a book sympathetic to Mussolini and Fascist Italy, reckoned that Britain must reconcile herself to a world that was receding from laissez-faire and becoming increasingly characterised by isolated and controlled national economies.[89] Even Sir Winston Churchill, in the Romanes Lecture of 1930, doubted if institutions based on adult suffrage could reach the right decisions upon the intricate propositions of modern business and finance, which government was increasingly concerned with.[90]

However, I am not claiming that the conservatives who expressed admiration for fascism in the inter-war years, or, those who advocated corporatism, are fascists. But, that their conservatism is located in the collectivist strand of modern British conservatism. Furthermore, this does not mean that all collectivist conservatives in the inter-war years either expressed admiration for fascism, or advocated corporatism. Harold Macmillan, whose conservatism has been one of the most significant contributions to the collectivist strand of modern British conservatism, claimed in 1927, with other Conservatives that the Conservative Party must increasingly be identified with policies of collectivism, for both electoral and governmental success, as the epoch of laissez-faire had passed.[91] By 1933 he had wholly accepted the idea of extensive government planning as a pre-requisite for national economic success.[92] A fundamental axiom of his conservatism was: "the collective responsibility of all citizens of a society to each citizen individually."[93] Furthermore, he operated among a group who from the nineteen twenties were known as the 'Young Conservatives', the more prominent members of which were Duff Cooper, Anthony Eden, Noel Skelton, Oliver Stanley, Rob Hudson, Robert Boothby, and later Terence O'Connor.[94] Their collectivism

fructified in the Industrial Charter of 1947.[95]

Indeed, the collectivist strand has been especially evident in the post-war era with the acceptance by conservatives of expanded government activity and the Welfare State. In 1947, David Clarke wrote that the government should set the objectives and the standards of industrial activity;[96] whilst, in 1948, Bernard Braine thought Conservative policies should match the needs and aspirations of the people.[97] Perhaps the most significant contribution to the collectivist strand in the post-war era has been that of R.A. B.Butler, with his concern that: "the need in our modern democracy is to associate the Tory with progressive and humane concerns"[98]

Although this thesis does not permit a thorough investigation of the collectivist and libertarian strands of modern British conservatism I think it worth mentioning that Joseph Chamberlain with his perception that political power had shifted to the working classes provided impetus to the collectivist strand. A similar impetus was afforded to the libertarian strand during the inter-war years with the ailing fortunes of the Liberal Party and the defection of many of its supporters, including Ernest Benn, into the ranks of the Conservative Party.

This dichotomy of modern British Conservatism into collectivism and libertarianism has been similarly recognised by Samuel Beer[99], Harvey Glickman[100], and Sir Ernest Barker[101]. Unlike a recent study[102] I would locate Ludovici's conservatism within the collectivist strand of this dichotomy. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text-book for Tories. Ludovici tells us that the legislature tolerated "that laziest, stupidest, and cruellist of all principles, laissez-faire", unlike the wise check it had received in earlier Tudor and

Stuart times.[103] He submitted that it was on the battlefields of Edge Hill, Marston Moor and Naseby that trade first advanced in open hostility against tradition, quantity against quality, capitalistic industry against agriculture and the old industry of the guilds, vulgarity against trade, machinery against craftmanship.[104] All contempory ugliness and vulgarity were "baptised Puritan and Non-conformist in the blood of the cavaliers sacrificed on the battlefield of the Grand Rebellion."[105] Even the reforms that shaftesbury secured were terribly belated. Thousands were maimed, crippled and killed before the evils which he discovered were suppressed[106] the old conscience-stiller which Darwin and his school flung to thee conscience-stricken, by telling them that all the aching misery and the cruel struggle led invariably to the survival of the fittest, should cease and no longer be believed.[107] Charles I did not fight for despotism but for the welfare of the people. He opposed the fighters for parliamentary supremacy because it was:

> ...simply coveted for the liberty which it gave to those in power to indulge their lusts of private gain and private greed, unfettered by a ruler who, while standing apart from all factions, could rule for the benefit of all.[108]

Corolated with the above was the development of mechanical science, with its contrivances of all kinds calculated to increase the rapidity of production without concerning itself in any way with the character of the workmen who were to operate these machines.[109] The Long Parliament was not an assembly of decent men, but a pack of mercenaries.[110] It represented the ruthless force of rapacious vulgarity and trade.[111] The anomoly of the Grand Rebellion is that it was a fight against the poorer people and the King, for the 'liberties' of the people.[112] For Ludovici the Industrial Revolution

was: "the inhuman and hideous brutality of the enslavement by one race of its own members." [113] He attributed part of the blame for its occurrence on the English nobility whose lack of public spiritedness contributed to rather than discouraged it. [114] Only Charles I, the whole of his government and lieutenants, were inspired by the sacred watch word of public spiritedness: "'Respect the Burden.'" [115] The dignity of wealth and the social duties of property had repeatedly been desecrated by generations of plutocrats since the Grand Rebellion. [116] Ludovici believed Vicount Bolingbroke would have confirmed his contention that: "the ruler is essentially a protector, and only where men see or exercise superiority do they always see and experience protection. Superior power is and always has been the shelter of the weak." [117] Aristocracies who imagine that they can rule hedonistically and egotistically without the consent of the people are bound to fail and be swept away. [118] Only Charles I satisfied Ludovici's aristocratic ideal by his insight, dauntless courage, fearless and desperate sense of duty to the people. [119]

If I may digress, Ludovici's predilection for aristocracy is consistent with his lineage. His ancestry, as the name implies, were of Italian origin from Bologna. Under Pope Gregory XV (who was Alexander Ludovisi) his family was ennobled, and attained to great power as members of the Venetian nobility. This line continued until it became extinct in the person of Ludovici, Prince of Piombino, General of the Fleet of Galleys of the Kingdom of Naples, who left an only daughter, Princess of Piombino, who married Ludovisi of Rome. Then the line proceeds.

The original coat of arms (Bologna) is a shield with alternate stripes of red and gold, which becomes the top or chief of those of Rome.

That of the new Ludovici of Piombino is the second quartering, with the Lion of Venice as the chief and the mota broken below. The significance of the broken wheel is unknown. The third quartering, a white eagle, is a coat of augmentation granted for some personal service. The fourth quartering is the same as the first, repeated for the sake of symmetry.[120]

In his A Defense of Conservatism, Ludovici claims that for five hundred years the English people had looked to their gentlemen to lead and to defend their liberties.[121] He quoted Disraeli to indicate their mutual belief that:

> "The proper leaders of England are the gentlemen of England. If they are not the leaders of the people I do not see why they should be gentlemen. Yes, it is because the gentlemen of England have been negligent of their duties and unmindful of their station that the system of professional agitation, so ruinous to the best interests of the country, has arisen in England."[122]

So effectively did Charles I bind the populace to the cause of monarchy that his successors on the throne were able to indulge in the worst abuses without bringing monarchy into discredit.[123] He was the staunch defender of the qualitative values that had been the paramount preoccupation of the Middle Ages. Workmen and tradesmen combined to maintain a standard of quality in the work or goods they produced and purveyed. The guilds which were the outcome of these combinations, punished breaches of technical conscientiousness, or of fair-dealing with severity. The craft guildsmen of the Middle Ages insisted on maintaining quality'" for the honour of their guild"', and their system of regulations was '"intended to check fraud and maintain the corporate good name of their craft."'[124] Charles I, whom Ludovici thought was the first

great Tory, strove to secure the welfare of the people throughout his reign. This aim has characterised the best conservatives down to Disraeli who maintained: ""Power has only one duty; to secure the welfare of the people.""[125] For Ludovici, the conservative should believe in private property, but not private property divorced from responsibility.[126] Ludovici censored Conservatives for their tendancy, duringthe preceding 50 years, to identify themselves with capitalists and co-operate with Liberals. He conceived it as one of his political tasks to correct their deviation.[127] Conservatives should follow the lead of the greatest conservative, Charles I, who secured the personal freedom and happiness of the people by protecting them from the rapacity of their employers in trade and manufacturing, but also against the oppression of the mighty and the great. In this paternalism Charles I revealed the only attitude which constitutes the means for preserving the nations identity.[128] The Tories should have kept to their public-spirited tradition, of which Charles I was the epitome, and ensured the welfare of the working classes. Ludovici commended the factory measures of 1874, 1878, 1891, 1895, and 1901, which all tended to improve the condition of the worker, and to protect his life and limb. But, he castigated the Conservative Party as these measures were belated and mainly inspired by private individuals. The only redeeming feature was the presence of two Tories, Michael Thomas Sadler and Lord Ashley, among the pioneer agitators for factory reform.[129] The only important treatises on conservatism that Ludovici thought Englishmen were responsible for, are those of Bolingbroke and Disraeli.[130] The line of cleavage in English politics is between the Tories plus the people on the one hand, and the Liberals plus the manufacturers, the big traders, and the exploiters of the people on the other.[131] Therefore, Winston Churchill's claim at

The time of the General Strike that society is divided into those who stand for capital and those who stand for socialism, was inaccurate:

> ...particularly, as when he announced it, he drew the unjustifiable conclusion that the political fight of the future would be between a coalition of Conservatives and Liberals on the one hand, and Labour on the other.[132]

Indeed, the line of cleavage in English politics could not, according to Ludovici, lie between capitalism and socialism:

> ...It lies between the Tories plus the people on the one hand, and the Liberals and Socialists of all classes plus the exploiters of Labour on the other. for that Socialists are the exploiters of the people, whatever they may say to the contrary is clearly to be read from their doctrine. They simply stand for a more machine-like organisation of the industrial community. They rob the people not only of their belongings but also of their character.[133]

We are told that Lord Firle, an aristocratic hero in What Woman Wishes, held Disraelian beliefs. He thought his brothers' actions, Rupert had gone to America and Henry to China, and their refusal to enter politics, were unpatriotic and a selfish desertion of the Conservative Party.[134] After hearing A. M. Landrassy's speech to the 1900 Club, Lord Firle proclaimed: "'Its the best thing I've heard since, as a boy, I listened to Disraeli discussing the Compensation for Disturbance Bill'".[135] Again, this locates Ludovici's ideal of conservatism in the Disraelian tradition.

Ludovici's collectivist conservatism is evident in his notion that private property should always be associated with duty and responsibility. He praised the ancient Greeks for their reluctance to grant or admit absolute individual ownership as readily as the Romans did. The compulsory readjustment of wealth and property in ancient Greece, unlike the Agrarian Laws of the Gracchi, were successfully maintained. There were inumerable public services which the wealthy were called upon and expected to perform. Although wealthy Romans also performed public services, they were more voluntary than those of the Greeks and prompted by ostentation.[136] Ludovici attributed this to the absence of Aristotle's "balanced view" in Rome. Aristotle, in his Politics, defends private ownership as being economically superior because all men regard more what is their own; as being a source of pleasure; and as being more conducive to the development of character. However, he insists repeatedly on the desireability of blending private with communal ownership.[137] Ludovici accepted Aristotle's position [138] and turned to history to vindicate his collectivist notion of property as it will: "at least enable us to see the different institutions of civilised mankind in the process of working, and to judge of their viability and worth by the extent of their endurance."[139] After the return of the Jewish exiles from their captivity in Babylon in the sixth century BC, and their reguilding of the Temple, it was found that the community they formed in Judah developed all the injustices and symptoms of appression that Ludovici believed inseparable from uncontrolled conditions of wealth.[140] It was left to Nehemiah to forbid usury and effect a re-distribution of property confiscated for debts. The speed with which similar evils called forth similar remedies, Ludovici believed, is shown by the fact that not later than the fifth

century BC in China, about a century after the introduction of money, and therefore of the means of accumulating wealth, the Chinese were already recommending the control of capital.

Ancient legislatures such as Solon, Pericles, Lycurgus, and Agis, had recourse to re-distribution to try to avert catastrophe.[141] Throughout the history of Athens we are constantly reminded of the conditional nature of the original proprietary rights and of the sound prejudice against excessive accumulation, by the innumberable services imposed upon and expected of the rich. The Athenian democracy financed its administration from exactions from the wealthy and also tried to prevent gross accumulation of property in private hands.

The development in Rome was slightly different, according to Ludovici. The history of Rome reveals a steady encroachment of absolute private ownership upon conditional ownership, or ownership bound up with duties and obligations, with a consequent accumulation of large fortunes in the hands of a few, and all the resulting evils of such a condition.[142] Although the bulk of the ultimate private owners of the land had either descended, or had bought their land, from the Possessores (men who had only conditional or usufructuary rights granted by the community as a whole) when the two Gracchi attempted by their Agrarian Laws, to effect a re-distribution of land, these mere possessores, who had no right of private ownership in the land, protested as if Tiberius and Gaius were perpetuating an act of robbery. The reforms attempted by these brothers came to nothing, and by 111 BC nearly all the land, which had been public property, had passed into private hands. Rome, after 167 BC was able to abolish the tributum civium Romanorum and gradually to complete the conversion

of conditional or communal, into private land tenure, without causing an insurrection among its despoiled and impoverished citizens, whom it fed and amused gratuitously. Only a small re-distributions of land occurred under Caesar, Nerva and Septimius Severus, while the last remains of cultivated public lands in Italy were sold to be given away by the Flavian Emperors.

Likewise, England, thanks to the enormous development of her industries and wealth, began to be able, after the sixteenth century, to support a huge and increasing population of dispossessed people without too much material hardship, or, at any rate, without enough of it to cause an upheaval.[143] With the decay of feudalism, the system of responsible proprietory rights, which received so important an impetus from Henry VIII and has lasted to the present day, was firmly resisted by Elizabeth and Charles I each of whom took firm steps to control capital, to prevent it accumulating in a few hands, and to impose upon the new, independent rich, certain duties towards the community. Ludovici believed Charles I had sacrificed his head in the prosecution of these collectivist aims. However, the party in favour of laissez-faire won the day:

> ...With rapid strides, the foundations of the present capitalistic system were completed, and in the few years that separated the Long Parliament struggle with Charles I for a free hand, and the passing of one or two statutes in Charles II's reign, which extended the capitalists policy to the land, the new era was successfully launched.[144]

Ludovici concludes from his survey of the history of proprietary rights that great civilisations have without exception been observers of the right of private property. But, that: "everywhere this right has been to some extent limited,

particularly in regard to the land."[145] He believed that capitalism or the irresponsible administration of wealth combined with large accumulations of it in a few hands, when accompanied with a vast multitude of disinherited or destitute people, led to recurrent abuses and errors.[146]

Charles I and his supporters fell, and he ultimately died in the struggle with the factions who were ultimately responsible for laissez-faire. Though Charles I died as a self-professed 'martyr of the people', those of his prominent and influential supporters who survived him, attempted the continuation of his beneficent policies, and in so doing became known as the party associated with the Crown: "Thus began the Tory tradition of supporting the Crown and championing the popular cause."[147] Indeed, Ludovici proclaimed, can we wonder at the anger of venal shopkeepers, merchants and tradesman, and the more unscrupulous among the governing classes, when all the measures of Charles I's patriarchal rule are reviewed - his opposition to the rapacious lords and the country gentry, his intolerance of the theft of the Church and poor funds by provincial magnates, his firm resolve to sustain the spirit of the working masses against those who wished to depress and oppress them, and his determination to administer justice irrespective of rank and power: "For it was persons of the highest quality who were daily cited to the High Commission Court 'for incontinence', or some other misdemeanour in their lives."[148]

Mr. Thomas Sefton-Smith, in Poet's Trumpeter, finally 'succeeds' in the commercialised literary world after a life of obscurity. He soon becomes negligent of his duties to his family and domestic servant, Mary Barker. One night, when stricken with worry about

his neglect of Mary Barker, he accidentally disturbs an oil lamp and perishes amidst his unpublished poetry.[149] An obituary appears in the Meteor, a liberal evening newspaper, written by Sebastion Squeeze, a supercilious, untalented and jealous rival of Mr. Sefton-Smith. It was a hurriedly written production, consisting of faint abuse of the poet and veiled abuse of his supporters. It hinted at his lack of education, suggested that the enthusiasm over his work would prove to have been exaggerated, and acknowledged his merits only in guarded terms.[150] However, Mary Barker had memorised all Sefton-Smith's destroyed poems. The BBC sends her a letter offering her money for broadcast recitations. But, Ivy, Mr. Sefton-Smith's daughter, had destroyed it through her greed. Subsequently, it transpires that as Mr. Sefton-Smith's poems were unpublished Mary Barker has sole right to their copyright.[151] Through her extreme kindliness she gives eighty seven per. cent. of the royalites from the publication of her deceased masters poetry, and twelve and a half per. cent. from her recitations and broadcasts to Mr. Sefton-Smith's family.[152] Ivy Sefton-Smith receives her nemesis:

> . Meanwhile, Ivy chastened by all that had happened since the night of the fire, and having somehow learnt that a policy of rigid individualism and a keen eye to the main chance did not in the long run pay among civilised mortals, had passed through a long period of shame and confusion, from which she had at last emerged a saner and wiser person.[153]

When Mr. Sefton-Smith had suddenly risen to fame Professor Bevington, a scientist and long-standing admirer of his, and the members of the poets family, who deserved no commendation, were all mentioned as among those who had long known of the high quality of Mr. Sefton-Smith's poetry. Mary Barker, the dutiful servant who was the first and most energetic admirer of Mr. Sefton-Smith's

poetry and had been responsible for his recognition, received no credit.[154] Just before her master had "perished in a conflagration fed by his own life work"[155], Professor Bevington had dismissed his feckless housekeeper, Mrs. Wright, and appointed Mary Barker, who had been neglected during the period of her master's 'success', as her replacement. Ludovici comments: "How important it is for human beings to be treated as if they mattered!"[156]

Ludovici was aggrieved that work for the vast majority of Westerners meant doing not only what they dislike, but activities that were an affront to dignity and a menace to health.[157] From its origins, Western civilisation had acted on the presupossition that no matter how many disagreeable new or old fatigues its many complications might require to be done, the necessary personnel to do them could always be found on threat of starvation.[158] Ludovici advocated a way of life in which forced labour would not be part of its arrangements.[159]

Fundamentally, as Ludovici believed that English history, since the Grand Rebellion, bore no trace of the ethic of noblesse oblige what could he be conserving? His works comprise a tirade against the record of the Conservative Party in English history. He wrote in his A Defense of Aristocracy. A text-book for Tories that during the nineteenth century and after the Tories had great opportunities to take the place of the Crown in England as the patriarchal rulers of the community, and vindicate Disraeli's promise that: '"power has but one duty: to secure the social welfare of the people."'[160] They failed the people:

> But they missed their opportunity. probably they did not even see it. For there are some of them even today who will be found to declare that such statements as I have just quoted from Disraeli are Radical, and not susceptible of adoption by Tories in any way whatsoever! Thus they allowed things to go their own way, and obeyed the stupid indolent behest 'laissez-faire.' [161]

Ludovici recounted an experience of his in 1915, when the journal Land and Water which contained a review of his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories came into the hands of his colonel. Ludovici claimed that he would not easily forget the indignant and suspicious manner in which his colonel questioned Ludovici on that subject: "In his thinly veiled reprimand, there was all the idealism and romantic allusions of the first decade of the century and yet he regarded himself as an out-and-out-Conservative."[162]

Ludovici severely reprimanded Conservative leaders in the early months of 1922for theiracquiescence in the Coalition Government led by David Lloyd-George. Their disinclination to break with the Coalition Government indicated their "utter bankruptcy." The Conservative Party had shown it was incapable of leading.[163] It lacked momentum because it had no programme.[164] If Lord Balfour, Lord Birkenhead, and Mr. Austen Chamberlain were in the least inspired by a strong conservative faith, they could not have thus abandoned their party; "We may therefore conclude that the official Conservative Party, as represented by its old figure-heads is as dead as the Liberal Party which used to oppose it."[165] He believed the field of conservative ideas, and conservative solutions to modern problems, lay practically unexplored.[166] Ludovici reiterated this claim in his A Defense of Conservatism and cited it as one of his reasons for believing that conservatism had failed in England.[167] The Conservative Party had been ignorant of

conservative principles throughout its history.[168] Mere 'journalists' had filled the vaccuum that had been created by the absence of any conservative political thought in England.[169] The failure of Conservative statesmen and thinkers to maintain the high standard of realism requisite for sustaining conservatism as a practical and sound political policy, had led to much confusion and to the framing of much unconservative legislation on the part of Conservatives themselves. Ludovici thought the Tory reader of history, like himself, could only be astonished to find his party committing themselves to programmes and policies extremely remote from the tenets of his political creed.[170] Significantly, Chapter III of his A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories is entitled: "The English Aristocrat as a Failure in the Tutorship of Ruling." [171] Whilst Chapter IV of his A Defense of Conservatism is entitled: "A Criticism of the Conservative in Practice."[172] In the latter book he asserts that the Tories did nothing to shield the nation from the worst consequences of the Industrial Revolution.[173] Never was there a better opportunity for applying the fundamental principles of Toryism, but:

> The misery of the people ultimately compelled the people to seek their salvation in self-government. That is the best comment on the way in which Toryism availed itself of the chance it had been given towards the close of the eighteenth and during the first decades of the nineteenth century(his italics).[174]

The fact that that public health was virtually unrecognised by the legislature when Victoria ascended the throne, Ludovici thought adequately demonstrated the neglect by Tories of their sacred duties.[175] The Tories never understood one of their most elementary duties - the care of the body and of health among the people - and paved the way for popular discontent and revolt.[176] Only in 1860, after the

inspiring example of private individuals like Sir Edwin Chadwick and Sir John Simon, did a Conservative government, led by Lord Derby, pass the Sanitary Act. Ludovici thought its belatedness indicated that the concept of sound Conservative government had deteriorated.[177] With regard to factory legislation, Ludovici thought it was notorious that, despite the enormous changes which had taken place in the social condition of the people, since the accession of George III, and which demanded the wise interference of the legislature, no Tory administration took any effective steps to mitigate the evils created by the Industrial Revolution.[178] Conservatives have, according to Ludovici, concerned themselves too little with ideas of any sort whatsoever, and have taken pride in distrusting intellectualism as such, when they had neither taste nor character to fall back upon.[179] Indeed, Ludovici thought the charge of stupidity which he believed was so often and so frivolously levelled against the Conservative Party of the nineteenth century, represented a certain portion of the truth.[180] For: "when it is said that Conservatives have sufferred for many generations, either from ignorance or a total lack of doctrinal guidance, we have a good deal of evidence to substantiate our claim."[181] In the vital department of government concerning public health, so essential to a sound Conservative administration, Ludovici thought England might well have been without any Tory or Conservative administration until the late nineteenth century.[182] He thought it impossible to absolve the Tory Party of the chief blame for social strife, because they are the only party whose principles might have enabled them to save the situation.[183] The fact that the Tory Party failed to see itself as the national and popular party, and failed to see this task as necessary: "is probably the best evidence we have of its universally alleged lack of intelligence and ideas."[184] The threat of Mr.Asquith to the House of Lords, that they either pass the Parliament Bill or he would create peers

wholesale, was actually in pursuance of a Tory precedent, first used by Harley's Tory administration in 1711.[185] But, this was not the only respect in which Ludovici thought Conservatives were implicated in the "crime" of 1911. They were also implicated:

> ...through their lack of political acumen and historical knowledge, which allowed them to look on more or less cowed and helpless while they were being identified with the Gradgrinds of the Liberal Party and the Whig chauffers of the Capitalistic Juggernaut whose car had flattened down the working classes in the nineteenth century.[186]

Ludovici wrote of the arrogance of Conservative leaders which induced them to omit to organise a thinking body of conservatism. In consequence, they were devoid of sound ideas and policies.[187] Owing to their indolence and self-confidence, the Conservatives under Lord Derby had already set the precedent for adopting the ideas of other parties, by cutting the ground under Gladstone's feet and introducing a Reform Bill:

> Now the policy of trying to defeat your opponents and rivals by imitating and filching their ideas, might be justified as between manufacturers, retailers, or even caterers, but when it is pursued by allegedly opposed political parties, one of which pretended to stand for the conservation of all that was institutionally prescious in the nation, it is catastrophic. For, in the end, it can only culminate in driving the more radical and more socialistic party to ever greater extremes of Leftish policy, in order still to have something fresh to offer its supporters, which its opponents, the Conservatives, had not yet filched.[188]

Ludovici believed that in this way, through their indolence and ideological bankruptcy, Conservatives had been the instigators of extremes in the Labour Party's plans and outlook, which they deplore.[189] The Conservatives were at best a body of indolent opportunists who are only capable of immitating the actions and

performances of their more alert and better equipped competitors. Indeed, for Ludovici, conservatism had been absent from modern British politics for over a century.[190] He hoped that staunch conservatives, like he claimed to be, would doubt the credentials of modern Conservative governments to be in any respect the exponent of conservatism. He thought one of the Conservative Party's inveterate and fundamental shortcomings was that in the social levels from which its leading recruits, and administrative officers had been drawn, the distinguishing vices had always been sloth and ignorance:

> Too comfortable to see any urgency about enhancing their reputation in the country; Too well fed, housed and clothed to be driven by misery to scan the horizon anxiously for competent pilots and navigators of the ship of State, and too uncritically loyal to the old school, college and Parliamentary associates to exercise stern discipline over their friends in Office, or to exact from them a minimum standard of brain-power, efficiency and even information, Conservative administrations have for generations been so lacking in political wisdom, prescience and ability, and so defective in their grasp of their Party's history, doctrine and function that had a large section of the population in the commercial, industrial and propertied classes, not believed that their bank balances and other assets were better safeguarded byaParty ostensibly hostile to Socialism than by one properly wedded to it, they would have been swept from the political scene long ago.

This is why Ludovici believed Conservatives had drawn 'their' policies from anywhere. Even their most famous nineteenth century leader, Disraeli, was reckoned by Ludovici to be guilty of plagiarism. He recounted a personal experience of his at a luncheon party at which he, and others, were advocating a return of A. J. Balfour to power; '"God forbid!" he exclaimed with great feeling. "that would mean my hunting".'[191] Ludovici thought this accorded with their tradition of ignorance. The elder Pitt, amongst other Conservatives, admitted the only history of England

he had ever read was Shakespeare.[192] Whilst, just to select a few of the severe criticisms of Conservatives that Ludovici accepted, he agreed with both Beatrice Webb's and Lord Morley's verdicts that both A. J. Balfour and the Duke of Northumberland were of deficient intellect. Ludovici concludes his survey of the talents of modern British Conservative statesmen:

> ...from Lord Brougham, who in 1835 said of the English ruling caste, "The want of sense and reason, which prevails in these circles is wholly inexcusable", to Mr. T. C. Worsley who 105 years later, speaking of the Public Schools that rear the bulk of the recruits to the Conservative Party, said: "the result has been to saddle the nation with a body of leaders whose understanding of the world they live in is wholly inadequate", and who added that the same body of men "have landed us in the present mess" (meaning of the state of England just before World War II), the verdict is always the same. Nor can it be said that Mr. Worsley's treatise (Barbarians and Phillistines, London, 1940) where these strictures appear is unduly biassed.[193]

Ludovici's "great frankness" in indicating the defects of the Conservative Party that he alleged, was recognised by his contempories.[194] In What Woman Wishes, A. M. Landrassy, addressing the 1900 Club, explained why the Conservative Party had grown so appallingly weak. He explained that it was due in the first place to the arrogant incompetence of its ideological mentors, the Cecils; but secondly, and chiefly, to the fact that for years they had no constructive principles or programmes.[195] Again in his Man; An Indictment, Ludovici reiterates his claim that the Conservative Party is bankrupt of ideas.[196]

As Ludovici repudiated the Conservative Party for their corruption his task was to forge a new conservatism. His attempt to transform the meaning of conservatism is mainly to be found in his A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories.

and his A Defence of Conservatism, in which he defines his task as the elucidation of "a Conservative philosophy of the future."[197] He made no attempt to conceal the fact that his was a novel conservatism:

> ...although the philosophic attitude of Conservatism is at bottom quite unassailable and, when soundly understood and wisely implemented, its principles can defy all scrutiny and criticism, let us not make the fatal mistake of confounding it with what for generations has passed as 'Conservative' in England.[198]

In Ludovicis novel of 1921, What Woman Wishes, a 'Tory' movement is founded by its aristocratic heroes called the Friends of Order. Its headquarters in Pall Mall is described thus:

> In the outer office there was a small square writing table for a clerk, and another large and heavy round table, on which lay the current Tory periodicals, a few books on political subjects, and one or two works of reference. In the inner office, on the other hand, there was a long leather covered table, with leather covered chairs all around it, and a blotting pad to each chair; the walls were concealed from cornice to skirting by bookshelves containing almost all the literature of the counter-revolution from the nervous and forcible writings of the Syndicalist-Royalist Georges Sorel, to the cold and austere treatises of the post-Nietzscheans. There was even a corner for the poets, and one whole bookshelf over the mantelpiece was alotted to the modern Chinese and Japanese school of reactionaries; Ku-Hung-Ming, Okakura-Kakuzo, etc.[199]

The first notable event connected with the Friends of Order was the publication of A Handbook for Anti-Bolshevists.[200] At the beginning of the novel the hero, Lord Chiddingly, who lashed the Lower House with ill-concealed contempt, is arising young Tory. But, after having lost his seat in East St. Patricks to a Liberal in the General Election of 1918, he was endeavouring with the help of his father, Lord Firle, and Arthur Maximillian Landrassy,

to reconstitute the Conservative Party. In the War Parliament, to which he had been elected in 1915, he had attempted to teach the House the habits of thinking and acting on aristocratic lines, and to defend and protect the masses. He had just begun to earn the title of Lord George Bentinck Redivivus when the 1918 election had interrupted his Parliamentary career.[201] He had failed to discern any possible "cure" for the condition of the classes in England, until late in 1919 he had come across a book by Arthur Maximillian Landrassy called A Vindication of the Rule of the Best.[202] He learned from Landrassy that his recognition had been the first that he had received: "'I have been waiting for years. My misfortune had been the stupidity of the Tory Party.' And then he [Landrassy] added with a sigh: 'it is also their misfortune.'"[203] Thereafter, Lord Chiddingly saw to it that Landrassy wanted for nothing, and that his fame spread. Lord Chiddingly, with the help of Landrassy, begins to become regarded as promising a constructive Tory Party. They confer, and agree, that the Cecils' 'Brain Trust' has too long dominated English conservatism for the worse.[204] Lord Firle, the father of Lord Chiddingly, agrees to Landrassy's plan to form a society called the Friends of Order, and gives his pledge to Landrassy that he will be its President.[205] It was on November 11, 1920, just as the bustle and crush of the Armistice Anniversary was beginning to subside that Landrassy rose in the large and crowded dining room of the 1900 Club to address the members on his scheme for combating modern disorder. The Marquis of Firle introduced Landrassy to the well known Unionist and Tory peers who were present, and the large number of Unionists M. P.s, and he proclaimed that the author of The Vindication of the Rule of the Best was at last getting a hearing from the people whom he could teach something.[206] Landrassy then declared to those assembled

that while the chief aim of The Society of the Friends of Order would be to create a comprehensive programme which could stem the spread of socialism, its national object would consist in: "'solving current problems on Conservative lines and in giving a policy to the Tory Party.'"[207] Later in the novel, when the Society of the Friends of Order gains momentum, Lord Chiddingly, its leader, found himself becoming one of the most prominent and most talked about young politicans on the Tory side. And the more alert among the Conservative Party were beginning to look to him as one of their most important figures, if not as their future leader:

> ...Broken, discredited and impoverished as they were, thanks to the very much enervated family, whose leading member is Mr. A.J. Balfour, it was naturally with some excitement and self-congratulation that the Tories saw returning to them, in the persons of young men of the type of the future Marquis of Firle, Aubrey St. Maur [of Too Old for Dolls, (London: Hutchinson, 1920)], Captain Biggadyke [of French Beans, (London: Hutchinson, 1923)], etc., a kind of strength which had not been theirs for nearly two generations. Indeed, so accustomed had they become to the overweaning importance of the Cecils', that it was almost with incredulous wonder that they rubbed their eyes to descry the virile and magnetic group of young men that was beginning to take the place of these giants of high falutin' blandishments.[208]

Ludovici wrote that the field of conservative ideas and 'solutions' to modern problems lay practically unexplored. He suggested that an "unofficial" elite of thinkers should evolve a new conservatism and constitute a centre from which all public indoctrination in conservative ideas would have to emanate.[209] Ludovici believed that without the evolution of a new conservatism, that he proposed, the Conservative Party would be discredited and its only fate that of political extinction.[210] As Dr. Hale, in The Taming of Don Juan, says to his protege, Gilbert Milburn, after succeeding in getting him adopted as unofficial Conservative candidate for the Northern

division of Wessex: "'as your party is absolutely bankrupt both in ideas and good leaders, now is your chance to outline a new Conservative policy.'"[211] It will comprise the subject of the ensuing chapters to describe the radical changes that Ludovici desired in conservatism. It will be maintained that Ludovici rendered conservatism commensurable with fascism.

1. Noel O'Sullivan, Conservatism (London: Dent, 1976), pp.11-12.

2. Roger Scruton, A Dictionary of Political Thought (London: Macmillan, 1977), p.78.

3. Samuel P. Huntington, "Conservatism as an Ideology," American Political Science Review, volume 51, No.2, (June 1957), p.457.

4. Noel O'Sullivan, op.cit., p.29.

5. Robert Eccleshall, "British Conservatism as an Ideology," Political Studies, volume XXV, No.1, (March 1977), pp.62-82.

6. Noel O'Sullivan, op.cit., p.139ff.

7. Nigel Harris, Competition and the Corporate Society, (London: Methuen, 1972), pp. 254-256.

8. Michael Oakeshott, "Rationalism in Conservative Philosophy," Political Quarterly, volume 32, No.3, (July 1961), p.287.

9. Rob Jones, Traditionalism, Conservatism and the British Political Culture (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1974), pp. 71-72.

10. Anthony Quinton, The Politics of Imperfection, (London: Faber and Faber, 1978), p.10.

11. Geoffrey G. Faber, The Old Order (London: John Murray, 1914), p.97.

12. Rolden G. Wolin, "Burke and Conservatism," American Political Science Review, volume 48, part 4, (1954), p.1002.

13. Harold Laski, The Rise of European Liberalism (London) with a Preface (London: Allen and Unwin, 1922), p.146.

14. Samuel Beer, Reflections on Conservatism, (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1979), p.6.

15. Anthony Mario Radovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.9.

16. Ibid., p.2.

17. Ibid., p.1.

18. Ibid., pp. 34-35.

19. Ibid., p.37.

20. Ibid., p.60.

21. Ibid., pp. 136-137.

22. Ibid., p.194.

23. Ibid., p.191.

24. [illegible] Lords [illegible], [illegible] Debates, 5th Series, Volume 5, 1907), p.1021.

25. Cmd., "Report of the Committee on the Reform of the House of Lords", Cmd. No.10, (dated May 1918), p.247.

26. Cmd., "Report of the Conference on the Reform of the House of Lords, the Minutes of Evidence taken before the Conference, and Appendix", Cmd. No.1399, (dated February 1921), pp. 170-171.

27. Ibid., p.172.

28. Ibid., p. 173.

29. Ibid., "The Proposals of Coal Government (1921)," South African Archives, Volume 9, No.3, (March 1965), p.14.

30. Ibid., "The Proposed Method of Abolishing the Veto of a Second Chamber (Canada Returns, 1907), p.82.

31. W.T. Greenlock, "The Character of Modern British Conservatism," in Timothy Gray Eliot, ed., Modern British Conservatism, edited by Robert Kingsley, M.A., Ph.D., and D. Barrett, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1973) p.195.

32. Ibid., pp. 194-195.

33. James Bingham Stephen, Eliot, Hardy and Parliament (London: Longmans and Elder, 1873), p.80.

34. Lord Salisbury, The Salisbury Speech of Lord Salisbury (London: Constable, 1907), p.75.

35. Lord Salisbury "London Speech," 2nd September 1892; reprinted in Lord Salisbury et al., Lord Salisbury on Politics (Cambridge University Press, 1972), p.93.

36. Henry Thomas Paine, Lord Salisbury (London: John Murray, 1885), p. 302f.

37. W.T.S. Stead, Lord Salisbury, 2 volumes, (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1913), Volume II, p.131.

38. Gore, The Gore Ardwick Lectures, with Letters by Mr. Lord A.J. Balfour, (London: George Allen, 1908), p.215.

39. Lord Hugh Cecil, Conservatism (London: Williams and Norgate, 1912), p.96.

40. H. Holden, "Reference-Table on Home Rule Liberty and Property Defence League, 1882-1914," in Lloyd George, Liberty, edited by H.D. Brown (London: Hamilton, 1974), p.219.

41. Lloyd George Memorandum, Germany (London: Liberty and Property Defence League, 1914), p.22.

42. H.J. Hood, "H.M. Radicals and Socialism in England," in H.D. Brown op. cit., p.310.

43. H.W. Nelson, Aristocracy and Democracy (London: Allen and Unwin Press, 1898), p.276.

44. A.B. Cooper, "The Ethical Basis of the Victorian Constitution," University of Toronto Quarterly, Volume IV, No. 2, (January 1935), pp. 222-242.

45. W.H. Greaves, "The Evolution of Conflict," Social Science Review, Volume 41, January 1967, p.264.

46. ---, The Politics of Pure Democracy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1940), p.49.

47. J.P.G. Freeman, Democracy in England (London: Macmillan, 1933), p. 223.

48. Aubrey Jones, The Pendulum of Politics (London: Pelican and Penguin, 1946), p.207.

49. Carl J. Friedrich, "The Political Thought of Neo-Liberalism," American Political Science Review, Volume XXIX, No.2, (January 1935), pp. 209-225.

50. Milton Friedman, Capitalism and Freedom (London: Macmillan 1970), pp. 285-286.

51. J.L. Harold, Parties in a Free Society (London: Chatto, 1969), p.40.

52. W.H. Greenleaf, Gladstone's Philosophical Politics (London: Longman, 1966), p.82.

53. Michael Oakeshott, "On the Character of a Modern European State", in his On Human Conduct (Oxford University Press, 1975), pp.109-327.

54. Ibid., p.205.

55. Ibid., pp. 316-317.

56. Timothy Raison, Conflict and Conservatism (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1966), p.17.

57. David Howell, Edinburgh and Beyond (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1969), p.12.

58. Ruben Segura, Sobre Derecha (London: Temple Quill, 1970), p.72.

59. Quintin Hogg, Lord Hailsham, The Dilemma of Democracy (London: Collins 1970), p.39.

60. Paul Smith, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).

61. Benjamin Disraeli, Lord Beaconsfield, "Vindication of the English Constitution," 1835, reprinted in Ralph Nicholl, Speeches on Conservative Political Principles (London: John Murray, 1913), p.216.

62. Lord Randolph Churchill, "Tenth Report," Fortnightly Review Volume 33, May 1, 1883, p.

63. George H. Sabine, "The Conservation of Vested Interest," National Review, Volume XII, (March 1934), pp.325-327.

64. Lloyd George, The Truth about the Peace (London: Philip Allan, 1926), p.46.

65. Ibid., pp. 50-51.

66. Ibid., p.2532.

67. J.T. Davidson, The Constitutional Duty of Loyalty (London: Faber and Faber, 1936), p.14688.

68. C.L. Mowat, The Tory Mind (London: Watts and Co., 1939), p.10.

69. "Appendix" to Ibid., p.44.

70. Alan Bullock, The Life and Times of Ernest Bevin (Glasgow University Press, 1960), p.21.

71. Ibid., p.40.

72. Christopher Dawson, Religion and the Modern State (London: Sheed and Ward, 1936), p.12.

73. Ibid., p.133.

74. Idem., Beyond Politics (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1939), p.20.

75. Ibid., pp. 26-27.

76. Ibid., pp. 86-87.

77. Walter Elliot, Toryism and the Twentieth Century (London: Philip Allan, 1927), p.45.

78. Idem., "Foreword" to Harold E. Read and Major Guy, The Working of a Corporate State (London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1933), p.3.

79. P.G. Edwards, "The Foreign Office and Fascism, 1924-1929" Journal of Contemporary History Volume 5, No.2, (1970), p.155.

80. Sir Percival Phillips, The 'Red' Dream and the Blackshirts: The true story of the Fascist Movement (London: Daily Mail, 1929).

81. R.J. Overy, "The British Union, the Conservatives, and Mussolini, 1928-1934" Journal of Contemporary History Volume 5, No.2, (1970), pp. 168-182.

82. L.J. Carpenter, "Corporatism in Britain, 1930-1945" Journal of Contemporary History Volume 11, No.1 (1976), p.12.

83. Sir Arthur Salter, The Framework of an Ordered Society (Cambridge University Press, 1933), p.4.

84. Lord Bolton, Democracy and Dictatorship (London: Lovat Dickson, 1934), p.15.

85. Lord Eustace Percy, Government in Transition (London: Methuen, 1934), p.15.

86. Lord Eustace Percy,"The Conservative Attitude and Conservative Social Policy," in Conservatism and The Future, edited by T. Cook (London: William Heinemann, 1935), p.24.

87. Roy Glenda y, The Economic Consequences of Progress (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1934), pp.218-219.

88. Idem, The Future of Economic Society (London: Macmillan 1944), p.244.

89. Leo Amery, The Forward View (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1935), p.319.

90. Sir Winston Churchill, Parliamentary Government and the Economic Problem (Oxford University Press, 1930), p.9.

91. Robert Boothby, M.P., Harold Macmillan M.P., John de V. Loder, M.P., Oliver Stanley, M.P., Industry and the State: A Conservative View (London: Macmillan1927), pp.19-20.

92. Harold Macmillan, Reconstruction: A Plea for a National Policy (London: Macmillan, 1933), p.18.

93. Idem, The Middle Way (2nd ed., London: Macmillan, 1939), p.30.

94. Wind of Change, 1914-1939 (London: Macmillan, 1966), pp 177-178.

95. Idem, Tides of Fortune, 1945-1955 (London: Macmillan, 1969), pp.302-303.

96. David Clarke, The Conservative Faith in a Modern Age (London: Conservative Political Centre, 1947), p.29.

97. Bernard Braine, Tory Democracy (London: Falcon Press, 1948), p.65.

98. R.A.B. Butler, The Art of the Possible (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971), p.29.

99. Samual Beer, Modern British Politics (2nd ed., London: Faber and Faber, 1969), p.300ff.

100. Harvey Glickman, "The Toryness of English Conservatism," Journal of British Studies, Volume 1, No.1., (November 1961), p.14.

101. Sir Ernest Barker, Political Thought in England from 1848 to 1914 (2nd ed., reprint: Oxford University Press, 1959), p.109ff.

102. Rodney Barker, Political Ideas in Modern Britain (London: Methuen, 1978), pp. 200-201.

103. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), pp.43-44.

104. ibid., p.50.

105. ibid., p.51.

106. ibid., p.51.

107. ibid., p.83.

108. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), pp.130-131.

109. ibid., p.131.

110. ibid., p.151.

111. ibid., p.155.

112. ibid., p.161.

113. ibid., p.234.

114. ibid., p.101.

115. ibid., p.105.

116. ibid., p.288.

117. Viscount Bolingbroke, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., pp. 7-8.

118. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.14.

119. ibid., pp.161-162.

120. Albert Ludovici Jnr., An Artists Life in London and Paris, 1870-1925 (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1926), p.9.

121. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.29.

122. Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, quoted in Money and Buckle, Life of Disraeli, Volume III, p.101; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.30.

123. Anthony Mario Ludovici ibid.

124. Alfred Milnes, From Gild To Factory, p.45; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.43.

125. Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, quoted in A. Ponsonby, Religion in Politics, p.10; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.58.

126. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.59.

127. ibid., pp.75-76.

128. ibid., p.80.

129. ibid., p.128.

130. ibid., p.132.

131. ibid., p.213.

132. ibid., p.214.

133. ibid., p.216.

134. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), pp.27-28.

135. Anthony Mario Ludovici, What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), pp.83.

136. idem, The Sanctity of Private Property (London: Heath Cranton, 1932), p.15.

137. ibid., p.17.

138. ibid., p.18.

139. ibid., p.19.

140. ibid., p.20.

141. ibid., p.22.

142. ibid., p.23.

143. ibid., p.24.

144. ibid., p.28.

145. ibid., p.30.

146. ibid., p.31.

147. idem., English Liberalism (London: English Array, [1939]), p.26.

148. ibid., p.21.

149. David Valentine pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici , Poet's Trumpeter (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939), p.254.

150. ibid., p.260.

151. ibid., pp.275-276.

152. ibid., p. 282.

153. ibid., pp.283-284.

154. ibid., p.192.

155. ibid., p.263.

156. ibid., p.249.

157. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Work in Western Civilisation," Hibbert Journal, Volume 55, (October 1956), p.30.

158. ibid., p.31.

159. ibid., p.34.

160. Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, Sybil (London: Longmans Green & Co., 1889), p.312; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.102.

161. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.102.

162. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (2nd ed.; London: Constable, 1933), pp.xi-xii.

163. idem, "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, new series Volume 111 (June 1922), p.948.

164. ibid., p.49.

165. ibid., p.952.

166. ibid., p.969.

167. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.25.

168. ibid., p.26.

169. ibid., p.35.

170. ibid., p.75.

171. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), pp.77-103.

172. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp. 129-168.

173. ibid., p.88.

174. ibid., p.94.

175. ibid., p.97.

176. ibid., p.98.

177. ibid., p.99.

178. ibid., p.124.

179. ibid.,p. 131.

180. ibid., pp.136-137.

181. ibid., p.137.

182. ibid., p.139.

183. ibid., p.166.

184. ibid., p.167.

185. ibid., p.195.

186. ibid., p.197.

187. idem., "In Defence of Conservatism," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.2, (June 1955), p.6.

188. ibid.

189. ibid.

190. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "In Defence of Conservatism," South African Observer, Volume 1, No. 2.,(June 1955), p.7.

191. idem., "Britain's Conservative Statesmen," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.4., (August 1955), p.5.

192. ibid.,

193. ibid., p.6.

194. R.B. Kerr, Our Prophets [Studies of Living Writers] (Croydon: R.B. Kerr, 1932), p.95.

195. Anthony Mario Ludovici, What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.81.

196. idem., Man: An Indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.244.

197. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.v.

198. idem., "In Defence of Conservatism," South African Observer, Volume 1, No. 2., (June 1955), pp.6-7.

199. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), pp.94-95.

200. ibid., p.108.

201. ibid., p.23.

202. ibid.,p. 24.

203. ibid.,pp.24-25.

204. ibid., p.26.

205. ibid., p.79.

206. ibid., p.81.

207. ibid., p.82.

208. ibid., p.133.

209. idem., "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 111, (June 1922), p.961.

210. ibid., pp.961-962.

211. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]),p.297.

CHAPTER 3, PERENNIAL CONCERNS WITH ART, CULTURE AND NIETZCHE

For one whose father and grandfather were both famous artists, not surprisingly Anthony Mario Ludovici's initial concerns were artistic. His grandfather, Albert Ludovici, who had emigrated to England from Italy, was a painter in London of domestic subjects and became a member of the Royal Society of British Artists in 1867. He was a pupil of Monsieur Drölling in Paris during the eighteen-forties, and follow student of the celebrated painter Henner.[1]; exhibited a total of 323 pictures in London between 1848 and 1891[2], one of his works being bought by Napoleon III, from the Salon des Refuses in 1863.[3] He diedinVerey in Switzerland on September 10, 1894[4], after being a member of the Royal British Academy for the greater part of his life.[5]

Anthony Mario Ludovici's father, Albert Ludovici Jnr. (1852-1932), was born in Prague on July 10, 1852. He was educated in London and Geneva, and was a landscape and genre painter, he was elected a member of the Society of British Artists in 1878[6], and exhibited at the Royal Academy from 1880. He came under the complete hypnotism of Whistler, and was Whistler's:"most orthodox and uncompromising henchman" in Britain.[7] He lived mainly in Paris, but also in London.[8] Anthony Mario Ludovici's mother, Maria Cals, whom his father married in Paris in August 1875, was also associated with the world of art and culture.[9]

Anthony Mario Ludovici started life as an artist, illustrated various books, and was Auguste Rodin's private secretary for part of 1906, a post which he secured through his father's personal influence, to whom he had already expressed his wish to become a writer. Due to

his rejection of contempory art, he left graphic arts to pursue a vocation as a writer. As a young man he was disturbed by the bewildering inconsistency and contradictariness of the opinions on his work he was able to elicit from the artists whose judgement he valued: his father, Rodin, Sautor and Whistler. He decried the absence of all of authority, or at least of unanimity among authorities:

> This was roughly about 1898...ever since then, on and off, my thoughts have turned upon the why and wherefore of this confusion and lack of standards and upon its disastrous consequences. More especially have I always felt the danger of a pervasive charlatanism in a sphere where, owing to the absence of established canons and standards, everything is allowed.[10]

It was this anarchic subjectivity and lack of unifying style and canon in the arts that constituted the chief objection Ludovici raised to his parents and others, to the adoption of the graphic art as a calling.

From his dissatisfaction with modern art he attempted to discover the cause of its degeneration and to overcome the subjectivity which he thought had destroyed over a century of art. He turned to Nietzscheism as an authority that could give art a real and vital justification. In the only place where he provides his reasons for his early repudiation of art as a vocation, Ludovici claimed that the absence of standards in art arose from our loss of a homogeneous culture, which he thought: "the only culture worthy of the name according to Nietzsche."[2]

However, Ludovici did not merely adopt Nietzscheism in his views on art and culture. Above all others, Nietzsche was the thinker to whom Ludovici owed most of the ideas in his social and political thought. Although it is not the purpose of this thesis to compare Nietzsche's and Ludovici's social and political thought, throughout

this thesis, I shall allude to the ideas they share. It is extremely important to recognise Ludovici's eulogy of the 'philosophy', &personality, of Friedrich Nietzsche. Ludovici wrote three major commentaries on the 'philosophy' of Friedrich Nietzsche, and was one of the most significant disciples of Nietzsche in Britain from the first decade of this century.* We know that Ludovici joined the New Age, in 1911, and collaborated with its two brilliant Nietzscheans, J.M.Kennedy and Dr. Oscar Levy. Ludovici first met Dr. Oscar Levy, perhaps the leading Nietzschean in England at the time, in the late summer of 1908.[12] Dr. Oscar Levy was already contributing to the New Age by that time, with J.M. Kennedy[13], and it was probably he who recommended Ludovici to A.R. Orage who, with Holbrook Jackson, had acquired joint owner and editor-ship of the New Age in the spring of 1907. Ludovici had met and was very impressed with A.R. Orage[14] when he was preparing his lectures on Nietzsche at University College, London, over two years

---

*The three major commentaries are: Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with an introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N.Foulis, 1909); Nietzsche: his life and works, Preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910); Nietzsche and Art, (London: Constable, 1911). Ludovici translated Elisabeth Foerster-Nietzsche's The Young Nietzsche, (London-William Heinemann, 1912). Furthermore, with the authorisation of Elisabeth Foerster-Nietzsche he translated Friedrich Nietzsche's Selected Letters, (London: William Heinemann, 1921). He was a major contributor to the first complete and authorised English translation of Nietzsche's works, The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909 - 1913). Ludovici translated Elisabeth Foerster-Nietzsche's introduction to Volume I of this series The Birth of Tragedy, or Hellenism and Pessimism (1909). He translated Volume Four Thoughts Out of Season (1909). He translated Volume Eight The Course of Wagner (1911). He annotated Volume Eleven, Thus Spake Zarathustra (1909). He translated Volumes Fourteen and Fifteen, The Will to Power (1909). He translated Volume Sixteen, The Twilight of The Idols...The Notes to Zarathustra and Eternal Recurrence (1911). Finally, Ludovici translated Volume Seventeen, Ecce Homo (1911).

before the first evidence of his actually contributing to the New Age.*

Ludovici was the prolific 'art' critic of the New Age between 1912 and 1914. However, he contributed very little to New Age during World War I because of his active service, much to A.R. Orage's dismay.[15] Indeed, he did not contribute anything to the New Age after the mid-1920s; which may have been due to the fact that in October 1922, A.R. Orage renounced the editorship of the New Age, or that Ludovici was too preoccupied with the writing of his books, it was his most prolific period. Anyway, when A.R. Orage returned to England in 1931, after a most bizarre hiatus spent in exploring mysticism, he founded the New English Weekly in April of 1932, and Ludovici became a regular writer of reviews for that journal. Although A.R. Orage died on November 5, 1934, Ludovici continued as an occasional contributor to the New English Weekly. A review of public affairs, literature and the arts, through its merger with the old New Age. A weekly record of Christian culture, social service and literary life, to form the hybrid New English Weekly and New Age, etc. in January 1939 its reversion of name to the New English Weekly, etc. in April 1947, and the latter's final demise in September 1949.

Nevertheless, although Ludovici was one of the New Age Nietzscheans[16] and it is true that the New Age reacted against liberalism and romanticism during and after World War I[17], it was a predominantly socialist journal. It advocated guild socialism[18] and later became a mouthpiece for the social credit schemes of Major Douglas[19], from which Ludovici always kept aloof[20]. It is possible that Ludovici

---

*Which is Anthony Mario Ludovici's, "Review of M.Halevy's, The Life of Friedrich Nietzsche, translated by J.M. Hone, with an introduction by T.M.Kettle (T.Fisher Unwin)", New Age, volume VIII, No. 17, February 23, 1911, pp. 402-3.

imbibed the guild socialism that the New Age was advocating and adopted it in his advocacy of corporatism, and feudal ideal of totalitarianism, which is discussed later in this thesis. However, in his contributions to the New Age, he never displayed any sympathy with the guild socialism it advocated.

The importance of the New Age to Ludovici was that it helped to establish him in the literary world. He also gained a great deal of notoriety in his dissemination of Nietzscheism in the New Age. He earned some unflattering comments for his outspokenness. The following is from Wyndham Lewis: "He is obviously a fool it is worth no-ones while to notice...his dismal shoddy rubbish is not even amusingly rediculous."[21] Whilst T.E. Hulme called Ludovici a charlatan of Nietzscheism, "a little cockney intellect which would have been more suitably employed indexing in a lawyers office". And for maliciously denigrating the art of Jacob Epstein* he suggested a little personal violence would be appropriate: "But the unworthy sentiment of pity for the weak, which, in spite of Nietzsche, still moves us, prevents us dealing drastically, with this rather light-weight superman."[22]

We know that before Ludovici translated six volumes of Nietzsche he had spent some time in Germany, and there got acquainted with the writings of Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, who were his inspiration for the rest of his life. Undoubtedly, Ludovici adopted a good deal of his anti-feminism from Schopenhauer.[23] Whilst, Nietzscheism is profuse throughout Ludovici's A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories. In the latter Ludovici claims that Nietzsche's recognition of the need

---

*In Anthony Mario Ludovici's, "Art: The Carfax, the Suffolk and the Twenty-One Galleries", New Age, volume XIV, No. 7, December 18, 1913, p.215.

for a transvaluation of values was prophetic, for only then would the people be able and willing to recognise the claim of superior life.[24] Only an elite of "taste and discrimination" is able to save Western civilisation from unrelieved degeneracy by a transvaluation of values[25]:

> ...the modern world has in Nietzsche's stupendously courageous enquiry into the broad question of sick and healthy values, an outline of its task, and a signpost as to the direction it should pursue, which it can ignore only at its own hurt and peril.[26]

In Ludovici's A Defence of Conservatism we are told that the conservative is a definite 'type.'[27]

Ludovici eulogised Nietzsche for his healthy realism which wrenched the mask from the dangerous face of romance.[28] He had realised that it is not traditional institutions that are degenerative but values, hence the dire need for a transvaluation of values.[29]

Just as Nietzsche philosophised the real and the vital so did Ludovici, indeed, it under pinned his social and political thought. The pre-Platonic Greeks, according to Nietzsche, "had before themselves Life in a luxuriant perfection", unlike us who are "muddled with the disunion engendered by the wish for freedom, beauty, fulness of life, and the love of truth that only asks: What is the good of Life at all?"[30] Nietzsche, for Ludovici, overcame Schopenhauer's pessimism by discovering an object in life, the elevation of man and society.[31] The question of life-promoting 'taste' plays an important part in Nietzsche's writings, as it does in Ludovici's.[32] But, Ludovici was to make his own application of Nietzscheism. Interestingly, Dr. Oscar Levy warned Ludovici not to make Nietzscheism popular when it ought to be esoteric: "Why not act up to your Machiavellian principles, and rather lecture on the drama, socialism, folklore, the sins of the upper classes, or the sanitation of Mayfair?"[33] And that Ludovici should be propogating Nietzscheism, not a race.[34]

Ludovici thought that just as Schopenhauer had turned in horror from man's blind will to live in the midst of Life, and as life reached self-consciousness in man it is for man to neutralise it, so Nietzsche had turned in horror from Schopenhauer.[35] He had realised that man may attain to superman[36], improve his race[37], and play a bold part in the game of life.[38] Hitherto the pre-requisite to be 'philosophical' had been "tediousness, longwindedness, dryness - anaemia", with our Kants, J.S. Mills and Sidgwicks: "Now Nietzsche is a man who wrote with his blood, who made philosophy as palpatatingly interesting as the most thrilling romance."[39] It was to Nietzsche's credit to have seen that "active, creative, Dionysiac" values belonged to the 'master morality', whilst the 'slave morality' is passive and defensive.[40] Nietzsche deliberately spoke coldly and deliberately on matters on which the multitude spoke with tearful voices, to give the impression of benevolence.[41] For Ludovici, Nietzsche was an exception who escaped from the general degeneracy of Europe, its unscrupolous praise of 'progress' and volgar levity in the face of effeminency and decay, and voiced the hope of a real world, regenerated and reorganised on a sounder, more virile and more orderly basis, "if only the stupendous revolution of a transvaluation of all values were made possible."[42] Ludovici reckoned that Nietzscheism must avoid becoming a "merely intellectual movement", and that Nietzsche's followers must build upon his "taste in Sociology."[43] Nietzsche was eulogised by Ludovici as the greatest thinker of the nineteenth century.[44] We should call our history a triumph of man, face life with positivness, and not shrink from life, as Schopenhauer suggested that we should.[45] In 1941, Ludovici proclaimed that he was:

> ...a veteran of the aristocratic and soldier academy of Nietzsche, who for 30 years has been quietly prosecuting the great thinker's works, and, without pronouncing his name at every breath, has nevertheless been performing the unprofitable and unpopular task, wherever possible, of combating degeneracy, and promoting the elevation of the type Man.[46]

For Ludovici, values are entirely matters of taste and prejudice, not of truth.[47] It was Nietzsche who had discerned the truth that human taste, or values, could be either lethal or life-promoting, and that valuing life was among the most vital of human functions.[48] Ludovici reckoned the task of 'philosophy' is to apply what is known to an intelligent conduct of the affairs of human life. However, instead of pursuing and searching for wisdom, "philosophy has become bogged in the quagmire of epistemology." It was to Nietzsche's credit to claim "a more vital, a more flesh-and-blood function for the philosopher... and to interpret knowing along biological lines."[49]

Ludovici only claimed to diverge from Nietzsche on two matters. Firstly, Ludovici regarded Socrates as the greatest transvaluer of all time: By substituting humanism for mans old healthy monism. Once monism had been contradicted by Socrates every sort of degeneracy, and apology for degeneracy, became possible.[50] Thus, four hundred years before Nietzsche's Jewish-Christian transvaluation every essential principle which made it possible had been established by Socrates. Ludovici thought that in this matter he was justified in charging Nietzsche with "confusion and a lack of consistency."[51] Secondly, Ludovici thought that in failing to see how and why the conduct prompted by pity could be and often is ignominious, Nietzsche had not reached Schopenhauer's degree of clarity about it.[52] Ludovici believed pity provided a relief from envy, and reckoned of all modern thinkers, Schopenhauer, "probably the greatest psychologist, if not the greatest philosopher Europe has produced"[53], got nearest to the truth in this matter, although he never elaborated this truth. Schopenhauer maintained: '"Pity is the opposite of Envy."'[54] According to Ludovici, Nietzsche's failure to discover the relationship between pity and envy, together with his equally serious oversight concerning Socrates, "constitute the two major blemishes which in my

opinion mar his philosophical outlook."[55]

Although there are traits of Nietzscheism in most of Ludovici's writings I reiterate that it is not the object of this thesis to demonstrate it. Nevertheless, it is a matter of importance and I think it essential to allude to some of the copious evidence that could be adduced to demonstrate this. In Ludovici's novel of 1918, Mansel Fellowes, we are told that the Nietzschean Dr. Mel Hado said an intellectual "'Yea to Life',...wholesale acceptance of Life's most cruel and most beautiful behests", and was but the spiritual counterpart to Mansel Fellowes's physical fight to achieve the consumation of her vital female destiny - marriage to Richard Latimer.[56] When Richard Latimer is converted to Catholicism by Father Jevington and renounces Mansel Fellowes, Dr. Mel Hado, was to essentially a "philosopher of the open air and of Life" to ignore the appalling tragedy of it.[57] In Ludovici's Mans Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition, of 1921, the struggle is between 'Dionysians' and 'Prometheans.'[58] Similarly, in Ludovici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, we are told that the hero, James Gordon, was busy in a very profound exposition of the Nietzschean doctrine of 'eternal recurrence.'[59] Although the latter are just a few of the innumerable instances where Ludovici obviously refers to Nietzscheism, in the remainder of this thesis, where space and relevance permits, I shall indicate where the ideas of Ludovici and Nietzsche are contiguous.

Above all, however, the most obvious adoption of Nietzscheism by Ludovici is to be found in his views on the vital role of art and culture. He reckoned Van Gogh and Gaugin, received no help from philosophy in regenerating art and culture, and bringing it closer to Life, except from Nietzsche. It was not until Nietzsche's intensely

vital doctrine of '"art for lifes sake"' was formulated that "the cause of art actually found a philosophical talker who thoroughly understood what he was talking about."[60] Nietzsche had presaged a rejuvenated and purified culture[61] that would promote Life and not pedantic knowledge.[62] Art is but a weapon in the service of mans 'will to power.'[63] Mans joy or pain in life is determined by the artist who values life and the world for the "acclimatised herd".[64] Nietzsche would have us believe that the Dionysian artist "cannot look out upon life without transfiguring it, hallowing it, blessing it, and making it appear better, bigger, and more beautiful."[65] For Ludovici, Nietzsche saw the truth that art is not distinct from the values and conditions prevailing in the culture in which it arises.[66] It was Nietzsche's ambition, throughout his life, to regenerate European culture, and initially in Wagner he thought he had found the man to do it.[67] However, he realised that the regeneration of German culture, of European culture, and the transvaluation of values which would be necessary for regeneration, lay off the track of Wagnerism. Ludovici reckoned that Nietzsche's disavowal of Wagner was due to his realisation of the truth that:

> ...the principles of art are inextricably bound up with the laws of life, that anaesthetic dogma may therefore promote or depress all vital force, and that a picture, a symphony, a poem or a statue, is just as capable of being pessimistic, anarchic, Christian or revolutionary, as a philosophy or a science is.

To speak of a certain class of music as being compatible with the decline of culture, therefore, was to Nietzsche a perfectly warrantable association of ideas, and that is why, throughout his 'philosophy', and Ludovici's, so much stress is laid upon vital aesthetic considerations.[68] Hence Nietzsche's dismissal of Wagnerian music. In Wagner's music, Nietzsche saw the promotion of decadence and degeneration.[69] Ludovici agreed with Nietzsche that Wagner had supplied the "hashish and morphia" to conceal the dull ugliness of our civilisation.[70] Only the

classical artists of the nineteenth century, such as Heine, Goethe, Stendhal and Gobineau, were conscious of what was wrong with them, and possessed the will and the strength to overcome their illness.[71] Wagner's romanticism just like Gothic architecture was the outcome of inner discord and weakness.[72] He was a "splendid romanticist" because of his inner disciplines[73], and his success was due to the craving of the modern world for romanticists able to conceal the degeneracy that prevailed. In a romanticist like Wagner "life-theory and life-practice" could not co-incide, whereas in a great leader like Nietzsche they must.[74]

Ludovici's most obvious avowal of Nietzsche's vital 'aesthetic' is to be found in his Nietzsche and Art, published by Constable in 1911.* In the latter Ludovici claims that he strictly confines himself to Nietzsche's aesthetic[75], and adopts it as the basis for a new, and vital, valuation of art.[76] He reckoned Nietzsche's works are full of the evidence of an artistic temperament that laid great stress upon the creative act as an alleviation of life: "Who could have been an atheist out of his lust to create?"[77] In attacking Wagner as the embodiment of romanticism, Nietzsche merely personified the movement to which he felt himself so fundamentally opposed. Ludovici conceived himself as continuing Nietzsche's task of assailing romanticism.[78] In Ludovici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, Gerald Swynnerton recalls that James Gordon, Nietzschean and Egyptologist, pointed out the granite sculptures of the Egyption gallery in the British Museum, and they agreed that if the artists who

*It consisted of lectures which he delivered in a condensed form at University College, London, during November and December, 1910; where two years previously he had the honour of addressing an audience on Nietzsche's moral and evolutionary views, and which formed his first book, Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with an introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, published by T.N. Foulis in 1909.

carved these classical masterpieces were to recur they would think it worthwhile again.[79]

For both Ludovici and Nietzsche the only criterion of good art is that which promotes life. The Nation received Ludovici's interpretation of Nietzsche's vital 'aesthetic' with unconcealed hostility, for confusing art with politics and life: "When Nietzsche, and Mr. Ludovici after him, speak of the danger that may come to life through art, they speak as philosophers and moralists, not as artists."[80]

Ludovici's adoption of Nietzsche's aesthetic vitalism provided the basis for his critic of modern art. He derided the democratic inclination of modern art.[81] Contemporary European art was just "the taste of the masses" and the artists themselves actually confirmed and submitted to this mob rule.[82] Their pursuit of truth was indicative of the paralysis of will that had overtaken art.[83] They were absolutely democratic and vulgar;[84] like scientists they merely ascertained facts.[85] Ludovici thought that just as the Grand Rebellion in England was a matter of Roundheads and Cavaliers, of people who were Puritan and negative to life, against those who were Pagan and positive to life, the "Hundred Years' Rebellion in Art" also had its Roundheads and Cavaliers. Before the Counter-Reformation, Ludovici thought art was always understood to possess a vital meaning: "to mean practically life expressing herself, or a certain kind of life expressing its view of all life." The artist was the advocate of life. He received his brief direct from life, and his pleading had some direct relationship to life. The effect of the Reformation and Protestantism was to separate art from life:

> ... For who doubts that the Impressionists, the Neo-Impressionists, the Post-Impressionists, the Futurists, the Cubists, the Synthesists, the Pointillistes, and their ancestors the Transcriptists, Naturalists, Pre-Raphaelites, etc., are anything else than the Puritanical Baptists and Anabaptists, Methodists, Wesleyan Methodists, Plymouth Brethen, Quakers, Unitarians, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists of a Grand Rebellion in art?[86]

Beneath all these anaemic artists' concentration on mere technique only impoverished life spoke.[87] The artistic world concentrated

its attention upon the palette and nature when it was human life that was crying out for a cure. They regarded art from the craftsman standpoint, "the proletariat of the studio", as a mere matter of technique, and continued along that line only in the discovery of ever newer conventions for the rendering of impressions.[88] The examples of the post-impressionists became a canon for a legion of mediocre people who merely immitated. Pot-boilers came into ascendancy who heralded the dissolution of art, "and their colour is the colour of decomposed tissues and of putrefyng corpses."[89] The people of taste, the artists, had abetted the triumph of ugliness by their inaction: "How many painters, sculptures, or Architects, have ever started even a militant movement against the abuses of a capitalistic, industrial, and commercial State?" The Eugenics movement was not one composed of artists, alarmed at the uglification of the race. Indeed, artists did less than silently acquiesce in the tasteless innovations of industrialists and exploiters of mankind, they became commercial men themselves.[90]

Ludovici believed the impressionists were quite mistaken in supposing that because high finish happened to be connected with the sterile painters of the Graeco-Roman school, that itwas therefore a quality to be wholly condemned. It was this mistake of the impressionists that Ludovici believed opened the sanctuary of art to all. But, the cure was not to abolish finish as the impressionists had done. Rather: "The cure was to correct their scheme of life, or the scheme of life of their nation." Ludovici thought the mistake of making slight attention to finish had also been perpetrated in music, literature, and in architecture.[91] Above all, Ludovici thought that rather than censure the anarchy of the cubists and futurists, condemnation would be much better spent on something much vaster - the 'system', and of which the section of pictorial art was only a small and neglected part.[92]

The role allotted to the artist in modern society was reprehensible. The sincere and vital artist who undertook to probe the deep mystery of that particular part of life to which he was attracted by his individual taste and abilities was virtually foredoomed to dementia by the circumstances of his occupation: "amid the racket and thunder of the crowded thoroughfare of modern life."[93] Not only did the artist have no place alotted to him but the very position he tried to conquer for himself was hedged round with petty obstacles and minor personalities.[94] History did not necessarily 'place' a man, or even a whole age, and give to them their proper level. Time frequently passed over those in silence who ought to have had a lasting claim upon the respect and appreciation of their fellows.[95] Ludovici thought this was especially likely to happen today when the world is largely governed by the commercial principle which places quantity before quality.[96]

For Ludovici, the revolution in art of the nineteenth century had been the cause and consequence of this corruption in art, which culminated in impressionism. The purpose of art was tacitly assumed to be to obtain as faithful a transcript of nature and reality as they were felt to be by anybody and everybody. Peasants, 'innocent' and 'unsophisticated', seemingly belonging to nature and not to town or 'artificial' life, were included in the category nature, from which it was legitimate to make a transcript. Whilst, in the category reality, cafe scenes, scenes of town life, glimpses 'behind the scenes' provided their 'artificiality' and 'unnaturalness' were mitigated by a certain 'character', were deemed as legitimate sources for transcription. All of this was done not because the peasant or scenes of town life were linked up with any definite scheme of life; but, because, all life passions, "all life schemes were at an end", and anything was good enough for these artists, whose scepticism drove them to technique as their only refuge.[97] These preoccupations usurped the place of the

rapidly vanishing 'subject' in pictures. It was the last vestige of an historical period in which men had been inspired to express their relationship to life by something higher and greater than both themselves and their art:

> ...In fact, it had always flourished in periods when humanity had known of a general direction, a general purpose in life, and of a scheme of life which gave their heartbeats and their breath some deeper meaning than they have at present.

The impressionists completely overlooked the truth that the deficiency of their academical contempories was of a scheme of life, and faith in life, and not of technique. Their 'artistic instincts' were not strong enough to make them see that the uninspired subject picture was the most poignant proof that could be found of the fact that mankind no longer possessed, to any passionate degree, that which made the subject picture possible - a profound faith in something greater and more vital either than the artists themselves or their art, something which gave not only art, but also life, a purpose.[98] In abusing the degenerate subject picture, these innovators were simply inveighing against a pathological symptom.[99] Mere matters of technique had usurped the place of higher and more vital aims.[100] The academic school was bankrupt, lifeless, and exhausted. It no longer consisted of artists with an exalted ideal and the fire of creation in their hearts, but of slavish immitators of the classic painters and sculptors.[101] Ludovici thought the impressionists were typical of both modern opportunism and democracy which had torn down every institution which is discredited, not through any fault inherent in its nature, but through those who mismanage it, whether it be aristocracy, monarchy, or religion, instead of reconstituting and constructively restoring it.[102] He spoke of the "scattered and heterogeneous heaps of refuse" which constituted Western aesthetics and the place of aesthetics in its civilisation.[103] No art-canons existed, and modern art-criticism rested on no accepted rules and Principles[104]

The moment in history when the first fundamental blunder was made in art was about 1860 in France, the advent of the first impressionists. The opportunity to effect desirable reforms was obviously favourable: "for the classic conventions of the Academicians had certainly lost touch with Life, and they included many time-serving mercenaries destitute of genius." But the impressionists could not effect a cure as they had not made a correct diagnosis. They mistook a symptom for a cause and imagined that the shortcomings of the Academicians' technique were the sole root of the trouble. Mere changes in technique could neither improve inspiration nor create artistic passion where both were defective.[105] Admittedly, the first impressionists gave the artist the technical equipment to be more arresting and convincing than theretofore, "better able to pass on to the beholder at least some of the vital spark received by his closer touch with Nature." But, there gradually developed a fanaticism, in connection with technical changes alone, which superceded all vital considerations. These changes were foolishly expected to regenerate art overnight:

> ...whether the human material to hand were or were not more gifted than that which had produced the Academicians of the classic convention, or whether or not our present world, Life, Faith in Life, and the Love of Humanity, still had the potency to procure adequate inspiration for the artist.[106]

The impressionist doctrine that the subject did not matter gave a permanent licence to subjectivity in art - for no ultimate reference existed. This ill considered dismissal of the 'subject' in art culminated in modern abstract art.[107]

Ludovici thought Kant's reckless statement in his Kritik Der Urteilskraft that the subject should be disregarded in assessing a work of art, and only its design or composition should be considered, was of supreme importance in the genesis of abstract art.[108]

Unfortunately, Kant was followed by Hegel and Schopenhauer, who were responsible for a grossly exaggerated valuation of music.[109] Hegel emphasised that music was "wholly abstract"and a more "intellectual" means of approach to human feeling.[110] Whilst Schopenhauer claimed that music "represented the very essense of Life."[111] Ludovici thought the regrettable effect of the above was to fill all aesthetes' minds with a veneration for art of a non-representational and romantic kind. Whereas, the artist should contemplate some aspect of life and represent it.[112]

Ludovici thought the early origins of the movement which culminated in the acceptance of abstract art in England, are to be sought in the peculiarities and careers of Walter Pater, Oscar Wilde, and James MacNeill Whistler. Walter Pater exhorted graphic artists to try in their works to approximate their methods and manner to those of music and emphasise the total negligibility of the subject, and the supreme importance of the composition and arrangement.[113] There was only one man in England, courageous and aesthetically erudite enough to expose the "Puritan aesthetics" of Pater, Wilde and Whistler, and that was Ruskin. However, he failed the cause of vital art.[114] According to Ludovici, we have only to read Whistler's Ten O'Clock in order to see how he slavishly repeated all Walter Pater's aesthetic doctrine to a startled audience, which included Ludovici's "poor infatuated father".[115]

Ludovici's reaction to the collection of Whistler's paintings at the Tate Gallery in 1912 was one of depression and fatigue to their "sordid lack of life, health, and colour; by their black and white austerity, like the garb of Charles the First's murderers." Whistler's greys poured from his palette with all the profusion of a "tropical Puritanism". If Kant had finished what Luther had begun then, for Ludovici, Whistler had put the coping stone upon the morbid edifice

of Puritanical art. One did not require to have read Mr. Whistler's Ten O'Clock, in which he proscribes art from life, but just a little vitality and one hour in Room No. 5 at the Tate Gallery, to reach the same conclusion as Ludovici about Whistler's impressionism:

> The breath and blood that issue from these grey abysses is the foetid breath of impoverished life, the weak blood of the anaemic patient. The love that is revealed in these pictures is the only love that is left to the Puritan - the love of things that can be contemplated without desire or interest (of the senses), the love of things that lure one neither to life nor to any form of love.

In lifting pictorial art into the undefiled realm of symphonic music Whistler discovered the picture for Puritanism. He would have been better advised to have explained his Kantian aesthetic to Puritans rather than to artists.[116] Whistler, like the earlier impressionists and secessionists from the Academy, far from seeing that the chaos of values and the decline of man had led to the decline of art, proceeded not only to concentrate upon technique, but proclaimed that the subject in a picture or sculpture did not matter. Ludovici was not suprised that among the secessionists of the impressionist period there should have been found Whistler, an American, whose Puritanical traditions inclined him wholeheartedly to embrace the new negative art creed. He exalted variegated schemes of blacks and greys to the rank of subjects in his pictures.[117] Just as the impressionists in France of the latter half of the nineteenth century and Schopenhauer, triumphed due to the pessimism which no longer wished to be reminded of man and life, so the success of Whistler in England was due to the latent Puritanism of his outlook, and the Puritanism of those to whom he appealed.[118] As it was unlikely that Whistler, the American Puritan, had ever read Kant, the German Puritan Ludovici attributed their common aesthetic doctrines to their "Scottish blood".[119] Their reckless fiats opened the way to the extravagances of post-impressionism, cubism, futurism, and the defiant obscurities of abstract painting.[120]

Ludovici's tirade against the artistic establishment is most evident in his pseudonymous novel of 1939, Poet's Trumpeter. In the latter, the Society for the Study of English Verse, to which Mr. Thomas Sefton-Smith, the hero, submits his poetry, is led by a Mr. Danethorpe. He is described as a successfully retired businessman, who, because he was raised to a position of safety, opulence and power by the age, believed in its every taste and judgement.[121] Also in the Society is a journalist, Sebastion Squeeze, who had learnt prosody at University and mocked Sefton-Smith for his lack of scholarship. Sefton-Smith had been no more than a postman, and his wilful ignorance of prosody compounded the jealosy of his rivals, who thought his chances of success should be nil.[122] Professor Bevington, an admirer of Sefton-Smith, attributes the latter's dismissal by the artistic establishment to its liberalism and romanticism:

> 'For the last three centuries we have been building up an authority for science', he replied, 'and have built up none for art! It has been left to the charlatans and astrologers, just as science was, when three centuries ago we rescued her. and that is why in art today no-one can say this is so and that is so, or why nobody is believed when he says such things.'[123]

The aspiring poet's son and daughter, Ivy and Jack, could barely be civil to him[124], whilst his sister-in-law nad her husband, Mr. Edward Rivett, who had acquired great wealth and was utterly unintellectual, pitied Mr. Sefton-Smith.[125] Mr. Danethorpe, a prominent member of The Society for the Study of English Verse, despite his condemnation of socialism and favour of a wholly uncontrolled individualism, of which he imagined himself a prime product, was one of the most humble puppets of mass suggestion.[126] Drawing largely upon his friends' eminent and scholarly criticism, Dr. Lanyard-Whistler of Oxford, he conceded that there was something in Sefton-Smith's poetry - "some feeling for Nature, some deeper consciousness of the power behind phenomena." However, he was afraid that the frequency of strained rhymes, the

absence of enjambments, the heavy rhythm, and the constant use of everyday phraseology, made the whole read little better than rhymed prose. He expressed his, or rather Landyard-Whistler's, disaproval of the lack of romanticism in Sefton-Smith's poetry.[127] To which Mr. Sefton-Smith timidly inquired if whether or not Mr. Danethorpe's romantic aesthetic would exclude Poe and Baudelaire. He replied that Poe and Baudelaire raise us to "'those lofty altitudes where the joy over existence assumes a pure, ethereal form not to be confounded with a grosser emotion of a lower plane.'"[128] Sefton-Smith, on the other hand, relied on feeling rather than rules, when criticising another's poetry.[129]

Ludovici confused his artistic, political and moral categories. He traced the deterioration of art to the degeneracy of man:

> ...owing to the prevalence of sickness, debility and nervous exhaustion, there is no longer any lofty criterion concerning what is, and what is not, necessary, inevitable and desirable in art production. Iracsibility, as I pointed out 15 years ago [Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art, (London: Constable, 1911)], but which only recently I have learnt to ascribe to faulty bodily coordination, by giving the modern generation a sense of injury and a general lack of well being, causes everyone to feel that he has 'something to express'.[130]

From its inception his diagnosis of the condition of art was Nietzschean. He believed that if everybody had a right to every judgement and every joy; if a certain slavish truthfulness to nature and reality had wrecked higher aspirations; it was because the fundamental principles of christianity were no longer latent but active and potent in our midst.[131] For Protestantism was neither more no less than a general rebellion against all authority.[132] The Holy Catholic Church, by its rigorous discipline and firm establishment upon hierarchical principles, suppressed for a while the overweening temper of Christianity, and all claims of individual thought and judgement.[133] However, according to Ludovici three doctrines detrimental to art and culture were to

burst forth through the impact of Martin Luther and the Reformation, which Nietzsche had identified as the cause of the paralysis of will in Europe.[134] They were: equality; the general depravity of human nature; an absolute truth which could be made common to all.[135] They were fatal to the artist who demanded obedience and procured reverence.[136] Art should have waged the most forcible opposition to liberalism.[137] However, once the spirit of individual liberty and judgement had invaded that department of life which heretofore had been most sacred, religion, it was bound to enter and defile less sacred sanctuaries.[138] The insignificant majority got more freedom than was good for them, whilst the noble minority, the artists, were deprived of their birth right.[139] The attitude of the Christian ideal to Life, to the body, and the world was an entirely negative one. The classic feature and form of body surely and permanently vanished from the wall decorations of the fourth, fifth and sixth centuries A.D., and the Christian 'type' asserted itself with ever greater assurance.[140] For Ludovici, beauty and voluptuousness, smoothness and charm were very naturally regarded with suspicion by the promoters of the Christian ideal: "for beauty, voluptuousness and shapeliness lure back to Life, lure back to the flesh, and ultimately back to the body."[141] He thought the ugliness of Gothic style lay in its contempt of the body and of Life.[142]

In Ludovici's novel of 1922, The Goddess that Grew Up, Cyril Bashfield Streeter prefers the Latin to the German school of music. The melody of the Latin school of music, is the symbolic musical representation of one voiceabove the many, the crowd.[143]; whilst the German school of music is recognised by the rule of harmony, which is the overwhelming of the one voice by the crowd. Modern music, which is chiefly German music, rises historically with the Protestant Reformation, the proclamation of the principle of democratic controls. However, Latin music, reaches back to the unique reign of authority in Europe - to purely

Catholic times.[144]

The graphic arts are, for Ludovici, dependent art. Today, the artist can turn nowhere to find the 'type' worthy of his pictorial advocacy.[145] In Ludovici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle: The Romance of a thrice-married lady, Gerald Swynnerton recounts to Knowles a conversation he had with James Gordon, Egyptologist, in the British Museum. James Gordon had inquired if whether or not Gerald Swynnerton had realised that museums are confessions of weakness. They are but the signs of our present incompetence and impotence. He felt weak and insignificant as he walked through the Elgin room. If modern men were not degenerate they would have pounded these relics into a pulp, and used it as a mortar for braver things, for masterpieces of their own. But they did not have the requisite confidence in themselves. The Renaissance artists destroyed the monuments of old Rome, Mehenet Ali robbed the pyramids to build his magnificent mosques, but:

> ...'"...we must have museums, because, although we are over 500 millions of living creatures in Europe today, our culture is as dead as these stones, and can create nothing: because in our heart of hearts we are convinced that we are a pack of incompetent fools!"'[146]

Gerald Swynnerton further recounts to Knowles his agreement with James Gordon's adverse opinion of the Gothic, but he still felt it superior to anything his age could produce.[147]

For Ludovici, art products reveal the condition of the Society in which they are produced.[148] He thought there were two explanations of the stultification of academic art from 1860: "(a) The fact that the modern men of Europe had ceased to be inspiring, and (b) the chaos of values."[149] Man's expression in art is always the externalisation of what is in him.[150] The prohibitive ugliness of modern poetry, graphic and plastic arts, was "due to the scarecrow ugliness of our

poets, artists, sculptors and musicians."[151] We cannot hope to repeat what happened in art, literature, architecture, interior decoration and furniture design in the century or more that followed the birth of Thomas Hood's grandfather, who was an agricultural labourer.[152] It is idle to expect anything like that brief English Renaissance to spring again from England's 'proletariat', which was so well bred that the Spaniards were aghast at the dentition of Wellington's soldiers:

> In vain can we hope for any feats remotely equivalent to the Architectural and Architectural Work of the Adams Brothers, the Furniture of artists like Sheraton and Chippendale, and the poetry of such labourers grandsons as Burns and Thomas Hood.[153]

This, for Ludovici, was the oversight of the impressionists. They mistook the nature of the plague of the Academicians, which was really the degeneracy of man. From art's bankruptcy we may infer the degeneracy of men, they had ceased to be inspiring.[154] At a time when the chaos of values and the degeneracy of the modern European made a lofty art tendency impossible, impressionists, who thought themselves the only hope of the art world, concentrated upon problems of technique.[155] They did not graze the surface of the actual cause of the trouble, which was still operating: "We still have the chaos of values, only intensified; and we still have degenerate manhood, but more degenerate."[156] Their exaltation of light, atmosphere, colour harmonies and mere patterns to the rank of subjects in their pictures pleased the Puritan and pessimist, but revolted those who wanted life.[157] They did not realise the truth that the salvation of art and the salvation of humanity are identical as problems.[158]

Another cause of the degeneration of art that Ludovici, and Nietzsche, denegrated, was science and rationalism which, they believed, pursued the same ideals as Christianity: Universal liberty and equality; devotion to the truth that can be made common to all; the depression

of the value and dignity of man.[159] The empiricists, Francis Bacon, Hobbes and Locke, were among the first by their teaching, to level a decisive blow at the man who knows and who is the measure of all things, the artist; they reduced all knowledge to that which can be made immediately the experience of all.[160] Liberals, from Benthan to John Stuart Mill and Sidgwick, by taking the greatest number as their norm, ably reflected the Christian principle of the equality of souls in their works, and drew their values from mediocrity, which is constantly in need of values drawn from supermediocrity, for its love of life and reconciliation with drabby reality.[161] Ludovici saw in the rise of science the collapse of human wisdom. For it is humanity's artists, the most sensitive men of the community, whose art is the crystalised harbinger of facts that will become patent to all in the concrete world of politics and national life.[162] Ludovici lamented that when suffering and grave physical degeneration arise in the 'Art of Life' it is the scientist who is called upon to advise in our 'Promethean civilisation', who has to take the place of the artist, of the man who knows.[163] The scientist, by aiming at a general truth for all, depresses Life[164]:

> If the world grows ugly, and Life loses her bloom; if all winds are ill winds, and the sunshine grows sickly and pale; if we turn our eyes dubiously about us, and begin to question the justification of our existence, we may be quite certain that this man, the realist, and his type, are in the ascendency, and that he it is who is stamping his fist upon our millenium.[165]

The devotee of truth depreciates Life. There are necessary "grey studies" to be made, necessary uglinesses to be described, but they should be kept within the four walls of a laboratory, until the time comes when, by their collective means, man can be raised and not depressed by them. Science should work behind the scenes of Life, it should not promalgate the values concerning life, but be the modest hand maiden of art.[166]

Following Nietzsche, Ludovici thought Christianity and science reached their zenith in the last half of the nineteenth century, and culminated in a discovery which infected the whole atmosphere of Europe: The evolutionary hypothesis of Darwin and Spencer.[167] A more depressing conception could not have been conceived.[168] It could become the common possession of everybody.[169] In its description of the prime motor of life as a struggle for existence, and above all in its unprincipled optimism, it bore the indelible stamp of shallowness and vulgarity.[170] If becoming were a reliable hypothesis, it must be supported by different principles from those of the Darwinian school, and Nietzsche was the first to sketch these different principles.[171] Ludovici thought that when we try to discover the influence of Christianity and science upon the world, "we wonder not so much why Art is bad, but why Art has survived at all."[172]

All Ludovici's denigration of contempory art is underpinned by the conviction that it has become divorced from life, romantic. Modern art is remote from experience, fantastic, unpractical, dreamy. Grandeur or picturesqueness, or passion, or irregular beauty have been preferred to finish and proportion. It is unreal, subjective, and fabricated. Under the term 'abstract art' we are invited to expect and accept pictorial productions quite devoid of any specific content, meaningless in their message, and consisting simply of arrangements of arbitrary and unintelligible forms presented in a riot of colours having no relevance to the form in question. Modern artists are independent of rules for the execution of their works, whether of observation, draughtmanship, or colour technique, and are free to produce wholly indecipherable dispositions of forms and colours, which have no greater significance than those to be found in carpets, wall-papers, tartans, and the like.[173] Modern art romantically banished all representation of such natural products as

bore Nietzsche's 'will to power', - and in fact every aspect of life. Indeed, abstract art threatened to eliminate all trace of life.[174]

Ludovici believed the delight which the Englishman feels at the sight of an uncouth landscape, tangled brushwood, bracken, brambles and rocks, has a moral and not an aesthetic valuation behind it: "It is a delight in the presence of chaos, of anarchy, or over a lack of restraint, design or purpose." A delight in the very reverse of the pillars of culture and civilisation - authority.[175] Following Nietzsche closely, Ludovici thought he knew of the conditions associated with romanticism, that which is "fantastically different from reality". These conditions are to be found in democracy which is conducive to their cultivation, they are: The right of self-assertion granted to everybody, and the consequent deterioration of the interpretation of life owing to the fact that the function of interpretation is claimed by mediocrity; the belief in a general truth which can be made common to all; a democratic dislike of recognising the mark or stamp of any particular human power in the things interpreted.[176] If art is created by "hunger" it is likely to be either true to nature, uglier than nature, or absurdly unnatural. The first is the product of the ordinary man, the second the product of that man below mediocrity and the third the outcome of the sufferer:

> ...who wishes to reak his revenge on all that thrives, and is beautiful and happy, and which bids him weave fantastic worlds of his own away from this one, where people of his calibre can forget their wretched ailments and evil humours and wallow in their own feverish nightmares of overstrained, palpitating and neurasthenic yearnings.

Ludovici, again following Nietzsche, called the first "poverty realism or Police Art"; the second, pessimism and incompetent art; the third, romanticism.[177] Romanticisms fundamental features are its worship of the abstract principle of liberty, anarchy and the absence of culture

which rude nature exemplifies on all sides; and it was a moral or liberal spirit that animated it, whether in Rousseau or his followers.[178] Modern romanticism could not bear the "fierce light of an art that is intimate with Life and inseparable from Life."[179] It was not an artist who first said that mountains and rugged scenery were beautiful. It was Rousseau.[180] Ludovici associated romanticism with "vagueness, looseness of thought, a tendancy to a non-tragic super-mundane outlook, sentimentality and liberalism."[181]

To the romanticism of modern art Ludovici contrasted the classically real. He desired fidelity of representation, truth of nature, insistence upon details; the showing of life as it is without glossing over what is ugly or beautiful. Art and culture should be life like, realistic, true to nature. He maintained that the graphic arts, from the beginning of civilisation and even before it in late barbaric times, had always been representative. Their very raison - détre, their aim and function, had been to register and perpetuate the real.[182] In Ludovici's novel of 1918, Mansel Fellowes, Richard Latimer, after divesting most of his didactic in the writing of text books, turns his hand to fiction, and determines to conquer the stage-loving public with realist plays, "unmarred by the psychological and scientific excrescences of a self-conscious school of neurasthemics."[183] Dr. Melhado, Richard Latimer's Nietzschean mentor, complements him on his choice. Realist drama is the medium of expression that demands the most restraints, "'the most tyrannical laws'", and does not attract female aspirants.[184] Later in the novel, when in France, Richard Latimer discerns his classical ideal in French histrionic art, which uplifts him. He felt that, like the language of France, with its lack of the tonic accent and its dependency on quantity for emphasis and rhythm, the French drama was the only classical thing the world had seen since the decline of Hellas: "He used to point out to

Frenchmen that their language was the only guide we now possess to the pronunciation of classical language."[185]

Ludovici claimed to adhere with Nietzsche in regarding classical realism as the means of luring men to life.[186] He thought, in Nietzsche's, and his own view, that romanticism could have no place in art, it suggests something that is not real. The artist's view of the world should be "extremely real", it should depict life in all its horrors and beauties. Only the classical artist can face and place tragedy whereas the non-classical mind flees from life in all its powerful manifestations to "the romantic and the wildly fantastic".[187]

The impressionists, instead of pursuing art for arts sake, should have agitated for a closer relationship to life, and formed "the nucleus of a new party wishing earnestly to regenerate and re-vitalise art by connecting it once more with the highest form of life - man himself."[188] Quality art is that which seeks its subjects more living and nearer to life, than those of romanticism.[189] It should be the constant endeavour of the classic artist to make his expression of life as adequate as possible to life itself. He should be forever striving to attain to a high degree of finish which will yield the closest approximation to the vigour of his original conception.[190]

In Ludovici's novel of 1923, French Beans, the hero, Andre de Loudon could not read modern novels; they struck him as being too romantic. Reading Montesquieu's Lettres Persanes, however, he was transported back again into the atmosphere he loved most - "the masculine atmosphere of pre-Rousseauesque Europe."[191] In Ludovici's pseudonymous novel of 1939, Poets Trumpeter, we are told that Sefton-Smith's poetry was not

"all bubbling brooks, warbling birds and smiling valleys", but incorporated all the features of life.[192]

Most importantly it is the principles of classical realism which are most life-like and should, therefore, according to Ludovici, be the principles of conservatism. This is found most explicitly in Ludovici's A Defence of Conservatism the second chapter of which is called "Conservatism and Realism."[193] Classic craftsmen set about their work on the elementary principle that nothing lasting can be produced if those who produce it have no sense for quality. Permanence, which was the aim of Greece and Rome, was achieved to the extent to which this principle was observed.[194] For Conservatives it is of importance to observe the productions of the classical world, whether in thought or material things as they are concerned with permanence. Ludovici defines the classic as that which is real, in the sense that it is based on eternal laws. That which survives must be real as it depends on nothing transitory or fantastic. Thus, in material productions, the building which depends, as the classic building does, wholly upon the eternal law of gravity, is real in the sense that the principle on which it is constructed is true for all time.[195] Likewise, in the grandfather clock man has discovered a time piece which, for relative permanence, must excel the bracket clock for all time. Because the grandfather clock depends on two eternal laws, gravity and the pendulum, for which it can depend for its durability; whereas the bracket clock depends on only one eternal law - that of the pendulum. In the bracket clock, in which the action of gravitation is supplanted by a spring whose resiliance is ephemeral, "man has discovered something less permanent, less real, less classic than the grandfather clock."[196] Ludovici also claimed to be able to trace the same classic principle in the history of thought. Classic or realist thought is that which survives because it is in harmony with

some eternal law of the human mind. He thought Aesop's fables are eternally valid; some of Pluto's and Aristotle's writings, especially the eighth book of The Republic; and the same might be said of much that Homer, Aristophanes, Horace, and Tacitus, said and wrote. Similarly, Aristotle's poetics contain a canon for dramatic poetry which can never be surpassed for its psychological analyses. In that which is classic we may expect to discover the reality that has secured its permanence, and that reality will be the eternal law which it exemplifies and applies: "Classicism is thus realism - the profoundest realism (with quality of matter, expression, material and treatment always understood in its concrete examples)." Since Conservatists are concerned about the problem of permanence, they must be both classicists and realists.[197]

Ludovici, in his A Defence of Conservatism, opposes classical realism to romanticism, the creation of the Middle Ages and Christianity, when man was trying to achieve an impossible compromise between life and a religion which might have been addressed to disembodied spirits. The Roman world, during the first four centuries of our era, in attempting to carry out these feats, "had gone almost mad". The Holy Catholic Church, by reinterpreting her doctrine less ascetically, could only assuage and not eliminate the radical conflict between the Christian ideal and "the life of this world".[198] The expression of the civilisation created by this conflict between the Church and Life was romanticism.[199] Its romanticism consisted in the fantastic flights to which the attempt to reconcile the life of the real world and the 'life' indicated by the ideals of the Church necessarily led.[200] Even though it was superceded and died, its influence, and the elements which gave rise to it have not disappeared from our midst:

> ...Strained, unreal, fantastic psychology is still a factor in our midst; it still colours the speculations of politicians and sociologists; and even in its modern garb this Romanticism can be recognised for what it is - that is to say, something unreal, the antithesis of Classicism or realism.[201]

In the graphic arts, as Ludovici had shown elsewhere*, he thought it possible to trace all through the early and later Middle Ages, the influence of the same fantastic conflict. The body of man was transformed by degrees into the eccentric 'type' that seemed compatible with the unworldly ideal of asceticism. The Gothic figure became ever more and more tenuous, more emaciated, and ever more morbid. The ephemeralness of this non-vital 'type' expresses a fantastic conflict between the permanent and the impermanent, the real and the unreal. It was, however, in the architecture of the period that Ludovici thought the equation "Unreal - Romantic - Impermanent", finds its most convincing expression.[202] Romanticism, and its fantastic ideal, were crystalised in the '"fantastic architectural feats"' of the Gothic edifice.[203] Liberalism could also be traced in the history of thought, according to Ludovici, to the influence of the romantic mentality. It is the unreality, the ultimate impracticability of the fundamental principles of liberalism, their ignorance of eternal laws, that makes liberalism romantic.

The conservative, on the other hand, according to Ludovici, is a realist in thought and action, he finds the only truth to be that of life. The classical truth of life is hierarchy, which cannot be squared with any unreal notions about human equality. Thus, the conservative is a supporter of order, subordination, authority and discipline. He believes in time and its relation to quality, and vice versa. He does not build on the romantic idea that greatness of any sort is independent of causation. He organises society on lines in which time and quality can work their reciprocal effects

---

*Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art, (London: Constable, 1911), pp. 176 - 183.

in human beings and in things.[204] And, being a realist, the conservative is averse to popular control, because he cannot believe that everybody is endowed with the necessary judgement to decide what is in his best interest.[205]

Ludovici desired a 'militant realism'.[206] which would overcome anarchy and chaos by simplification, adjustment, and transfiguration.[207] It would be of a kind which is forced upon the powerful classical artist who, in a world upholding values other than his own, is obliged to bring forward his ideals with such a preponderance of characteristic features as would seem almost to represent a transcript of reality.[208]

In Ludovici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, we are informed that the Egyptologist, James Gordon, lived for a revival of Egyption classicism.[209] Whilst, in Ludovici's novel of 1920, Too Old for Dolls, Lord Henry Highbarn asserts to the company he is addressing that they should disabuse their minds of the idea that poetry is romantic.[210] Poetry's most important characteristic is that it adopts a mnemonic form, which conduces to remembering "'important, vital things'".[211] A man who casts his thoughts or his emotions into a poetical or mnemonic form, implies that he is dealing with thoughts or emotions that are important or vital enough to be remembered. Only romanticists have neglected this truth:

> 'The works of your Wordsworths, your Tennysons, your Brownings, your Mathew Arnolds', cried Lord Henry above the noise, 'might be distilled down to one quarter of their bulk and nothing would be lost.'[212]

Ludovici desired that art be entirely unassailable from the strictest realism, in order to make it quite plausible and true to life.[213]

However, Ludovici did not merely desire a realism that would be true to life - it was to be of vital importance in life. In his Nietzsche and Art, he says art should raise the value of Life for man.[214] The soul of man rises or falls according to the nobility or baseness of the meaning which he himself puts into Life: "And, just as, in this matter, he may be his own regenerator, so, also, may he be his own assassin."[215] Ludovici thought that Nietzsche's realisation that Life must be valued was the recognition of a "biological need".[216] All humanity, in the pell-mell of becoming, cried out for a meaning, interpretation, and scheme, that would make Life their property. Life could only be made possible when it had been vitally ordered and arranged.[217] It was humanity's artists who gave Life a human meaning in order to subordinate it to man's power.[218] The vital artist snatches a corner of Life from the eternal flux and torrent of all things into decay or death, and carves it in an unchanging form for the layman, in spite of a world of becoming.[219] Just as the musician cries 'Time!' to the cacophonous medley of natural sounds that pour into his own, and assembles them rythmically, so the graphic artist cries 'Time!' to the incessant and kaleidoscopic procession of things from birth to death, and places in the layman's arms the eternalised image of Life.[220]

'Aethetics ' for Ludovici, finds its place in Life itself. There is no absolute in subject beauty, it is merely the means to an end of a 'type' of man.[221] Absolute beauty exists only in the confines of a particular race: "the moment we begin to share the Chinaman's or the negro's view of beauty, we run the risk of cutting ourselves adrift from our own people."[222] Only when values are beginning to get mixed, owing to an influx of foreigners, according to Ludovici, does the vital biological idea of absolute beauty tend to dissapear, to be replaced by the weak and liberal belief that beauty is relative.

Thus, in Attica of the fifth century BC, where many foreign slaves were to be counted among the population, the idea that beauty was a relative term first occurred to the 'talker' Socrates.[223] The vital artist should depict life, his people, their regularity of form and feature, which is indicative of a certain regular mode of life, and in so doing affirm the vital values of his people.[224] But, before art for the sake of Life can be discovered, man, the highest object of art must be regenerated.[225]

Art, according to Ludovici and Nietzsche, had only been divorced from Life during the Christian era. In the early Christian paintings of the catacombs the Saviour was depicted with all the beauties and charms of the classical god or hero, whether as a Hermes, an Apollo, or an Orpheus.[226] But, by the seventh century, the greatest paradox the world had ever seen, a god on a cross in his death agony, was portrayed for man's eyes to behold.[227] Such, for Ludovici is the vital reaction of art on Life, that as Western Europe received its religion and its ideal 'type' from Christian-Roman art, we should not be surprised:

> ...if today, in our ball-rooms and drawing-rooms we are often confronted with tenuous, flame-like, swan-neck creatures, that recall Burne-Jones, Botticelli, Duccio and Segna to our minds, we know to which values these slender people owe their slender, heaven-aspiring stature, and their long sensitive fingers.[228]

The clustered pillars of Gothic churches and cathedrals volatilize mass and volume, as though they have been spiritualised and dissipated. They are the 'germ' of Protestantism in stone.[229] Gothic architecture's ugliness lies in its contempt of Life and the body.[230] We should not even expect too much of the Renaissance, which was nothing more nor less than man's convalescence, after an illness that had lasted centuries[231]: "To expect the recovering invalids

to impart something of themselves to Life, to enrich her and to transfigure her, would be to expect the impossible."[232]

By contrast, the Greeks' classical conception of beauty acknowledged that life was a blessing to which it was worthwhile to be seduced and lured.[233] Ludovici reckoned that he could trace two 'art-wills' in the bloom of Hellenic art, from the sixth century BC, to two distinct races of men who strove for mastership in Greece.[234] He attributed the fall of Greece to the triumph of that race with the lethal 'art-will'.[235] Ludovici also attributed the perfection of Egyption classicism to the fact that in the days of King Khophren they were racially pure, thanks to their isolated position on the Delta of the Nile.[236] He interpreted the statue of King Khophren as the apotheosis of a 'type' which was the product of the vital values of his people.[237] Similarly, adopting Nietzsche's 'aesthetic' vitalism, Ludovici reckoned that modern art could not be restored until the race had been purified.[238] A man's 'taste' is in the roots of his constitution.[239]

Claiming to have followed the principles of Nietzsche's aesthetic exclusively, Ludovici reckoned the great need was for a definite canon and statement as to the vital purpose of art in Life: "the establishment of an order of rank among tastes". The latter would permit the opportunity of exercising some choice in Life: A choice of 'type' in manhood; a choice of vital values.[240]

Art and life react upon each other.[241] A picture, like a sonnet, like a sonnata, and like a statue, should claim the attention of those who are most vitally concerned with Life and humanity: "every breath of Art comes from the lungs of Life herself, and is full of indications as to her condition."[242] This notion of the inter-

dependence of art and Life, which Ludovici adopted from Nietzsche, is to be found throughout his works. In his A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories he says beauty is essentially the regularity, symmetry and grace of figure which is gradually acquired by a stock pursuing for generations a regular, symmetrical existence, under the guidance of the particular vital values of the race.[243] In the final chapter, "What is Culture?", he suggests that the object of dissil-usioned conservatives should be a culture that will rear a racial elite. It is a Nietzscheian culture, not "idealistic and romantic", But one that would allow conservatives to face all the good and evil of their choice, provided they get what they regard as good - life.[244] Adherence to this vital culture would restore beauty as a constant quality in the external world, and in the internal world of the emotions, as all one-sided rearing of "squeamish ideals" could only eliminate all greatness and character.[245] Only a Nietzscheian culture could make life possible and desirable.[246]

The greatest possible virtue of art is for it to be positive to life and particularly to human life.[247] The artist is the most intense manifestation of life: "He knows what life, human life, wants in order to flourish, because he himself is a flourishing specimen of life, and his taste is life's taste."[248] If all the artists painters were able to exercise their vital taste and power of selection among a population the size of modern England, England would have a periodical and authoritative statement from the men of vital taste in their country, as to who are the elite.[249] An important work of art is something in the nature of an amputation, a loss of blood from the artists life.[250] For Ludovici a beautiful poem is only that which can be linked, "consciously or unconsciously", with things which are desirable in humanity, or in a certain kind or part of humanity. All beauty, then, leads back to life, to human beauty, all ugliness is human ugliness.

No healthy people, according to Ludovici, has ever considered youth as ugly; because youth is the vital promise of human life and of a multiplication of human life. Conversely, no healthy people has ever considered gangreneous limbs, or decay in any form, as beautiful; Because decay is the death of human life and the reduction of it. If it were not for the lethal notions of the 'beautiful consumptive' and the 'captivating cripple' which are to be found in the works of romantic English writers, who hail from the over-Christianised north-west of Europe, the Eugenics Society would have been superfluous.[251]

Art is of such vital importance to Ludovici that it is life herself looking upon her soul and her forms. It is life pronouncing her judgement upon herself:

> ...Where life is sick and impoverished, her voice, speaking through the inferior man condemns herself, and paints herself bloodless and dreary, probably with the sky above depicted in a lurid and mysteriously fascinating fasion, calculated to make the earth seem grey and gloomy in comparison. Where life is sound and exuberant, her voice, speaking through the sound man., extolls herself and paints herself in bright, brave colours; which include even bright and brave colours for pain and the like.

The vital artist looks about him for that thing in life on which he can expend his passion to speak of life itself, and life in its highest manifestation - man.[252] The 'type' most adequate for pictorial advocacy isthat which promises the most life, the biologically sound.[253]

Aesthetic values find their place in life and the race. In Ludovici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, Gerald Swynnerton describes the heroine, Catherine Doyle, as neither the woman of a picture by Rubens, nor the woman of a Botticelli: "'The first is the taste of the Jew, the second of the Englishman.'" Rather, she was more like the woman of a picture by Van Dyck, the

ideal English woman of the Stuart period.[254] Indeed, so closely entwined is art with Life that Ludovici speaks, in his The False Assumptions of "Democracy", of aesthetic survival values which he prefers to mere survival values. They would have made a higher and more lasting civilisation possible.[255] This notion recurs in Ludovici's Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition. In the latter, Ludovici maintains that each race of men must answer not merely the question of how it is to survive, vital-survival-values, but how it is to survive in a desirable form, aesthetic-survival-values.[256] The degeneracy of the population of industrial Europe was due, according to Ludovici, to their exclusive observation of vital-survival-values.[257] The only check on the 'Prometheans' who led mankind downhill to degeneration and death with their 'progress' was the number of Nietzscheian 'Dionysians' to oppose them.[258] 'Dionysians' would have carefully observed aesthetic survival values.[259]

In Ludovici's novel of 1922, The Goddess that Grew Up, Peter Oliver was aghast at the novels and literary pictures of the day. They did not reflect the degenerate state of society as he knew it.[260] If they had been true to life they might have afforded him some vital guidance in life as to the desirable wife:

> ...It is true that, here and there, he lighted upon a novel in which illness was mentioned; but when this was so, it was always treated in a spirit so romantic and unreal, as to be represented as ennobling, uplifting and purifying, - in fact, to judge from the influence it was alleged to exert, as something almost desirable.[261]

For Ludovici, the possession and expression of beauty should be made a part of national life. Beauty should be cultivated in the human body as a factor in a happy life.[262] The national life is so sensitive to culture that Ludovici claimed to be able to trace

Christianities bias in favour of abnormality in history of art to its influence on popular values and dysgenic mating.[263]

Culture, insofar as it is harmony & order, is the product of the race that is pure. Ludovici cited as evidence for this thesis that all earlier cultures arose in naturally or artifically confined areas: in islands like Crete, and Japan, peninsulas like India, Greece, and Italy, naturally enclosed areas like Peru, Mesopotomia and Egypt, and more or less artifically enclosed areas like China and Palestine. In the only cultures that have left a permanent mark upon the world we find not only inbreeding but a conscious tendency to segregate.[264]*

So inextricably does Ludovici see the valuations of art as bound to the processes of life that he reckoned they influenced human mating. Every healthy race should postulate its elite as its vital standard of absolute beauty and pronounce the word 'ugly' in regard to all other racial standardsoof beauty, otherwise its vital mating judgement would amount to the evanescence of its own life.[265] He desired a racial aesthetic to check civilised man's tendency to extend his notion of beauty outside racial or national ideas.[266]

Perhaps Ludovici'smost bizarre illustration of his thesis of the vital interdependency of art and life is to be found in the third chapter of the second part of his The Choice of a Mate, "The Female Leg and the Influence of Dress on Morphology and Temperament."[267] In the latter he argues that our Christian civilisation had imbibed a lethal culture that was peculiar to the Greeks in the period of their decadence.[268]

---

*This thesis recurs in Anthony Mario Ludovici's, The Choice of a Mate, with an introduction by Dr. Norman Haire, (London: John Lane, 1935), p.51 ff.

'Taste' is healthy-or unhealthy according to whether it tends to an ascent or a descent in the line of life. The Greeks, in their decadent male-homosexual bias, did not depict the normal female trunk-leg ratio in their art.[269] Ludovici then proceeds to discuss how this ideal, by having been acquired and followed by Europe, especially since the Renaissance, has affected our choice in mating and influenced the morphology of women. Especially in Protestant countries, with their more ascetic and primitive form of Christianity, there was nothing to resist this cult. Indeed, the early Christian ascetic ideal of human form in general, could only have exacerbated the "late Greek, wholly male-homosexual ideal of human form."[270] Lduovici attributed the recurrent feminism of Europe since the decline of ancient Greece to a morphological anomoly that had been created in life through Greek decadent art assimilating the male form to the female form:

> ...the conscious or unconscious admiration of the leptosomatic or even asthenic female- long or male-leg, broad-shouldered, narrow-hipped and athletic - by most Europeans since the days of male-homosexual Greece (with its marvelously persuasive plastic art) and the acceptance by Christian art of the leptosomatic ideal has probably done much to effect a change in female morphology, and to produce (maybe in periodical waves) a large percentage of masculinoid, eunuchoid and, ..., also infantile adult females in certain generations.[271]

The lethal 'taste' which Greek male homosexuality generated in regard to the female figure, by influencing mating, had been responsible for the creation of viragoes. Ludovici desired that the ancient Greek ideals of female beauty and form be routed out from our "life-habits"[272], by the development of an aesthetic cult freed from Hellenic bias.[273]

The criterian of beauty, for Ludovici, is that which is a life-promoting force.[274] In Ludovici's pseudonymous novel of 1939, Poet's Trumpeter, Professor Bevington says to Thomas Sefton-Smith, that he hopes that out of all the chaos of modern literary criticism a

sane humanity will eventually emerge. Posterity should destroy all literary criticism which deals only with petty problems about manner, and develop a vital canon for art that promotes life, and asks of an artist's creations: "'Was it vital? Was it consonant with mankinds continuing as a pleasing phenomenon on earth? Was it consonent with mankinds wishing to continue?'" Professor Bevington then proceeds to complement Sefton-Smith on the vitality of his poetry. It made him wish to see humanity continue in a pleasing form.[275] Sefton-Smith opines that good art should be a lofty expression of Life.[276]

Ludovici thought culture sustained a race. He reckoned all that was needed for the death of a particular race was not necessarily the disease or violence introduced by another race, but merely the dependency introduced by the imposition of a new culture, which undermines their will to live.[277] He reckoned that Indian culture by resisting Western culture and not allowing it to deflect them from the paths of their racial ancestors promised to regenerate even the social usages of the Indian people:

> ...Above all, it promises to resuscitate their arts and crafts - the 'material' aspects of their civilisation - by repairing the damage suffered from their impact with a civilisation like that of Europe which long ago divorced arts and crafts from any metaphysical source and made mass-production not only possible but indicated.[278]

Democracy, Ludovici believed, could only arise in a people that had lost the "instinct of workmanship", with its sense of quality. Only these 'types', artists and poets, who possess a sense of vital quality, can regenerate a race. But, reciprocally, their art can only flourish in a common culture where racial values are absolute. In an atomised society like the West, with conflicting values, artists can only add to existing confusion and anarchy.[279] The art which integrates a race, which harmonises with the values governing a

race's taste, conduct and outlook, is not the product of the artist or poet. It is the work of great creators who first established the homogeneity of racial values which, expressed in their vital art, "makes it as much a part of the whole as a flower is of the plant on which it grows." Only then does the distinction objective and subjective disappear and the artist speaks to those of his race serenely under the influence of the same vital values, "which all observe in every choice of their active life."[280] High culture and art can only be the outcome of the man of racial purity in whom there are no bodily parts independently inherited from disparate parents. Ludovici claimed that this is why all great cultures were the outcome of inbred and segregated groups and who, in addition, possessed 'culture potential'.[281] The "tasteful and sanitary administration" initiated in ancient Greece by Solon in the early sixth century BC required over a century to build up in the nation all the virtues and gifts which came to flower in the architecture of the Parthenon, the sculpture of Pheidias, the creation of Euripides, and, a decade or two later, in the works of Polycleitus and the plays of Aristophanes. It took over a century before: "the Way of Life established by the new regime had succeeded in producing a people almost uniformly sturdy and well-constituted, and able to supply its artists with types of surpassing beauty."[282]

Interestingly, if I may digress here, it is extremely important to appreciate the importance which Ludovici ascribed to art and craft. He desired a vital culture that would vivify, quicken, and vitalise men through creative generation. Ludovici claimed to agree with Bergson that life, organic life, is creative. The whole joy of living is epitomised in creation. Indeed, the whole of life is an act of creation, the greater the number of active adaptations the

higher the life. The "lust of creation" is behind the very organs of sight, hearing, and touch.[283] Reflecting a typically anti-rational fascist argument Ludovici reckoned that the enjoyment of life is largely a question of aesthetics: "Is not our emotional nature competent to decide upon a question of taste or pleasure?" It is our emotional and aesthetic sense that decide which road to lead in Life's many possibilities.[284] Liberalism and science merely wean us from our love of life and the value of life.[285] They merely succeed in making both life and the body vile, whereas "life is very largely an aesthetic phenomenon."[286] Ludovici's most important writings on life as a creative experience are to be found in his Creation or Recreation, written for the English Mistery in 1934. In the latter he spoke of a conflict of unprecedented gravity and magnitude between the forces of creation, or life, and those of recreation.[287] The 'solution' of mass unemployment created by automation through the further intensive application of machinery was to be rejected as it enforced no reciprocal duties from the idle and also enabled them to fill their otherwise unnocupied lives with cheap amusements.[288] The notion of 'colleges' of leisure craft, financed at great public expense, would merely enable the unemployed to be idle in an innocent and decorous manner.[289] Similarly, communism is no answer as it still accepts the most romantic ideals of nineteenth century liberalism in believing in the unmixed blessings of machinery, the desirability of intensive production, and the ideal of increasing leisure for all.[290] Likewise, Major Douglas's 'social credit' scheme accepted the increasing application of machinery to industry and its consequence, mass leisure, and argued that the unmixed blessings of these have been denied to the masses by the present system of wealth distribution.[291] Ludovici proceeds to elaborate a solution to mass unemployment. He suggests that our

notions of work and leisure are corrupt, derived too exclusively fromthespectacle of the urban wage earner on the one hand, and of the 'Mayfair loafer', on the other.[292] Our notion of work derived from theindustrialwage earner, except when he is a craftsman or highly-skilled man, has the following features: It allows him no opportunity of expressing his higher impulses; is ffequently only a small part of a division of labour which is infinitely repetitive and incapable of being a source of local prestige; may be accomplished by a machine to which the wage earner may be merely an attendant; It may be actually unhealthy; and, if it is absolutely clean work, may be wholly unproductive except of profit to the employer, and wholly sterile.[293] Ludovici thought that what characterised all this work is that it is uncreative. Because no higher impulse can be enlisted, as either nothing at all is produced, or nothing is produced in its entirety.[294] Conversely, we have come to connect leisure, the peculiar possession of the privelliged classes, not with creative impulses or creation, or with recuperation following the latter, but with recreation pursued as a vocation.[295] Ludovici thought we should rid our minds of these corrupt notions of work and leisure, and appreciate that a vital human being has no natural inclination for perpetual recreation, "but a native and irrepressible inclination to be constantly creative." These higher impulses of creativity are the heritage which man has inherited from his differences from the animals, through man having for thousands of years developed the habits of productive labour. We turn to creative activities not merely instinctively as a bird adopts a form of nest building, but as a gregarious act which gives us our raison - dêtre in the community.[296] Our advance from the bestial state isthehistory of the creative impulse, which every man possesses. The discontent of the working classes in all countries, where it has not proceeded from gross oppression, and the restlessness, neurotic pursuits, and

sickness of the privelliged classes", is due to their common divorce from their higher creative impulses.[297] Ludovici cites as further evidence for his thesis that if any healthy man finds a task that appeals to him and stimulates his particular endowments he will be active. Secondly, that intellectual power is a development of muscular sense and that the connection between hand and brain in man may be regarded as the source of a large proportion of what we know as the higher mental faculties.[298] Thirdly, as the universal spring of human action is Nietzsche's 'will to power', the conscious extension of individuality through creativity is one of the most profoundly satisfying activities of the human species. Fourthly, every healthy man engaged in some non-creative activity tries to redeem his self-esteem and to indulge his higher impulses by pursuing some creative activity as a pastime.[299] Finally, no man can survive in happiness and contentment unless he is productive and creative: "that your life is enriching Life." Thus, for Ludovici, the real problem of the eight million he expected to be unemployed through technological innovation by 1940, was whether they were to be forcibly prevented from adopting productive pastimes. As more of those who would be deprived of employment by mechanised industry indulge their "lust for productive pastimes" and further glut markets, it is questionable whether any law would be able to prevent them from doing so.[300] And, once the world had renewed its acquaintance with hand made goods it would not be easily persuaded to accept goods produced by machinery. Nor would it be likely that the home artisans themselves, "having once again tasted of the joys of handicraft", would ever wish to relinquish it for machine minding. Ludovici deduced from this projected tendency the inception of a wholly unprecedented necessity, the liquidation of whole classes of mechanical plants.[301] Excepting those industries no amenable to handicraft - smelting, foundry-work,

certain classes of machine manufacture, haulage, and the like - a liquidation of mechanical equipment would be inaugerated. Even the "lingering death" which would be vouched safed to large masses of factory equipment as long as the export of shoddy goods was continued to uncivilised peoples not yet aware of the undesirability of such products and of the form of their production, would be breif. And the stage in history would be reached when the majority of mankind would do deliberately and with a clean conscience what the Luddites were executed for doing in 1812.[302] Ludovici thought that some of the "more wise and independent of European rulers" had already paved the way for the forces of popular creativity. Hitler with his Ehstands Darlehn (State Loans for Young Proletarians Wishing to Marry), had arranged that advances of State money to prospective bridggrooms should consist partly of small cheques payable only to home-craft workers, so that, wherever possible, mass-produced home-ware and articles of domestic use would not be purchased by the poorer newly-wedded couples of Natzi Germany. Ludovici hoped that the creative "instincts of the English masses", always opposed to machinery, would be similarly confirmed, and that the wisdom of rulers like Edward VI, Elizabeth, James I, Charles I, and of thinkers like Cobbett, Ruskin and Samuel Butler, would ultimately be vindicated.[303] However, he thought before this ideal could be reached, great and bitter wars would have to be waged between the two belligerant 'types' of humanity, the 'Creationists' and the 'Recreationists'.[304] Behind the former would be found the elite of the working masses who would be resolved to legalise their position as home producers, artists, and the more enlightened and human of the economists, philosophers, and psychologists.[305] Behind the 'Recreationists', however, would be found 'vested interests', financial and otherwise, representing established mechanical industries, who saw their power menaced by the paid unemployed; and those elements of the masses and middle classes who had been

totally demoralised and deteriorated by two centuries of industrialism and commercialism, who had none of those higher impulses which insist on creation as the sine qua non of existence.[306] The ensuing struggle would rage over several decades, but the 'Creationists' would win, provided they possessed a sufficiently large body of leaders who were convinced of the existence in all normal and healthy men of their impulse to create.[307]

Similarly, as Ludovici addressed the English Mistery in the following year, 1935, he stressed that they were engaged in creation and should, like the blacksmith, and the builder, reapply the level, the square and the plumb-rule to their creation. The fact that they should find it necessary to apply the plumb-line and the rule in order to make sure that they had not departed from their original design should convince them that they had under their hands something living, creative, "and that is growing".[308]

Now, as can be seen from the preceding discussion, for Ludovici art and culture had degenerated because the life of the race had degenerated, and art and culture could be regenerated only by increasing the vitality of the race; Conversely, and idealistically, life can decline or ascend according to art's valuation of life. Therefore, for Ludovici, art and life are interdependent. From these premisses he proceeds to derive a rationale for a totalitarian culture. Of course, it may appear that the importance that Ludovici assigns to art is explicable in terms of his being a conservative, as it is not unusual for conservatives to make analogies between the practice of art and politics. Conservatives regard politics as a craft, the practice of which is peculiar to the historical experience of each society. Successive generations are apprenticed to a tradition which embodies the political wisdom

of that which has been tried and found to be viable. Statesmanship is a skill acquired through the experience of attending to the traditional arrangements of a society; not a corpus of 'scientific' laws which can be acquired independently of a practice the nature of whose application is always and everywhere the same. However, Ludovici's notion of the 'art of politics' is quite extraordinary for somebody who claimed to be a conservative. Indeed, I consider his confusion of his political and aesthetic categories to be evidence for the substantiation of my thesis that Ludovici is a fascist. It is one of the primary characteristics of fascists to conceive of no limitations to the sphere of politics. They politicize all aspects of life. As Ludovici says in his A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories it is not only in the matter of establishing order that good government excels. He calls this the "simple 'craft' of governing". He appends to this what he calls the vital second quality of good rulership:

> ...that virtue which sets the tone of the people, gives it a criterion of choice, and guides its passions. And this second virtue of good rulership might be called the 'tutorship' of governing, as opposed to the 'craft' aboe-mentioned.[309]

The elite must find a willing medium for their 'art'[310], fulfill the roles of both the craft and tutorship of governing, and establish a certain vital 'taste' or 'art of life' in the race.[311] The "artist's legislator"[312] dictates the type of 'flourishing life' to which the character of the nation or race must approximate, which constitutes the sound and stable basis upon which a permanent creation may be built by the aristocrat if he chooses.[313] He writes of how deeply "higher art" and social order and conservation are related through beauty in the human body alone, which brings about the conservative desire for permanence.[314]

According to Ludovici's aesthetic vitalism one cannot be an anarchist in the matter of pictures, or the matter of one's taste in scenery, without involving oneself in wishing to subvert society. A romantic or liberal attitude which condones anarchy and chaos in scenery, or in art cannot but bear "on our attitude towards life".[315] One cannot with impunity foster and cultivate vulgarity in one's architecture , one's sculpture, ones paintings, one's music and literature: "without paying very dearly for these luxuries in our respective national politics, in our family institutions, and even in our physique."[316] Only a vital culture and taste can achieve anything great in every aspect of life, including politics, morality, and law.[317] However, he declines to connect all these things together, and to show their inevitable interdependency, although he thinks this "perfectly possible though arduous undertaking."[318]

Ludovici believed that an important aspect of politics, that had been neglected by most political philosophers after Aristotle, is the creation and the control, or 'wardenship' as he preferred to call it, of cultures: "Surely, the imponderabilia, the unwritten laws governing a peoples choice in all things, in furniture, architecture, mates, even in sentiments, ideas and opinions, should form a part of government and, therefore, of thephilosophy of politics." Only one prominent recent political thinker had, according to Ludovici, not been guilty of this omission, Coleridge. Coleridge argued that even the Royal Society should be a department of the Church, as well as every branch of science, including all the sages and professions, whether in philosophy or law. Coleridge spoke, according to Ludovici, of the members of a Church thus constituted as resident guides and guardians and instructors, distributed all over the land. Coleridge had seen,

although Ludovici did not agree with his 'solution', the vital need of restoring to the idea of government the function of safeguarding and developing a people's, or race's, culture. Ludovici thought Coleridge would only have conceded to the contention that his ideal for culture is totalitarian, which it is, if only it could be proved that the sentiments, ideas, opinions and criterion of taste, of the masses, were not dictated to them by wholly irresponsible and incompetent parties; and if the masses in any nation could evolve their own culture and do so admirably. Only then would Coleridge have conceded that the culture of a people should not be created and controlled by government.[319]

Ludovici desired an authoritarian direction of culture. The terms and grammer of art should not be matters of individual choice, but of general convention. Only when the 'scheme of life' is at an end, as it is today, is there a state of anarchy in the vital direction of art. Although, anarchy of form is a lesser kind of anarchy than that of direction, because it is not concerned with such vital things as direction, but with the means of expressing direction.[320] This is the reason for Ludovici's hostility to the futurists, he thought they were anarchists of direction, the most vital issue, besides being anarchists of form. Their direction as well as their attitude to direction was utterly opposed to the vital direction and attitudes towards form of the elite principle which is the only means of attaining to any permanence of sound flourishing life: "because sound flourishing life is a process of selecting and rejecting correctly, and only very few can set the canons for this process."[321]

Ludovici reckoned the Holy Catholic Church succeeded in establishing one of the conditions necessary to all "great Art", which is: "unity and solidarity lasting over a long period of time, and forming

men according to a definite and severe scheme of values."[322] His ideal of a common culture is most clearly found in his introduction to The False Assumptions of "Democracy", entitled "The Confusion of Language and its relation to Revolution."[323] In the latter he proclaims that a common language is contingent for its vital potential as a unifying factor on a common culture that provides a design of life into which every word of the language fits like a piece of vital mosaic. Vital abstract or general terms, with which Ludovici thought we guide our lives, should stand for very precise ideas, and should mean the same things to all men of the same race or nation.[324] What perturbed Ludovici most about a confusion of language, in which words of an abstract and general nature have fallen out of place in the desire of life, is that it did not only mislead, but made it no longer possible to lead.[325] Ludovici thought a national art is only possible under the control of national values. An integrated culture, in which the same values invade and pervade every sphere of life, has immense advantages over a chaotic culture according to Ludovici: there is no division of vital opinion concerning what is good, beautiful, or right.[326] What the mass needs for leadership are "objective realists" prepared to establish uniform values and a language that would have a common vital meaning for all - a homogeneous culture.[327]

Predictably, from his totalitarian notion of culture and art, Ludovici generated prescriptions about the order of society appropriate to the vital culture he desired. The route of all beauty, he thought, is power in some form. It is the power of a long, uninterrupted tradition, or accumulated effort which gives rise to something beautiful in life, a particular and orderly set of features, pleasing to that race to whom that particular tradition is familiar.[328] He found the ideal

authoritarian conditions for the perfection of a racial aesthetic to prevail in India, where:

> ...The excellence of the body at least, was well provided for, while the system of casts and guilds (sreni) tended to emphasise and preserve whatever good was derived from the more or less hereditary system of blood occupations.[329]

This, evidently, is a notion that confirms Nietzsche's influence on Ludovici. The former wrote:

> ...we must accept the cruel sounding truth, that slavery is the essence of culture, which leaves no doubt as to the absolute value of Existence. This truth is the vulture, that gnaws at the liver of the Promethean promotor of Culture. The misery of toiling men must still increase in order to make the production of the world of art possible to a small number of Olympian men.[330]

In his commentary on Nietzsche's aesthetic, Nietzsche and Art of 1911, Ludovici attempts to demonstrate that to bestow admiration on a work of 'democratic painting' and at the same time to be convinced of the value of an aristocratic order of society, is to be guilty of a confusion of ideas which, ultimately, can lead only to disastrous results in practical life.[331] He identifies 'Ruler Art' as the art of plenitude and claims its production to be dependent upon four conditions which are quite inseparable from an aristocratic order of society, "and which I therefore associate, without any hesitation as Nietszche does, with Higher Man." These conditions are: Long tradition under the sway of noble and inviolable values, resulting in an accumulation of will power; leisure which allows of meditation; the disbelief in freedom for freedoms sake, without a purpose or an aim; and, an order of rank according to which each is given a place in keeping with his value, and authority and reverence are upheld.[332]

In the following I intend to demonstrate what Ludovici meant by 'Ruler Art', and his vital purpose for art in life. In Ludovici's Nietzsche and Art, where he claims to confine himself strictly to Nietzsche's aesthetic, Ludovici attempts to show that the highest art,

'Ruler Art', in which culture is opposed to natural rudeness, selection to natural chaos, and simplicity to natural complexity, can be the product only of an aristocratic society which observes in its traditions and active life the three aristocratic principles - culture, selection, and simplicity.[333] Only the 'Ruler Artist', according to Ludovici's and Nietzsche's philosophical idealism, can make the world and Life full of form and attractions, as a valuation, and make it possible for man to become master of the world.[334] It was the 'will to power' of the powerful that organised, ordered and schematized the world, and it was their will to prevail which made them proclaim their order and scheme of life as that which must be regarded as creation itself.[335] Once reality had been vitally interpreted by the artist's mind, creating and naming actually became the same thing: "For to put a meaning into things was clearly to create them afresh - in fact, to create them literally."[336] Thus, the world became man's work of art and nature was reduced to his chattel. It was man's 'will to power', which became creative in his highest specimen, the artist, which transfigured reality by means of human valuations and overcame becoming by falsifying it as being.[337] And, to create a thing in the minds of the people was to create that people to: "for it is to have values in common that constitutes the people."[338] The artist, following his divine inspiration to subdue the earthand to make it his, became the greatest stimulus to Life itself.[339] It matters who interprets life as only the few can make a people think that life is really worth living.[340] It is not a question of truth in the Christian and scientific sense, but of finding that belief, whether true or false, which most conduces to an exalted form of Life. A people become the creation of the artist whose greatest delight is to feel that his eyes, his ears, and his touch have become their eyes, and their ears,

and their touch.[341] Their elation consists in seeing the world through his vital "artistic prisms", and in allowing "their higher man, to establish their type." The artist justifies his life by raising the community to its highest power: "by binding it to Life with the glories which he alone can see, and by luring it to the heights which he is the first to scale and to explore."[342] The 'Dionysian artist', the prototype of all gods, exalts life, puts ugly reality into an art form, and makes life desirable for humanity.[343] The function of art is the function of the ruler as it lures a people to a certain kind of Life.[344] The vital values we hold concerning Life are either determined by art, or art lays stress upon certain vital values already established.[345] The values beautiful and ugly, which the graphic arts either determine or accentuate, are but the outcome of other more fundamental values "which have ruled and moulded a race for centuries." As the artist accentuates or determines the qualities beautiful and ugly, he bears an intimate relation to the past and possible life of his people.[346] Spurred by anarchy, his inspiration is government - to make things reflect him. But his will to stamp the nature of stability on becoming is a feeling of gratitude towards Life, "which makes him desire to rescue one beautiful body from the river of Becoming, and fix its image in the world." It is not the desire for being of Christianity which is based upon a loathing for Life and a weariness of it. The artist finds his greatest attraction in ugliness, by which Ludovici means disorder, and by converting it into beauty, or order, reaches the zenith of his power.[347] In the graphic arts, which either determine or accentuates the vital values 'ugly' and 'beautiful', every artist who establishes his notion of what is subject-beauty, like every lover about to marry, either assails or confirms and consolidates the vital values of his race or people.[348] The beauty of a person is the outcome of a long observance through

generations of the vital values peculiar to a race or people.[349]

Ugliness in the subject of art is the decadence of a 'type':

> ...It is the sign that certain features belonging to other people (hitherto called ugly according to the absolute biological standard of beauty of a race), are beginning to be introduced into their type. Or it may mean that the subject to be represented does not reveal that harmony and lack of contrast which the values of a people are capable of producing.[350]

Beauty, in any person, being the result of a long and severe observance by his ancestors of a particular set of vital values, always denotes some definite attitude towards Life.[351] The 'ruler artist' is he who, elevated by his love of Life, says 'yea' to his own 'type' and, in so doing, determines or accentuates the vital values of that type.[352] His power lies in his vitally intimate association with a particular people. Art of any importance, must be based upon a race's or peoples particular group of vital values, otherwise, it is divorced from life.[353] The 'Dionysian artist' cannot look at Life without enriching her. He periodically smashes Being in order to endure Becoming for the "joy and destruction of creation."[354] A Superhuman spirit, he apotheosizes the 'type' of a people and stimulates them to a higher mode of life.[355]

Ludovici found his ideal of 'ruler art' , the bondage of art with Life, in Egyption classicism. Not because he regarded a return to the 'type' of ancient Egypt as the only possible salvation of the graphic arts, which he dismissed as sheer romanticism, but because he saw in the spirit which led to Egyption classicism, which he regarded as necessary to all great achievements, either in politics, art, or religion, that which we ought to prize and cherish, and which we now possess in only a decadent form. It is the spirit which <u>will</u> establish order at all costs, whose manner of exploiting 'higher man' is to look upon Life through their transfiguring vision.[356] In ancient Egypt

we find the belief that restraint is necessary, and part of the art of life, and in order to have one group of advantages, another group must be sacrificed. This principle, sacrifice, is that which goes to rear a great people as all vital values, all art, and all life are dependent on it: "it is the principle of all great art, - and it is the principle of all great life."[357] The people this principle of sacrifice reared, the ancient Egyptians, who bonded this life-principle in their art, communicate little to the modern age through their vital art. But, according to Ludovici, as every great artist and legislature should know, it is precisely upon the principle of sacrifice, that all great art and life repose. The symbolic representation of this life-principle, sacrifice, and its bondage in art, was achieved by the ancient Egyptians in the pyramid.[358] Even their realistic portrait statues, which appear anomalous in the vital art of Egypt, can be explained. They were never intended to be works of 'Ruler Art', established to underline and emphasise the vital values of a race of people.[359] They had a definite purpose, but quite foreign to that of vital art, - death: "with underground tombs and sarcophagi."[360] Otherwise, Egyptian art is the apotheosis of a particular 'type'. They are what all art should be, a stimulus, and a spur to a life based upon a definite set of vital values. Ludovici saw the Egyptians' "wedlock of Art and Sociology" symbolised in the pyramid, the greatest artistic achievement that had been achieved, which in its form embodied all the highest qualities of great art, and all the highest principles of life.[361] With all its six thousand years of age it stands on the threshold of the desert, on the threshold of chaos and disorder, where none but the wind attempts to shape and to form, "and reminds us of a master will that once existed and set its eternal stamp upon the face of the world in Egypt, so that mankind might learn whither mankind had risen or declined." In its synthesis of the three main canons, simplicity,

repetition and variety, nothing has ever excelled it in its 'mystic utterance' of the condition of the ideal state, in which every member takes his place and ultimately succeeds in holding 'higher man' uppermost; and in its revelation that man can attain to some height if he chooses.[362] Ludovici thought Egyption classicism was the product of a people reared by a definite set of inviolable vital values. Although, Ludovici did not think it could be revived in our democracy he did think it was the best example of 'Ruler Art' in man's history, and that the vital culture of Egypt at least afforded a criterion according to which contempory art was putrescent.[363]

However, the contempory art critic's duties were useless as a practical pathology. It is the role of some greater pathologist, 'ruler artist' to discover what is wrong with life itself. Art is the bloom of life. If one objects to the bloom it is no use correcting that alone; one must correct the root - life. The task of correcting the root of art, life, belongs to the "artist legislator." The art critic, or minor pathologist, ought to write his report and send it up to a higher pathologist, a pathologist not of art, but of life. We all grow on a particular social tree whose art, whose blooms, are the inevitable outcome of the trees nature. It is futile to fulminate against the wrong blooms because they are the inevitable outcome of the tree, or living thing, from which the critic himself draws his sap.[364] It was industry and commerce, the vulgar despotism, that had led to the spurning of all that constituted flourishing and desirable life. The last 'ruler artist' in England was Charles I, who opposed the uncontrolled movement of lethal taste that flouted all that made for desirable humanity. Artists, since the death of Charles I, should have formed themselves into a select aristocracy "in a population of hogs", and refused all intercourse

with the hawkers and chapmen of the market place. However, the tendency among artists had been to abet rather than to oppose the grand movement of vulgarization, exploitation, and degeneracy which reached its zenith in the last fifty years of the nineteenth century, and became businessmen themselves.[365] But, in essence, the artists were only partly to blame. The graphic artist, does not create an order of existence, "a scheme of life", which is the role of the "poet - or artist legislator." The graphic artist is impelled to his work through his exuberant joy over the order of life that the vital 'artist-legislator' creates, and over the spirit which animates it. Therefore, in an age without the 'artist-legislator' there is neither architecture, sculpture or painting. In such a plight the artist literally does not know what to express. When, in 1860, the subject picture was proclaimed to be dead it was not the artists who were at fault. It was, rather, due to the absence of a really exalted vital 'artist-legislator' in Europe.[366] And the remedy sought by the graphic artist of the time, the regalvanisation of the graphic arts by awakening a feverish interest in a new technique, was feeble and futile; because it did not go to the root of Life, the real root of the trouble. Divorced from a general ruling scheme of Life, the graphic artist, drifted upon the seas of life like a rudderless derelict. They should have laid down their palettes and declared art to be impossible, unless a vital 'artist-legislator,' arose to give a fresh faith to a purposeless humanity.[367] When the graphic artist is not animated by a great scheme of life, graphic art loses its vitality, the subject picture dies, and painting becomes merely a means of expressing the ideosyncracies of individuals divorced from any great vital arrangement or scheme.[368]

Life is a process of choosing and discarding correctly. To choose and discard correctly leads to a permanence of flourishing life,

whereas, to choose and discard wrongly leads to death. Men choose and reject correctly only when they are guided by men of vital 'taste'.[369] Indeed, Ludovici regarded all great religions as sacerdotal attempts at perpetuating and preserving the vital 'taste' of a few great men. Societies are established systems guided by the vital selectings and rejectings of a few founders. The members of such societies see in their vital 'taste' the only hope of conservation:

> ...and where the selectings and rejectings, which constitute a scheme of life, have through the centuries proved their value as preservers of sound life, there is naturally a tendency in the people observing them to be intensely and obstinately conservative.

Only when the 'taste' of a founder has through the centuries failed to prove its value as a preserver of sound life are the people who have observed it revolutionary. The graphic artist is not, however, and never has been, responsible for the foundation of a scheme of life. Therefore, the graphic artist is essentially a dependent of the 'artist-legislator'. The graphic artist is no more than a civic arrangement, or a scheme of life become or becoming self-conscious. The graphic artist simply expresses the will behind it, he is not the will behind it. The minor artists (architects, sculptors, painters, musicians) are inspired by the vital 'artist legislator', whose scheme of life gives the minor artists their direction, their vital 'taste' for selection and the spirit of the interpretation of the life about them. The content of their work consists of the portion and kind of life chosen, and its interpretation in terms of the great living order to which the artist belongs.[370]

Ludovici hoped for the awakening to the truth that the artist, the architect, the painter, and the poet are bankrupt unless some vital aim and aspiration, animate their eye, inspire them in their work, and kindle in them the passion for a particular 'type' of man,

on which they may lavish their eloquence, their chromatic, musical and architectural rhetoric, with conviction and power.[371] The direst need of modern times is the artist legislator: "For, in order that fresh life and fresh type can be given to art, fresh vigour and a fresh type must first be given to life itself."[372]

Ludovici placed his hope for the regeneration of society and art in the promise of Nietzschean 'ruler artists', able to integrate and vitalise the nation through their culture. Subsequent generations, he hoped, would realise that the present plethora of social reform had one curious and universal trait - great unhappiness.[373] But, for Ludovici, it is not a question of the quality of happiness failing anywhere, but its quality.[374] Quality is quite as scarce above as it is below, although, it first began to leave the superior stratum, who had been scouting it for two hundred and fifty years with the advent of uncontrolled commerce and industry. Their favoured child had been quantity which could not provide joy or happiness in life. The power that discriminates between quality and quantity is taste - the vital power of the artist. By artist Ludovici does not mean "the commercial gang who now dub themselves artists", but the man who naturally knows and is the measure of all things. For two centuries and a half he had been deprived of power by those who usurped his place at the top. The true artist is the loving guardian of vital quality: "He rejoices in it, thrives on it, knows it, detects it, represents it, sings for it, dies for it." Until the martyrdom of Charles I, those at the top were guided by the dictates of vital taste. They, and their colleagues, the artists, were the depositories of quality through the ages and invoked its high authority at every moment of choice. This was the "most vital" function of aristocracy, and when it ceased the aristocrats themselves ceased to be. And, when

it did cease their damned in England an epoch in which no qualitative tradition, no qualitative example, any longer descended from the leaders to the followers in society.[375] Ludovici's remedy lay in regenerating the elite as 'ruler-artists'.[376] It is most evident in his A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories. He wrote that human life, like any other kind of life, produces some flourishing and some less flourishing specimens. And, in order that flourishing life may be prolonged, multiplied, and enhanced on earth, the vital wants of flourishing life, its optimum of conditions, "must be made known and authoritatively imposed upon men by its representatives."[377] Ludovici reckons the true representative of flourishing life are the artists, the men of vital taste. No committees or deliberative assemblies can form a substitute for him in this vital function. If one's choice of ways and means, or one's 'taste', is such that when they become general tastes they lead to an ascent in Life, then 'unconsciously' one's body which is a specimen of flourishing life, is uttering the credo of flourishing life. But, if one's tastes are such that when they become general they lead to a descent in Life, then one's body is a specimen of impoverished life, and pronounces the lethal doctrine of decline.[378] By artist, Ludovici does not mean a painter or a musician or an actor, but a man of vital taste who unhesitatingly knows what is right and wrong, and whose vital type only occurs two or three times in every generation of minor artists.[379] The people can only flourish if it is given a sound taste for discerning good from bad, that which is beneficial from that which is harmful, and healthy, vital conduct from sick, degenerate conduct. It is through the neglect of these principles of Life that lethal taste prevails today.[380] Real beauty is impossible without regular and stable living, lasting over generations:

> ...real Art is impossible without surplus health and energy, the outcome of generations of careful storing and garnering of vital forces, and without that direction and purpose which the supreme artist - the tasteful legislator - alone can give to the minor artists, be they painters, architects, or musicians within his realm.[381]

For the unbroken tradition, on which these things depend, to be established, there must be great stability and permanence in the institutions of a race, and it is the direction of flourishing life alone, that can reveal the vital taste and judgement necessary for the preservation of such stability and permanence: "For stability and permanence are desired only when beauty is present." When a people have achieved <u>real</u> beauty, and caught a glimpse of this beauty in all departments of their social life, they must cry for conservation rather than change.[382] It is only then that change is dreaded; for change threatens to rob the beauty from the face, the limbs and trunk of their civilisation.[383] The 'tutorship of ruling' involves the responsibility of establishing a great and vital culture that is sufficiently powerful to integrate a whole people, and ensure the inevitability of its expansion over the face of the earth.[384] 'Ruler artists' like Manu, Moses and Mohammed, "arch-geniuses in the art of pia fraus", thoroughly and subtlely contrived to weave a vital religion into the hygiene and food of a people so as to build up a fresh human physique that might be called either a true Brahmin, a true Israelite, or a true Mohammedan.[385] They effected a deep racial act of consolidation through their vital art[386], and bound the race or people by an internal relationship, based upon the most elaborate prescriptions of general conduct, hygiene, and spiritual occupation, until ultimately this internal relationship was stamped upon the faces and bodies of the people.[387] Life, the process of living, is a matter of constantly choosing and rejecting.[388] This choosing and rejecting in life is a matter of life and death. There can be only one opinion that is right, and another that is wrong. For some mens'

opinions on vital questions, by being erroneous, must lead to death. Therefore, 'taste', which is the power of discerning the right from the wrong in vital matters is the greatest power of life as it leads to permanence of life, in those who possess it and can exercise it.[389] The elite that Ludovici says possesses vital 'taste' in his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories are the 'ruler artists', the exemplars of flourishing life. The only source to which we can turn for the needs, the desires, the likes and dislikes of flourishing life, is not the mass[390], but the exemplar of flourishing life: "His voice utters the taste of flourishing life; it is the canon and criterion of all that leads to permanence and resistance in life - it is Taste."[391] The art and culture of the minor artists without direction from the 'ruler artists', from above, without a grand scheme of life providing the vital taste forthe minor artists' "interpretation of life - such art is mere make believe, mere affected fooling (his itallics)." For the architect, the sculptor, the painter, the poet, the musician and the actor are essentially dependents - "dependants on the superior man who is the artist legislator." If the ruler artist, or "artist legislator", is non-existent, as Ludovici thinks he is today, his dependants no longer have that momentum, direction and guidance in vital taste which their function requires to promote life:

> ...That is why their function becomes meaningless and erratic, and their aims become anarchical, unless there be that in their life and their nation which gives their art a meaning, a deep necessity and an inspiration.[392]

Democracy means death because it does not take into account the vital element of 'taste'. It meant inviting Life's adversary to the council-board[393], for 'taste' is a power of life.[394] Ludovici reckoned that the healthy regimen of the Catholic, with his fast days and lenten abstinance, and his festivals of dionysian indulgence, is following

the canonised vital 'taste' of some of the greatest specimens of flourishing life that arose during the Middle Ages.[395] The course traversed by a developing culture cannot be traced to evolution, which has no set plan, but is founded in the vital taste of its leaders.[396] Ludovici reckoned that artists are the only kindred spirits to the aristocrat in the whole of a nation, because of their common recognition of the vital importance of 'taste'.[397] He lamented what he regarded as the growing breach between aristocracy and culture, the first signs of which were visible from the eighteenth century.[398]

Ludovici's notion of vital 'ruler artists' is also found in his A Defence of Conservatism. In the latter he claims that the phenomenon of a 'culture potential' explains the fundamental divergence between the men who incline instinctively to vital qualitative values, and those who incline instinctively to lethal quantitative values, and the social form which each evolves. A nation divided between these two 'types' cannot find a compromise, a complete fusion of the two social forms is never possible, and the result is internecine warfare. The body of people inclining to quantitative values, tend to instability and futile change, because it never perceives the necessary relation between time and quality. Its conservatism will be largely self-interest; and if it possesses nothing, its conservatism will be feeble. On the conservative side, the members of this body will be unreliable, and on the non-conservative side, anarchical. Their culture potential will reach its limits in commercial work.[399] The body of people inclining to qualitative values, which will also draw itsrecruits from every social class, will, on the other hand, tend to stability and preservation, "not only of things but also of family traits and strains". Its conservatism will not be merely self-interest, it will consist of a wish to retain a stable

environment, often against self-interest, for the maturing of its seeds of quality. On the merely conservative side, the members of this body will be principled, and on the aristocratic side they will be patrons, selectors, and cultivators of lasting and beautiful things, whether in the personnel or chattels of the nation. The culture potential of these qualitativists will reach its limits in perfection of social organisation, and in the beauty of the people and of their environmental conditions. The relatively small concern about material success which characterises the latter body, the concern which is largely swamped by the primary impulse to quality and beauty, would lead to their death at the hands of the 'quantitativists'. And, then that part of the nation which supplies it with its most valuable vital quality, and therefore its chief equipment for conservation, would tend to die.[400] It is only through the rule of vital qualitativists, the elite, that a nation's conservation can be ensured. Ludovici demonstrates the latter by the following simple parable:

> Beauty contemplating her features in a mirror knows but one devil, which with all her might she wishes to cast out, and that is Change. To the skilful beautifying surgeon who offers to improve the line of her face by an operation, however slight, she promptly shows the door. And she is right (his italics).[401]

Ludovici thought only a few contempory artists approached his vital ideal of art. They were the following:-

Van Gogh and Gaugin.

Ludovici reckoned that in the works of Van Gogh and Gaugin something much more vital was on view than a mere collection of modern works of art. At last the Cavalier element was beginning to recover some of its former strength and he thought it but a forecast of future

events in the concrete world of politics and national life. Or, at least when Ludovici left the Sonderbund Austellung in the middle of July 1912, he reckoned that amidst the smell of gunpowder and above the scrimmage he saw Van Gogh and Gaugin, like two gallant veterans, directing the cause of flourishing life. For they were deserters from the other side, andknew their opponents weakest points. But, it was not victory that Ludovici saw, rather it was a very slight change in the fortunes of battle: "a mere wave of enthusiasm and trust on the Cavalier side - a mere wave of depression and greater exhaustion among the Roundheads."[402]

Those who persisted in their negative attitude to life, the 'Roundheads' and the Puritans, lost heavily in the post-impressionist movement. It was in this movement that the world of art first realised the great vital need, a closer relationship to life. The technique of the post-impressionist revealed a tendancy to sacrifice values to colour. Apart from the fact that pure colour and line-technique is associated with Egyption and Greek classicism, Ludovici thought it compels a painter to practice three desirable virtues: A pure colour technique forces the painter to a more masterly expression of reality; it deprives him of compromise and of 'democratic' blending, and leaves bravery, the ability to face and control contrasts, as the only alternative; In as much as it betrays a love of brightness, it is a sign of a more positive attitude towards life.

The manner in which Van Gogh and Gaugin replied to the question of what was the good of impressionist technique without the sublime inspiration of a worthy object and purpose constituted them deserters from the ranks of their old fellows - "the insurrectionists, the Roundheads." But, in claiming that man was the only fit subject for

pictorial rhetoric they realised the great deficiency of their age: "Now where was the man or the race of men in their day who could inspire the artist with a passion for man?"[403] Gaugin, in despair, actually migrated to the Marquesas Isles and to Tahiti, and there not only painted negresses, but, to his cost, also fought Western culture whenever and wherever he could.[404]

Van Gogh's art, for Ludovici, was a bridge leading out of the "negative revolution" of the latter half of the nineteenth century - impressionism.[405] His fame is all the greater as he lived in a degenerate age. The principle figures in the "Grand-Rebellion drama" of art, in the preceding century, were themselves innovators, renovators and subvertors. But, they revolted against sickness in an age of sickness, and assumed the title of rebel with both pride and dignity.[406] Ludovici then proceeds to locate Van Gogh in the 'revolutionary drama' of the preceding century. He concedes that though Van Gogh was an impressionist, Van Gogh strove to surpass Manet, Monet, Renoir, Degas and Whistler. Though the latter's art procedure may have been superior, Van Gogh's aims were higher and more vital, he realised more keenly what was wrong and what was desirable.[407] Van Gogh was an instinctive artist, absorbed in nature, and thoroughly at ease as her interpretor.[408]

Ludovici selected Van Gogh, and a little before him his friend, Gaugin, as the only two artists in the impressionistic and post-impressionistic movements of the late nineteenth century, that he approved.[409] Both Van Gogh and Gaugin were artists of 'sound instincts' as they had recognised the lack of the "great legislator"[410]. They realised that beauty can only be traced to man; and without man beauty could not exist on earth.[411]

The beauty of Van Gogh's technique and the characteristic that Ludovici chiefly admired in his works is the glorification of colour and neglect of values. He admired colour more than values because technique should be important only as a means of betraying how a man approaches and deals with reality. All thevirtues of a good technique are traceable to vital human standards and virtues. He reckoned that if one compares Van Gogh's pictures with the funereal work produced by the Glasgow school:

> ...you will be convinced of the difference between the bright, laughing, yea-saying attitude to life and the dark, gloomy, negative, churlish, Puritanical, and, in many respects, essentially British attitude to life.[412]

Van Gogh turned his back on the negative love of landscape, in which man or the hand of man in entirely absent, inspired by romantics like Rousseau and Schiller.[413] After much tribulation, and the gravest and most depressing doubts, Van Gogh realised the fundamental truth that art can find its meaning only in life, "and in its function as a life force." Therefore, the highest art must be that which seeks its meaning in the highest form of life, and Van Gogh again realised the truth that the highest form of life is man.[414] He realised that art was an expression of life itself.[415] From a negative impressionist, Van Gogh became more positive to life, and this healthy development led him to the inevitable - man himself.[416] But, Van Gogh, was desperate, he was doubtful of the existence of man with the greatest promise of life. Van Gogh turned to the peasant as he could find no other 'type' worthy of his vital pictorial advocacy.[417] His splendid tribute to Christ as a marvelous artist, a modeller and creator of men, was, according to Ludovici, the half-realised longing that all true vital artists must feel for that sublime figure, the ruler-artist:

> ...the artist-legislator who is able to throw the scum and dross of decadent civilisation back into the crucible of life, in order to make men afresh according to a more healthy and more vigorous measure.[418]

Besides Van Gogh, Gaugin, knew that there was something nobler than the peasant, but did not know where to find him. And, in doing this they were only doing what the whole of Europe would soon be doing, as art and life are intimately related, the former indicating the direction life is taking.[419] Gaugin was a man who felt more keenly than any other European of his day, according to Ludovici, the impossibility of consecrating his powers to the exaltation of the modern white man with whom he was contemporaneous. Comparatively early in life he faced the truth that the modern European, could not and must not, be the 'type' of the future. His parched thirst for a more positive 'type' drove him like a haunted explorer all over the world.[420] His influence was deep and lasting on Van Gogh.[421] Since Gaugin perceived the degeneracy of the highest subject of art, the civilised white man, he was really a vital artist without employment. Nevertheless, Gaugin and Van Gogh had probed deeply enough to see that the wrongness of man had something to do with the wrongness of art itself.[422]

But, for Ludovici, although these two exceptions, Van Gogh and Gaugin, saw the root of the cause of the degeneracy of art, impoverished life, they, and the impressionists, secessionists, and post-impressionists, had come and gone, without modifying the chaos of values and degenerate manhood. This could only be remedied by 'ruler-artists' - which only Van Gogh and Gaugin saw the need of.[423]

Auguste Rodin

Ludovici's great admiration for Van Gogh and Gaugin was, perhaps, over shadowed by his even greater admiration for the heroic personality and aesthetic vitalism of Auguste Rodin. His encomium of Auguste Rodin

is chiefly to be found in Ludovici's Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin, published by John Murray in 1926. Chapters two to six of the latter were previously published by the Cornhill Magazine in July and August of 1923, December of 1925, and January and February of 1926.*

For Ludovici, Auguste Rodin's art was distinguished by its closeness to life. The Salon Committee were so puzzled by the extreme realism of the treatment and the perfection of Rodin's "The Age of Bronze", that someexpressedthe suspicion that the statue had been made from castes taken direct from life.[424] His "Balzac" statue cleaves the air like a living thing naturally springing from the soil.[425] Ludovici writes of Rodin's "Thinker" statue as massive, powerful, and vital. The big upper limbs hang heavily from the shoulders as if they were really of flesh and bone, "the whole effect is one of prodigious though restrained vitality."[426]

Ludovici also admired Rodin personally. Especially, as his nature was one of "a peculiar mixture of apparently irreconcilible extremes."[427] On the one hand, Rodin had strong monarchical sympathies[428], and on the other hand he revealed the most tender concern for the character and

*Anthony Mario Ludovici's "Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin I", Cornhill Magazine, Volume LV - No. 325, New series, July 1923, pp. 1-13 was reproduced as "The First Impressions of Rodin's Home", Chapter II of his Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), pp. 45-67; "Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin II", Cornhill Magazine, Volume LV, - No. 326, new series, August 1923, pp. 131-143 was reproduced as "Rodin's Criticism of the Age"Chapter III of Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), pp. 68-89; "Further Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin I", Cornhill Magazine, Volume LIX - No. 354, New Series, December 1925, pp. 745-766 was reproduced as "Rodin as a Collector", Chapter IV of Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), pp. 90-112; "Further Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin II", Cornhill Magazine, Volume LX - No. 355, New Series, January 1926, pp. 111-126, reproduced as "Rodin as a Draughtsman", Chapter V of Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), pp. 113-140; "Further Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin III", Cornhill Magazine Volume LX - No. 356, New Series, February 1926, pp. 213-226, reproduced as "Rodin the Sculptor", Chapter VI of Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), pp. 141-164.

welfare of the common folk, rather like William Cobbett, and socialists, according to Ludovici.[429] In regard to modern democratic assemblies, Rodin was as ruthless in his criticism as the "most hide-bound Tory"[430], but appalled at the conditions of the working classes.[431] Rodin maintained that 'progress' is society's worst form of cant, according to Ludovici's recollections of him.[432] Sometimes, according to Ludovici, Rodin's views would recall those of Cobbett, Ruskin, William Morris, or Samuel Butler. Particularly, when he spoke of the influence of machinery upon the masses of all modern industrial communities.[433] Rodin possessed a "cold and logical realism".[434]

Critics might have accused Rodin of not achieving a fidelity to nature, but Rodin would have told them that he saw nature more vital, more highly energetic, than they did: "He saw it as it is - that is to say alive, with the sap of life running through its form (his itallics)." In his "La Pensee", Rodin had left the marble block on which the head reposes in a rough state, to see whether he could make the head so exuberantly alive, that it imparted vitality even to the inert mass of marble beneath it.[435] In order to make his busts quiver with life, as though blood were pulsating beneath them, Rodin deliberately added little nodules to them.[436] Ludovici joined Rodin, as his private secretary, when Rodin was sixty six years of age and yet he still possessed the capacity to feel and to respond freshly and powerfully, in spite of advancing years, to the harmony of life and art.[437] Rodin, like Ludovici, found his ideal in Greek classicism.[438] He was also an ernest and enthusiastic admirer of the Gothic.[439] Ludovici reckoned that the evolution of sculpture from the ancient Greeks, via the Romans, to our own time, had revealed, except for periods of decline, an ever-increasing fluidity and nervousness of form. Rigidity and vigour gradually diminished, until with Donatello a more delicate

and supple form was attained: "It is as if Christian civilisation had multiplied and rarified the soul of humanity and enabled man to see certain things more sympathetically and less simply."[440] Ludovici reckoned that although Rodin appreciated this truth and aspired to the Greek classicism of Pheidias in many of his pieces, his natural vain lay in the direction of the Gothic.[441] in Rodin's sculpture there is a movement, a swing, a freedom which is more Gothic than classic. In Gothic sculpture, according to Ludovici , there is an intensity of animation and expression, a restlessness of form and line, which is never encountered in the Greek or Roman. They, and the growth of natural science, represent part of the asceticism of man's grasp of life and nature for which the soul-searching creed of Christianity was responsible.[442] The quality of repose in the sculpture of the ancient Greeks was a manifestation of the serenity which belongs to a people not yet disturbed by self-doubt and self-contempt.[443] Everything that had appeared in Europe since the fall of the Roman Empire was more disturbing and nervous. Ludovici, thought Rodin was a supremely gifted exponent of this "strange accretion" received by the mind of man after the age of classic Greece.

However, Rodin saw life more piercingly than his predecessors. He discovered through hard manual toil and the incessant study of nature, a "magic means" whereby what he saw could be adequately communicated . The first of these requires the understanding that sculpture has been produced by a process the exact converse of nature.[444] Nature, works from within, outwards.[445] This fact, recognised by Rodin, taught him where the pitfalls in sculpture lay. Sculpture is the production of a form by peripheral processes, and is therefore the converse of nature's method. A sculpture of a man is an object which has acquired shape from the outside, as if by corrugations of its periphery, whereas:

"A man is a conglomeration of cells ; that have grown and pushed the air aside from an inner necessity." Rodin reckoned that all ordinary sculpture retains the signs of having been formed from the outside, rather than of having cleaved the air in expanding.[446] Rodin's object consisted in manipulating the medium of expression so as to produce by art a form that seemed to be created by natural laws. Rodin informed Ludovici that it was only when he had succeeded in appreciating the difference between life and sculpture that he had begun to produce living sculpture:

> ..."Look at every part of a given form", he would say, "as the limit of a thickness rather than a surface in length, and every point in that form as the extremity of a diameter directed at you, rather than as a slope or plain stretching across your line of vision, and you will have grasped my method of seeing what I am modelling."[447]

According to Rodin's criterion, Ludovici claimed to be able to distinguish between the flat sculpture of a poor sculptor and the work that breathed life, that conveys vitality cubically - in thicknesses.[448] Rodin had not merely discovered a successful technique, but wrested a secret from life itself.[449]

Ludovici reckoned that superimposed on Rodin's first "vital principle", that the sculptured form should have the qualities of natural form which consists in having grown outward from a centre, of having invaded space from an inner necessity, which he achieved by disciplining himself "to feel and understand all the surfaces of a form, not as planes in length, but as extremities of diameters pointing at him, as thicknesses vibrating with life through their whole form", was a second life principle - that of movement.[450] His figures, already vital as the outcome of the first principle, are given the additional semblance of animation by being represented as carrying through a bodily movement.[451] The sculptor seems doomed to

represent only immobility; because apparently he can seize only one movement in progression, and has to give the anatomical conditions of that one movement. And, if this is so, one of the principal characteristics of life is wholly beyond the reach of the graphic arts. But, Rodin had resolved it by realising that any attempt to seize one movement alone in progression was fatal to the illusion of movement.[452] The method of the photograph is the wrong one if the object is to give the illusion of life and movement by a single image. The eye differs from the camera in being able to record without confusion the merging of one movement into another, the blending of one movement in progression with another movement. Two positions, therefore, conceived as one, give the impression of movement even in the static sculpture or in the drawn outline.[453]

With these vital artistic formulae Rodin could not fail to achieve extremely real representations of life.[454] Despite the extreme mobility of the features of Rodin's statue, "Victor Hugo", Ludovici writes, that at every point on its surface one is conscious of the diameter directed at one and receding backwards through living matter; the periphery of it appears to press outwards from an inner necessity, and gives the illusion of life, although it has been formed from outside.[455]

However, Rodin did more than study life sedulously and apply its principles to his art and wrest from the living form the secret of its vital make-up, he worshipped human beauty.[456] Never does he present us with anything sick or degenerate, the exhausted 'type' of the modern world, which is freely chosen quite uncritically by less vigilant modern sculptors. All of his figures are patterns of health and vigour.[456] They breathe youth and unspent energy. His 'taste' was healthy as he preferred gross splendour in human stature, rather

than delicate and morbid-refinement. Ludovici eulogised the "power and quivering vitality of Rodin's art".[458] He reckoned that it must be obvious to the student of Rodin's works that a disparity exists between the style of his plasters and bronzes and that of his marbles. This is due to the fact that the marbles are chisselled interpretations by other artists, and do not come direct from Rodin's own hands: "The latter [marbles] are always smoother, bristle less with life, and show a shade less vigour than the former [plasters and bronzes]. They retain his quivering vitality as through a veil."[459]

Ludovici reckoned that as an artist Rodin ranked as the most thoughtful performer of his century. His naturally robust constitution drove all his natives gifts to the limit of their development. Rodin became an "engine of such formidable power" that he easily towered above the greatest of his contempories.[460] As a sculptor Ludovici thought Rodin was certainly the greatest product of the purely Gothic tradition. And his works the finest example, in his century, of the successful attempt to free the plastic medium from the limitations inherent in it.[461] He portrayed the living form as no other sculptor of his century succeeded in portraying it.[462]

Ludovici cautioned us not to confound Rodin's opposition to official art with that of the impressionist painters.[463] Rodin was much too earnest an admirer of Greek classicism, to be able to desire the impressionists' prescription. He was, however, an avowed enemy of the pseudo-Greek classicism of his day.[464] Whilst technical reforms took a very valuable and important place with Rodin, unlike the impressionists' they were used for the purpose of attaining to greater fidelity in the representation of the living form: "They aimed at rescuing the living form from people who had become mere

caricaturists in marble and stone."[465] Rodin never dignified technical innovations with the status of ultimate desiderata. They were always subordinated to his greatest object, which was the artistic representation of life itself. Rodin did not mock the academicians who had made the subject picture and the subject sculpture an absurdly inadequate representation by banishing the subject altogether, as the impressionists had, but showed how the subject picture could be so reverantly treated as to be honourably restored to its proper place in the plastic arts.[466] He rescued the discredited subject from the ignominy into which it had fallen, and in so doing ultimately triumphed in teaching the 'Graeco-Latin' academicians what true Greek classicism was. He embodied in his sculpture the "principles which made not only Greek but also Gothic sculpture the living thing that it is."[467]

The impressionists were typical of their age, opportunists and democrats, who sacrificed every institution that is discredited not through any fault inherent in its nature, but through those who mismanage it, rather than reconstituting it and constructively restoring it. In contrast, Rodin never claimed that he had introduced anything fresh, but that he had rediscovered what the Greeks and the Gothics had possessed, and what his contempories entirely lacked: "He read the secret of the life that animated the antique."[468] Rodin had played the most valuable and important part in the great movement which, beginning about the year 1860, continued until the advent of the cubists and futurists, because it led back to life and humanity, and, above all, to a healthy view of both.[469] Rather than call Rodin the sculptor of impressionism, Ludovici preferred to class Rodin as a mediaevalistic reactionary:

> ...who, with all the thoroughness and ardour of the mediaeval artist in his constitution, strove to

re-establish in modern France the spirit which had ruled his ancestors of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries.[470]

Emile Zola

Ludovici reckoned Emile Zola, with his "robust realism", had long before the twentieth century supplied the clue to the solution of the role of the subject in art when, in 1866, he had said: '"Une oeuvre d'art est un coin de la creation va a travers un temperament."' Ludovici claimed that Zola had described the first essential stage in every artistic inspiration. A part of life as seen through an artist's temperament is indeed the detonator of the whole concatenation of events culminating in the completed work and giving art its validity.[471]

Augustus John and Frederick Catchpole

Ludovici liked the art of Augustus John because he sought for representation the finest and healthiest 'type'of men or women, and found joy only in the expression of that 'type'. He declared his vital 'taste' in humanity. Similarly, Ludovici thought Frederick Catchpole particularly good because of the vitality of his art: "He has a great command of his medium and his people are all breathing and alive."[472]

Now, as I hope to have demonstrated in this chapter, Ludovici adopted his vital aesthetic from Nietzsche, and it formed the basis for his critique of modern art. He confused his political with his 'aesthetic' categories in a totalitarian conception of culture and art which is fascist. He believed that culture and

art are peculiar to different races and of vital significance to their life. The latter comprises Ludovici's rationale for an authoritarian direction of national culture and art. He intended that his fascist conception of culture and art be regarded as conservative.

I shall conclude this chapter by demonstrating that Ludovici believed his desiderata of culture and art were fulfilled in National Socialist Germany. Ludovici thought that one of the elements in national socialism which owe their inspiration to Nietzsche, "and bear in mind not only adolf Hitler's sincere and ernest admiration of Nietzsche's philosophy and his great friendship with Frau Forster-Nietzsche, Nietzsche's sister, but also Alfred Rosenberg's strong sympathy with the Nietzscheian outlook", was its ideal of culture.[473] Ludovici believed that in the National Socialist view of culture we are left in no doubt regarding the profound influence Nietzsche was exerting over his native country.[474] At the Nuremberg Opera House on September 9, 1936, Ludovici thought Hitler had made it quite clear that he could not regard art as an international affair:

> ..."all this chatter of internationalism in Art is as idiotic as it is dangerous". He argued that since Art is the expression of a people's life and the bloom on the tree of their values, and that "no man can bear any intimate relation to any cultural achievement which does not have its roots in his own origins and soil", it is as ridiculous to expect a national Art-product to have international validity or to make the same appeal everywhere, as to suppose that a German or an English national can feel the same emotions when reading another nation's history as when reading his own.[475]

Hitler concluded that culture is invariably the product of discipline and authority within a particular national unit. Ludovici thought that Hitler, in upholding that culture invariably springs from the work of the legislator who first establishes the vital values of a

people, that culture is the '"civilised product of political leadership"' and '"just as a Christian Age could have only a Christian Art, so a National-Socialist Age could have only a National-Socialist art"', was a perfectly consistent Nietzschean.[476] Ludovici believed that Hitler, in explaining the truth that any art which is independent of the vital values of the people among which it finds its being is of minor importance, was following Nietzsche:

> "No people could live", said Nietzsche, "that did not in the first place value. If it would maintain itself, however, it must not value as its neighbour doth... values did man stamp upon things only that he might preserve himself."

To have the same art as everybody else, therefore, would be to value as everybody else values, and this to a people means their death. The idea of an international art in present day conditions is erroneous; homogeneity of 'type' and values is still remote: '"What does all art do?" Nietzsche asks. "does it not praise? Does it not glorify? Does it not select? Does it not bring into prominence? In each of these cases it weakens or strengthens certain valuations?"'[477] According to Ludovici, Hitler had made it plain that his own and his colleagues' efforts were concentrated on restoring to the German people the traditions of their nation, their characteristic institutions and values, out of which a National-Socialist art would necessarily grow, as did a Judaeo-Graeco-Christian art out ofaEurope made homogeneous in spirit by the Hellenistic, Jewish and other values spread by the early Church. Here again, Ludovici thought Hitler and the National-Socialistswere fulfilling Nietzsche's promise, and quoted Nietzsche to reinforce his claims:

> "The essential thing in heaven and earth", said Nietzsche, "is apparently that there should be long obedience in the same direction; that there comes about and has always come about in the long run something which has made life worth living - for instance, virtue, art, music, dancing, ..., spirituality, etc., ... Even the beauty of a race

> or family, the pleasantness and kindness of their whole demeanour, is acquired by effort; like genius it is the final result of the accumulated labour of generations."[478]

Again, in Hitler's insistence on beauty in his same address of September 9, 1936, at the Opera House in Nuremberg, Ludovici thought Hitler revealed the Nietzschean influence in his vital outlook:

> "We of the National-Socialist Party love health", he declared, "The best of our nation's stock, in body and soul gives us our standard, and all we demand from our art is the glorificiation of this standard. The first precepts of our beauty will always be health."[479]

Ludovici thought Nietzsche was writing the same as the above as early as 1888:

> From the physiological stand point, everything ugly weakens and depresses man. It reminds him of danger, decay, impotence... Ugliness is understood to signify a hint and a symptom of degeneration; that which reminds us however remotely of degeneracy, impels us to the judgement 'ugly'... A certain hatred expresses itself here. What is it that man hates? - Without a doubt it is the decline of his type. In this respect his hatred springs from the deepest instincts of the race: There is, however, caution, profundity and far-reaching vision in this hatred - it is the most profound hatred that exists. On its account alone Art is profound."[480]

Ludovici thought that the emphasis Hitler made on this prerequisite-beauty, the way he linked it up with the demands he made of a vital national art, and his idea that the best of his nation's stock should be the vital standard glorified by the national art, warranted his acceptance as a Nietzschean:

> ...all the elements in his memorable address, down to the very notion of a national Art as the glorifier of a type, reveal him and his associates not merely as a new and potent force for the sanitation of European humanity (a force which is even now inspiring our own people), but also certainly as followers of Nietzsche, or, to put it moderately, as influenced by the poet-philosophers teachings.[481]

Notes to Chapter 3: Perennial Concerns with Arts, Culture and Nietzsche

1. Albert Ludovici Jnr., An Artist's Life in London and Paris, 1870-1925)(London: J. Fisher Unwin, 1925), p.9.

2. Frederic Bouse, Modern English Biography (2nd impression; London: Frank Cass, 1965).

3. Richard Sickert, "Mr. Albert Ludovici Jnr. [Obituary]," letter to The Times, March 26, 1932, p.15.

4. Frederic Bouse, op.cit.

5. Grant M. Walters, Dictionary of British Artists; Working 1900-1950 ((Eastbourne: Eastbourne Fine Art, 1975).

6. Albert Ludovici Jnr., op.cit., p.70.

7. Richard Sickert, loc.cit.

8. Grant M. Walters, op.cit.

9. Albert Ludovici Jnr., op.cit., pp.53-54.

10. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "The Crisis in Modern Art [Review of Professor Wladimir Weidle's The Dilemma of the Arts (SCM Press Ltd)]," New English Weekly, Volume xxxiv, No. 13, January 6, 1949, pp.152-153.

11. ibid., p.152.

12. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Dr. Oscar Levy [Obituary]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume xxx, No. 7, November 14, 1946, p.49.

13. Philip Mairet, A.R. Orage: A Memoir, (London: J.M. Dent, 1936), p.50.

14. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "A.R. Orage [Obituary]," New English Weekly, November 15, 1934; quoted in Paul Selver, Orage and the 'New Age' Circle, Reminiscences and Reflections (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1959), pp. 88-89.

15. A.R. Orage, "Letter" to Anthony Mario Ludovici, May 18, 1917; quoted in Wallace Martine, The 'New Age' under Orage (Manchester University Press, 1967), p.194.

16. Rodney Barker, Political Ideas in Modern Britain (London: Methuen, 1978), pp.128-129.

17. Wallace Martine, op. cit. p.213.

18. Philip Mairet, op.cit. p.42.

19. ibid. p.109.

20. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Social Credit Today and Tomorrow," letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Volume xvii, No. 1, April 25, 1940, p.15.

21. Wyndham Lewis, "Epstein and his Critics, or Nietzsche and his Friends," Letter to the New Age, Volume XIV, No. 10, January 8, 1914, p.319.

22. T.E. Hulme, "Mr. Epstein and the Critics," New Age, Volume XIV, No. 8, December 25, 1913, p.252.

23. R.B. Kerr, Our Prophets [Studies of Living Writers] (Croydon: R.B. Kerr, 1932), pp. 84-85.

24. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.261.

25. ibid., p.262.

26. ibid.

27. idem, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp. 38-39.

28. idem., "Review of M. Halevy, The Life of Friedrich Nietzsche, with an introduction by J.K. Kettle and translated by J.M. Hone (J. Fisher Unwin)," New Age, Volume VIII, No.17, February 23, 1911, p.403.

29. idem, "Art: Nietzsche, Culture and Plutocracy," New Age, Volume XIV, No.13, January 1914, p.412.

30. Friedrich Nietzsche, Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by A. Mugge, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume II; p.80-81.

31. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Notes" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarathustra, translated by Thomas Common, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume XI: p.421.

32. ibid., p.419.

33. Dr. Oscar Levy, "Introduction" to Anthony Mario Ludovici's Who is to be Master of the World? An Introduction to the Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), pp.ix-x.

34. ibid., p.xii.

35. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Who is to be Master of the World? An Introduction to the Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), p.74.

36. ibid.,p.86.

37. ibid.,p.77.

38. ibid.,p.82.

39. ibid.,p.111.

40. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche: his life and works, preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910), p.46.

41. ibid., pp.91-92.

42. idem., "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Twilight of the Idols, the Antichrist, Eternal Recurrence, Notes to Zarathustra, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18. vols, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Vol. XVI; p.x.

43. ibid., p.xv.

44. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.224.

45. idem, Woman. A Vindication (London: Constable, 1923), p.10.

46. idem, "Army Officers and Saluting," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XVIII, No. 21, March 13, 1941, p.241.

47. idem, "Social Values," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXI, No. 22., September 17, 1942, p.180.

48. idem., "Values," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXI, No. 22, September 17, 1942, p.180.

49. idem, "Dr. Dewey on the Responsibility of Philosophy [Review of Dr. Dewey, Problems of Man (New York: Philosophical Library, 1946)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXX, No. 2, October 24, 1946, p.17.

50. idem, "My Main Divergence from Nietzsche," Appendix 1 of Enemies of Women, The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon feminism (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), p.175.

51. ibid., p.180.

52. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.175.

53. idem., "Publie Opinion in England (XVI)," South African Observer, Volume XII, No.5, (February 1967), p.14.

54. Arthur Schopenhauer, Complete Works, Volume V, Chapter VIII, Paragraph 14; quoted in ibid.

55. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.175.

56. idem, Mansel Fellowes [A novel], (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.252.

57. ibid., p.269.

58. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.221.

59. idem., Catherine Doyle; the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson [1919]), p.16.

60. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "The Sonderbund Exhibition at Cologne -II," New Age, Volume XI, No. 15, August 8, 1912, p.348.

61. Friedrich Nietzsche, On the Future of Our Educational Institutions. Homer and Classical Philology, translated with an introduction by J.M. Kennedy, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume III: p.4.

62. Friedrich Nietzsche, Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by Maximilian A. Mugge, in The Complete Work of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume II; p.77.

63. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Will to Power, Books III and IV, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1910), Volume XV; pp.xiii-ix.

64. ibid., pp.xiv-xv.

65. ibid., p.xv.

66. idem, "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Case of Wagner, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume VIII: pp.ix-x.

67. ibid., p.xi.

68. ibid., p. xiii.

69. ibid., p. xiv.

70. idem., "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche's preface to the third edition of his The Case of Wagner, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Vol. VIII; p.xxi.

71. ibid., p.xxii.

72. ibid., p.xxiii.

73. ibid., p. xxxv.

74. ibid., p.xxv.

75. idem, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.viff.

76. ibid. p.4.

77. ibid. p.5.

78. ibid. p.12.

79. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson [1919]), p.17.

80. Anon, "Nietzsche's Criticism of Wagner [Review of Friedrich Nietzsche's The Case Against Wagner and Nietzsche contra Wagner, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (T.N. Foulis)]," Nation, July 9, 1910, p.534.

81. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art , (London: Constable, 1911), p.15ff.

82. ibid., p.21.

83. ibid., pp.99-100.

84. ibid. p.103.

85. ibid., p.119.

86. idem., "The Sonderbund Exhibition at Cologne," New Age, Volume XI, No. 13., July 25, 1912, p.307.

87. ibid.

88. idem., "The Sonderbund Exhibition at Cologne - II," New Age, Volume XI, No.15., August 8, 1912, p.348.

89. idem., "Art: The Pot-Boiler Paramount," New Age, Volume XII, No.3., November 21, 1912, p.67.

90. idem., "Art: The Royal Institute of Oil Painters and the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours," New Age, Volume XII, No.4, November 28, 1912, p.89.

91. idem, "Art: A Question of Finish," New Age, Volume XII, No. 21, March 27, 1913, p.508.

92. idem, "The Hundred and Forty-Fifth Royal Academy," New Age, Volume XIII, No.4, May 22, 1913, p.96.

93. idem, "Introductory Essay on Van Gogh and his Art," in Vincent Van Gogh, The Letters of a Post-Impressionist, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Constable, 1912), p.xi.

94. ibid., p.xii.

95. ibid., p.xv.

96. ibid., p.xvi.

97. ibid., p.xviii.

98. ibid., p.xix.

99. ibid., p.xx.

100. ibid., p.xxxii.

101. idem., Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.168.

102. ibid.,pp.190-191.

103. idem., "Ananda K. Coomaraswamy," New English Weekly,Volume XXXII, no. 9, December11, 1947, p.83.

104. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Confusion in the Arts," Contemporary Review, Volume 192, August 1957, p.106.

105. ibid., p. 107.

106. ibid., p. 108.

107. ibid., p. 110.

108. Immanuel Kant, Kritik Der Urteilskraft (Bruno Erchmann Edit; 1880), pp.39-45; cited in Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Public Opinion in England (XXIV)," South African Observer, Volume XIII, No.5, February, 1968, p.12.

109. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.12.

110. George F.W. Hegel, Vorlesungen Neber Aesthetick, (Dritter Abschnitt); quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid.

111. Arthur Schopenhauer, Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung, Volume I, Book 3, Para.52; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici., ibid.

112. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.13.

113. idem., "Public Opinion in England (XXV)," South African Observer, Volume XIII, No.6, March 1968, pp.12-13.

114. ibid., p.13.

115. ibid.,p.12.

116. idem., "Cant at the Tate Gallery," New Age, Volume XI, No.17, August 22, 1912, p.404.

117. idem., Personal Reminiscences of Augusta Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926),pp.178-179.

118. ibid., p.81.

119. ibid., footnote to p.182.

120. idem., "Confusion in the Arts," Contemporary Review, Volume 192, August 1957, p.108.

121. David Valentine [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Poet's Trumpeter (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939), p.31.

122. ibid., pp.68-69.

123. ibid., pp. 76-77.

124. ibid., p.25.

125. ibid., p.27.

126. ibid., p.32.

127. ibid., p.33.

128. ibid., p.34.

129. ibid., p.63.

130. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), pp.232-233.

131. idem., Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.51.

132. ibid., p.47.

133. ibid., p.45-46.

134. ibid., p.37.

135. ibid., p.43.

136. ibid., p.45.

137. ibid., pp.46-47.

138. ibid., pp.49-50.

139. ibid., p.52.

140. ibid., p.176.

141. ibid., p.181.

142. ibid., p.187.

143. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.247.

144. ibid., p.248.

145. idem., Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.189.

146. idem, Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), pp.22-23.

147. ibid., p.222.

148. idem, Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.170.

149. ibid, p.173.

150. idem, "Ananda K. Coomaraswamy," New English Weekly, Volume XXXII, No.15, December 11, 1947, p.83.

151. idem, "Personality in Statesmanship," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.7, November 1955, p.12.

152. idem, "Public Opinion in England (XXVII)," South African Observer, Volume XII, No.8, June 1968, p.12.

153. ibid., p.13.

154. idem, Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.170.

155. ibid., p.174.

156. ibid., pp.174-175.

157. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.81.

158. ibid., p.80.

159. idem., Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.54.

160. ibid., p.55.

161. ibid., p.56.

162. idem, "Introductory Essay on Van Gogh and his Art," in Vincent Van Gogh, The Letters of a Post-Impressionist, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Constable, 1912), p.xvii.

163. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.84.

164. idem, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.93.

165. ibid., pp.94-95.

166. ibid., pp.95-96.

167. ibid., p.57.

168. ibid.

169. ibid., pp.57-58.

170. ibid., p.58.

171. ibid., p.59.

172. ibid., p.60.

173. idem, "Public Opinion in England (XXIII)," South African Observer, Volume XXXIII, No.4, January 1968, p.13.

174. idem, Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.163.

175. idem, "Art: Raw Material at the Dudley Galleries," New Age, Volume XIII, No.24, October 9, 1913, p.703.

176. idem, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.vii.

177. ibid. p.143.

178. ibid.,p.162.

179. ibid., p.168.

180. idem, Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.171.

181. idem, The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), pp.253-254.

182. idem, "Public Opinion in England (XXIII)," South African observer, Volume XIII, No. 4., January 1968, p.13.

183. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.44.

184. ibid., p.48.

185. ibid., p.159.

186. idem., "Nietzsche and Art," Letter to the New Age, Volume IX, No. 19, September 7, 1911, p.455.

187. ibid., pp.454-455.

188. idem, "The Sonderbund Exhibition at Cologne - II," New Age, Volume XI, No.15, August 8, 1912, p.348.

189. idem., "Art: The Little Gallery and the Fine Arts Society," New Age, Volume XIV, No. 1, November 6, 1913, p.24.

190. idem, "Art: A Question of Finish," New Age, Volume XII, No.21, March 27, 1913, p.508.

191. idem, French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.186.

192. David Calentine [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Poet's Trumpeter (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939), p.90.

193. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp.38-76.

194. ibid., p.46.

195. ibid., p.47.

196. ibid., p.48.

197. ibid., p.49.

198. ibid., p.50.

199. ibid., p.51.

200. ibid., p.52.

201. ibid., pp.52-53.

202. ibid., p.53.

203. idem., Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.185; quoted in ibid., p.54.

204. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.55.

205. ibid., p.56ff.

206. idem., Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.viii.

207. ibid., p.125.

208. ibid., pp.144-145.

209. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), pp. 32-33.

210. idem, Too Old for Dolls, A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.200.

211. ibid., pp. 200-201.

212. ibid., p.201.

213. idem, "Young Woodley," English Review, Volume 46, May 1928, p.556.

214. idem, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.63.

215. ibid., p.66.

216. ibid., pp.69-70.

217. ibid., pp. 70-71.

218. ibid., pp.74-75.

219. ibid., p.120.

220. ibid., pp.120-121.

221. ibid., p.128.

222. ibid.,pp. 128-129.

223. ibid., p.131.

224. ibid., p.32.

225. ibid., p.168ff.

226. ibid., p.177.

227. ibid., p.179.

228. ibid., pp.180-181.

229. ibid., p.186.

230. ibid., p.187.

231. ibid., p.190.

232. ibid., p.191.

233. ibid., p.199.

234. ibid., pp.209-210.

235. ibid., pp.211-212.

236. ibid., p.218.

237. ibid., p.219.

238. ibid., p.235.

239. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p. 18.
240. ibid., p.24.
241. ibid., footnote to p.24.
242. ibid., p.24.
243. idem, A Defence of Aristocracy, A Text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.317.
244. ibid., p.431.
245. ibid., pp.430-431.
246. ibid., pp.431-432.
247. idem, "Art: The Gordon Craig Theatre," New Age, Volume XI, No.21, September 19, 1912, p.498.
248. idem, "Art: Mr. Bergson's Views," New Age, Volume XI, No.23, October 23, 1912, p.548.
249. idem, "Art: The Modern Society of Portrait Painters at the Royal Institute," New Age, Volume XII, No.15, February 13, 1913, p.358.
250. idem, "Arts Over Production in the Graphic Arts," New Age, Volume XIII, No.22, September 25, 1913, p.639.
251. idem, "Introductory Essay on Van Gogh and his Art," in Vincent Van Gogh, The Letters of a Post-Impressionist, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Constable, 1912), pp. xxix - xxx.
252. ibid., p.xxxv.
253. ibid., pp. xliii - xliv.
254. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson [1919]), pp.127-128.
255. idem., The False Assumption of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp. 204-205.
256. idem, Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.232.
257. ibid., p.235ff.
258. ibid., p.236.
259. ibid., p.241.
260. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), pp.29-30.
261. ibid., p.30.
262. idem., Lysistrata; or, Woman's Future and Future Woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.110.
263. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.298.

264. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Eugenics and Consanguineous Marriage," Eugenics Review, Volume XXV, No. 3., (October 1933), p.147.

265. idem, The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.168.

266. ibid., p.189.

267. ibid., pp.344-387.

268. ibid., p.348.

269. ibid., p.356.

270. ibid., p.362.

271. ibid., pp.365-366.

272. ibid., p.375.

273. ibid., pp.484-485.

274. idem., "Thorstein Veblen [Review of Thorstein Veblen and this America, by Joseph Dortman (New York: Viking Press 1940)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXVII, No.6., May 24, 1945, p.61.

275. David Valentine [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Poet's Trumpeter (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939), p.75.

276. ibid., p.105.

277. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "India and the Western World," in K. Bharatha Lyer ed., Art and Thought. Issued in honour of Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy on the occasion of his 70th birthday (London: Luzacs, 1947), p.238.

278. ibid., p.239.

279. ibid., p.240.

280. ibid., p.241.

281. ibid., p.242.

282. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government," South African Observer, Volume X, No.6., (January (1965), p.14.

283. idem., "Art: The Gordon Craig Theatre," New Age, Volume XI, No.21, September 19, 1912, p.498.

284. idem., The False Assumption of "Democracy"(London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.117.

285. idem., Lysistrata; or, Woman's Future and Future Woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.25.

286. ibid., p.26.

287. idem., Creation or Recreation (London: The First of St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1934), p.5.

288. ibid., p.10.

289. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Creation or Recreation (London: The First of St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1934), p.11.

290. ibid., p.12.

291. ibid., pp.12-13.

292. ibid., p.15.

293. ibid., p.16-17.

294. ibid., p.17.

295. ibid., p.20.

296. ibid., p.22.

297. ibid., pp22-23.

298. ibid., p.23.

299. ibid., p.24.

300. ibid., pp.26-27.

301. ibid., p.30.

302. ibid., p.31.

303. ibid., p.32.

304. ibid., p.34.

305. ibid., pp.34-35.

306. ibid., p.35.

307. ibid., p.36.

308. idem., Recovery, The quest of regenerate national values (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1935), p.3.

309. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.6.

310. ibid., p.7.

311. ibid., pp.16-16.

312. ibid., p.17.

313. ibid., p.23.

314. ibid., p.181.

315. idem., "Art; Raw Material at the Dudley Galleries," New Age, Volume XIII, No.24, October 9, 1913, p.703.

316. idem., Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), pp.v-vi.

317. ibid., pp.9-10.

318. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), pp.v-vi.

319. idem., "The Politics of Charles A. Beard [Review of Charles A. Beard's The Economic Basis of Politics (Alfred Knopf, New York)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXVIII, No. 10, December 20, 1945, p.94.

320. idem., "Art: An Open Letter to my Friends," New Age, Volume XIV, No. 9, January 1, 1914, p.280.

321. ibid., p.281.

322. idem., Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.171.

323. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy"(London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.11.-27.

324. ibid., p.12.

325. ibid., p.14.

326. idem., "Introductory Essay on Van Gogh and his Art," in Vincent Van Gogh, The Letters of a Post-Impressionist, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici (London: Constable, 1912), p.171.

327. idem., "Review of Woman, Theme and Variation, by A. Corbett-Smith (Noel Douglas)," New English Weekly, Volume I, No.7., June 2, 1932, pp.155-156.

328. idem., "The Arts and Crafts Exhibition at the Grosvenor Gallery," New Age, Volume XII, No. 13., January 30, 1913, p.305.

329. idem., "Art: The Art of India - III," New Age, Volume XIV, No. 19, March 24, 1914, p.599.

330. Friedrich Nietzsche, Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by Maximilian A. Mugge, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Vol. II: p.7.

331. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.v.

332. ibid., pp.vii-viii.

333. ibid., p.vii.

334. ibid., p.75.

335. ibid., pp.75-76.

336. ibid., p.76.

337. ibid., p.77.

338. ibid., p.79.

339. ibid., p.80.

340. ibid., p.87.

341. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.88.

342. ibid., pp.89-90.

343. ibid., p.91.

344. ibid., p.96.

345. ibid., pp.114-115.

346. ibid., p.115.

347. ibid., p.118.

348. ibid., p.130.

349. ibid., pp.131-132.

350. ibid., pp.134-135.

351. ibid., p.135.

352. ibid., p.137.

353. ibid., p.140.

354. ibid., p.148.

355. ibid., p.169.

356. ibid., pp.ix-x.

357. ibid., p.223.

358. ibid., p.226.

359. ibid., p.228.

360. ibid., p.229.

361. ibid., p.232.

362. ibid., p.234.

363. ibid., pp.234-235.

364. idem., "Art: White Roses at the Stafford and the Carfax Galleries," New Age, Volume XI, No.25, October 17, 1912, p.596.

365. idem., "Art: The Poster-Impressionist Exhibition," New Age, Volume XIII, No.18, August 28, 1913, p.521.

366. idem., "Art: The Goupil , The Alpine Club, and the Dorien Galleries," New Age, Volume XIV, No.5, December 4, 1913, p.152-153.

367. ibid., p.153.

368. idem., "Art: The Curtax Street, the Suffolk Street, and the Twenty-One Galleries," New Age, Volume XIV, No.7, December 18, 1913, p.213.

369. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Art: An Open Letter to my Friends," New Age, Volume XIV, No.9., January 1, 1914, p.279.

370. ibid., p.280.

371. idem., "Introductory Essay on Van Gogh and his Art," in Vincent Van Gogh, The Letters of a Post-Impressionist, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Constable, 1912), p.xx.

372. ibid., p.xxxvii.

373. Theognis [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici]," Happiness and Social Reform," Oxford Fortnightly, Volume III, No.9., November 13, p.6.

374. ibid., pp.8-9.

375. ibid., p.9.

376. ibid., p.10.

377. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.3.

378. ibid.,p.4.

379. ibid., footnote to p.4.

380. ibid., p.24.

381. ibid., pp.27-28.

382. ibid., p.28.

383. ibid., pp.29-30.

384. ibid., p.98.

385. ibid., p.169.

386. ibid., p.170.

387. ibid., p.171.

388. ibid., p.240.

389. ibid., p.241.

390. ibid., p.242.

391. ibid., pp.244-245.

392. ibid., p.248.

393. ibid., p.251.

394. ibid., p.254.

395. ibid.,p257.

396. ibid., pp.395-396.

397. ibid., p.418.

398. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.419.

399. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.40.

400. ibid., p.41.

401. ibid., pp.41-42.

402. idem., "The Sonderbond Exhibition at Cologne," New Age, Volume XI, No.13, July 25, 1912, p.307.

403. idem., "The Sonderbund Exhibition at Cologne - II," New Age, Volume XI, No.15, August 8, 1912, p.348.

404. idem., "Art: The Royal Institute of Oil Painters and the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours," New Age, Volume XII, November 28, 1912, p.90.

405. idem., "Introductory Essay on Van Gogh and his Art," in Vincent Van Gogh, The Letters of a Post-Impressionist, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Constable, 1912), p.x.

406. ibid., p.xvii.

407. ibid., pp.xx-xxi.

408. ibid., p.xxvii.

409. ibid., p.xxi.

410. ibid., p.xxvii.

411. ibid., p.xxix.

412. ibid., pp.xxxi-xxxii.

413. ibid., p.xxxi,

414. ibid., p.xxxiii.

415. ibid., p.xxxiv.

416. ibid., p.xxxvi.

417. ibid., p.xxxv.

418. ibid., p.xxxvii.

419. ibid.

420. ibid., p.xliii.

421. ibid., pp.xliii-xliii.

422. idem., Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.176.

423. ibid., p.175.

424. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.12.

425. ibid., p.31.

426. ibid., p.38.

427. ibid., p.59.

428. ibid., p.59-60.

429. ibid., p.60.

430. ibid., pp.60-61.

431. ibid., p.61.

432. ibid., p.81.

433. ibid., pp.81-82.

434. idem., "Review of Rodin, Immortal Peasant, by Anita Lesley (Herbert Joseph)," New Pioneer, No.13., December 1939, p.314.

435. idem., Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.71.

436. ibid., pp.71-72.

437. ibid., p.89.

438. ibid., p.96.

439. ibid., p.144.

440. ibid., p.145.

441. ibid., p.146.

442. ibid., p.148.

443. ibid., pp.148-149.

444. ibid., pp.149-150.

445. ibid., p.150.

446. ibid., pp.150-151.

447. ibid., pp.151-152.

448. ibid., pp.152-153.

449. ibid., p.153.

450. ibid., pp.154-155.

451. ibid., p.155.

452. ibid., pp.156-157.

453. ibid., pp.157-158.

454. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), p.159.

455. ibid., p.160.

456. ibid., pp.161-162.

457. ibid., pp.162-163.

458. idem., "Auguste Rodin's Art [Review of The Sculptures of Auguste Rodin, 119 Reproductions in Monochrome Photogravure, with a life and review of his work by Somerville Storey, and a Catalogue Raissone by Georges Grappe, (Allen & Unwin, 1939)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XVIII, No.22, March 20, 1941, p.258.

459. ibid., p.259.

460. idem., Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin (London: John Murray, 1926), pp.163-164.

461. ibid., p.164.

462. ibid., p.164.

463. ibid., p.184.

464. ibid., p.185.

465. ibid., p.187.

466. ibid., p.188.

467. ibid., p.189.

468. ibid., p.190.

469. ibid., pp. 198-199.

470. ibid., p.199.

471. Emile Zola, Mes Haines, Chapter III; cited in Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Confusion in the Arts," Contemporary Review, Volume 192, August 1957, p.109.

472. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Art: The Goupil the Alpine Club, and the Dorien Galleries," New Age, Volume XIV, No.5., December 4, 1913, p.153.

473. idem., "Hitler and Nietzsche," English Review, Volume LXIV, No.1, (January 1937), pp.44-45.

474. ibid., p.45.

475. Adolf Hitler, Speech at the Nuremberg Opera House, September 9, 1936; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici ibid., pp.45-46.

476. Adolf Hitler, ibid., quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.46.

477. Friedrich Nietzsche, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.47.

478. Friedrich Nietzsche, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici "Hitler and Nietzsche," English Review, Volume LXIV, No. 1, (January 1937), p. 48.

479. Adolf Hitler op.cit.; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici ibid.

480. Friedrich Nietzsche, 1888; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici ibid., p.49.

481. Anthony Mario Ludovici ibid.

CHAPTER 4, THE DEGENERATE WORLD

Fundamental to Ludovici's social and political thought, as with all fascists, is his conviction that the world is degenerate. As he writes in his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories: "Look about you now! observe the myriads of plain, ugly and asymmetrical faces in our streets; observe the illness and botched-ness about you!"[1] England had degenerated from her former greatness.[2] Even a Liberal, Mr. Lloyd-George, after his own perusal of the statistics of ill-health supplied by the Ministry of National Service, confessed that he was startled at the number of Grade II and Grade III men throughout England.[3] In his A Defence of Conservatism, Ludovici warned those who gloried over the fact that the recent General Strike could be overcome without violence or bloodshed that it indicated silent decay.[4]

In his condemnation of degeneracy Ludovici was regarded by his contempories as "dressing up in smart modern clothes the old Manichean heresy."[5] It is a conviction that he shares with his mentor, Nietzsche: "Paralysis of will; where do we not find this cripple sitting nowadays!"[6] Manliness rotted and danger dwindled as sleep seemed to be the greatest accomplishment.[7] Men had succumbed to a mood of utter despair and subscribed to Schopenhauer's horror and loathing of life and the world.[8]

In Ludovici's novel of 1918, Mansel Fellowes, the Nietzschean Dr. Melhado complains to Father Jevington that the union of Richard Latimer with Mansel Fellowes fits a vital and deeper age: It does not fit this one.[9] Dr. Melhado detested the prevalent plainness of modern men and women, and even in acclaimed beauties

he was prone to discover but a memento, a pale reminiscence, of what he considered genuine, vital beauty: "For beauty to him always implied a specifid modicum of intense vitality, or, to say the least - exuberance."[10] In Mrs. Fellowes's lodging-house, the other two lodgers besides Richard Latimer, one male and one female, are described as lifeless-looking specimens of humanity.[11] The male, a printer's manager by the name of Topple greatly admired Richard Latimer, as did the female, a typist by the name of Miss Carruthers, "all opal-grey from head to foot, even to her cheeks and faded hands." To their degeneracy is contrasted the vitality of Mansel Fellowes. But, the degenerate traditions of Richard Latimer's nation, family, and class, he was a barrister and successful writer, never led him to suppose that Mansel Fellowes was beautiful: For that she was little too vital and fiery.[12] In all Ludovici's writings there figures the typical Manicheanism of fascism. It takes the familiar form of the eternal struggle between the forces of life and those of death or decay. We are informed that when Richard Latimer ignores Mansel Fellowes for Gladys Morrison, a great and mysterious force steadily and stealthily worked along its usual inevitable lines, to mould her destiny. It was a force that worked slowly and deliberately, "like rushing water in a hard soil." It is the force of death and decay.[13] She feltacertain becoming diffidence and modesty in acknowledging that Richard Latimer had vitalised something "deeply interwoven with the hidden actuating power of her life". Her Life had awakened at the time when Richard Latimer had first come into her life.[14] His absence had begun to have a vital, life or death, meaning for her.[15]

In Ludovici's novel of 1920, Too Old for Dolls, the hero, Lord Henry Highbarn, questions the desirability of his role as a healer of society's nervous wrecks. He thinks he can be doing no good by

relieving the principal victims of the disastrous mess Western civilisation had made of life.[16] What Sir Joseph Bullion, a great 'success' of the system which is rotten and iniquitous to the core[17], lauded as 'progress' was really man's further receding from a true understanding of human life and its most vital needs. But, Lord Henry Highbarn is so perturbed by England's degeneracy that he contemplates quitting his country for China. It is too late to reform.[18] He declines offers of money from Sir Joseph Bullion to remain in England and treat Mrs. Delarayne, their mutual friend.[19] Later in the novel, Aubrey St. Maur, a friend of Lord Henry Highbarn, asks him why he is going to China. Lord Henry Highbarn gives his reasons as, firstly, curiosity to see how the Chinaman has escaped the degeneracy that is fast overtaking Europe, secondly, he could not bear to witness his country's decline, thirdly, and chiefly:

> '...I feel that it is the duty of all enlightened Western Europeans, who have seen the madness of European civilisation, to hasten to the last healthy spot on earth and to preach the Gospel of Europhobia, - that is to say, to warn the wise East against our criminal errors, and to save it from being infected by our diseases. If the world is to be saved, a cordon sanitaire must be established round Europe; for Europe has now become a pestilence.'[20]

Similarly, Lord Henry Highbarn's father, Lord Firle, says to the Vicar, Mr. Powers, in <u>What Woman Wishes</u>, that the word 'eccentric' can have no meaning nowadays as there is no centre from which to deviate.[21]

Ludovici attributed most of the hostility towards established and traditional institutions, which he saw it as his role to conserve, not to any defect in the principles of the institutions themselves, but to the physical and nervous exhaustion of those who represent this hostility.[22] We, according to Ludovici, who are but a faint memento of life, a pale shadow of vitality, cannot but question

the value of life.[23] In Ludovici's novel of 1923, French Beans , Sir Thomas Braintree, scientist and banker, immensely wealthy, learned, and having the air of one thoroughly disillusioned, would have given all his riches and property if he could have spent onehour in the company of his ancestors of the 'Golden Age'.[24] Whilst, in Ludovici's novel of 1924, The Taming of Don Juan, Dr. Hale, the hero, says to Frances Yardgrove, the consumptive son of Sir Jonathan Yardgrove a patent food manufacturer, that modern humanity is incapable of revolution as in revolution there is life and vigour.[25] After succeeding in getting his protege, Gilbert Milburn, adopted as the unofficial Conservative candidate for the Northern division of Wessex, only to be defeated by 'vested interests' in the General Election, Dr. Hale's despair deepens:

> 'I'm afraid Sir Jonathan Yardgrove was right', he said, 'and if we substitute for the word evolution in his remarks, the word degeneration, we shall find that they apply exactly. There is certainly nothing more ludicrously pathetic than the figure of one insignifcant individual trying at the present day to stem the irresistable tide of degenerative changes. The world seems to have made its fatal choice. The leading horses of civilisations chariot have their heads all turned towards the abyss, and nothing can now alter their direction. Poor old Wessex! Poor old England! how romantic have been my allusions and my long struggle.'[26]

Ludovici called our era one of fourth-rate bodily joys[27] and the people sub-human.[28] Disillusioned, our ultimate discovery that Life has lost its value dogs the heels of our civilisation.[29] Perhaps Ludovici's most trenchant criticism of national degeneracy is to be found in his The Secret of Laughter, which developed from a paper which Ludovici read to the English Mistery on December 8, 1931.[30] As fast as the clamour for humour had swelled the quality of national achievement had depreciated.[31] Modern degenerate mankind demanded laughter with "neurasthenic insistence".[32] Ludovici supposed that laughter, or showing teeth , is the signal of superior

adaptation.[33] The over indulgence in humour was compensated for the prevalent feeling of degeneration and inferiority.[34] Even for the minority of the healthy and sound, Life had become so complicated, that they took refuge in the sphere of nonsense.[35] Ludovici adopted his theory of laughter from Nietzsche, although, he merely acknowledged that Nietzsche had anticipated it: '"Perhaps I know why man is the only animal that laughs", said Nietzsche. And, he added: "He alone suffers so excruciatingly that he was compelled to invent laughter."'[36] The "neurotic fury" with which the average man and woman defended their sense of humour presupposed a decadent and inferior age.[37] Laughter had become no more than one of the many anodynes with which modern men were rocking themselves into a state of drowsy insensibility.[38]

Ludovici saw in modern man's reckless introduction of a violent factor into his life, the placing of "a lethal juggernaut like the internal combustion locomotive on our streets", thus restoring to his highly civilised towns and rural thoroughfares dangers far more terrific than those of any jungle or desert, a symptom of an epoch in history which was the most anarchical and inconsiderate of constructive values ever known on earth.[39] In typically Manichean imagery, Ludovici reckoned that in England since the Great Rebellion of the seventeenth century: "It is as though God and the Devil had changed places by slow revolution." Life had been assailled by the force of death.[40] In order to spare the sensibilities of those who came into contact with institutions for the degenerate, like reformatories, lunatic asylums and work houses, they were given euphemistic names. Urbanisation was called 'development' and incipient bolshevisation P. E. P.. Physical degeneracy and increasing juvenile delinquency was called 'freedom'.[41] No national cast of countenance united the English, pervasive sickness was their only bond.[42] Ludovici even reckoned the high speeds attainable in

motor cars may have been a principal factor, not only in masking the prevailing morbidity, "but also in relieving the pullulating feelings of inferiority which naturally afflicts a people riddled with organic defects."[43]

Now, it is the purpose of this chapter to examine the causes that Ludovici cited for the degeneracy which he saw about him. I can think of no better way of introducing this study than to discuss the principle which underpins all Ludovici's political and social thought, and whose neglect he thought was the primary cause of modern degeneracy:-

Introduction:
Action and Struggle - the Principles of History and Life

One of the principal notions to be found in the fabric of fascism is that of struggle. Now, it is often claimed that fascists were principally ex-servicemen. This is, in the main, true. However, I think the exaltation of militancy and combatancy in Ludovici's writings, who was a veteran of World War I, is also to be found before his martial experiences. It can only be claimed that Ludovici's martialexperiences intensified the notion of struggle in his writings after World War I, when he was at his most prolific. Indeed, his commentaries and interpretations of Nietzsche are profuse with the exaltation of combatancy well before World War I. And Ludovici's A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories although first published by Constable in 1915, was written before World War I. Nevertheless, it is true that World War I served as a catalyst in crystalising what was later to be regarded as fascism. In this sense Ludovici's martial experiences were of immeasurable importance, as they were to most fascists, in strengthening already held convictions.

However, if it was not for the intervention of Anthony Mario Ludovici's father, he may not have had any martial experiences. Albert Ludovici Jr. reminded Lord Kitchener of his school days at the Geneva pensionnat, when inquiring as to why his sons had not heard from the War Office, although they had passed the necessary examinations as interpretors, and riding tests at Knightsbridge Barracks, regarding active service. They suspected this might be due to their foreign surname. Within twenty four hours of this inquiry Anthony Mario Ludovici was ordered to leave for the Front.[44] Anthony Mario Ludovici arrived at Antwerp a few days before the Germans bombarded and took the town.[45] Only when Ludovici was at Le Havre, in charge of the German prisoners, did the suspicion of his fellow officers at his foreign name evaporate when, from a Punch's Almanack circulating among them, they discovered he was an English author.[46] Ludovici served as a field-gunner during World War I.[47] Only when he was in hospital with trench fever, in the early part of 1917, did the Army Authorities belatedly take note of his command of French and German, and second him from the Artillary for service under Military Intelligence at the War Office in London.[48] He was attached to the Intelligence Staff, War Office, in April 1917 and attained the rank of General Staff Officer, 3 rd. Grade, March 1919. According to Who's Who he was demobilised in October 1919. However, Ludovici frequently called himself 'Captain', and was addressed as such in publications. Indeed, according to his nephew, John Ludovici, he frequently donned military uniform and was a member of British Military Intelligence throughout the inter-war years and the early years of World War II, until Military Intelligence became, somewhat belatedly, suspicious of his political identity.[49]

Although the first edition of Ludovici's A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories is fascist and addressed to youth[50], the typical

trait of fascist ex-servicemen, but was written before World War I, in his preface to the second edition, in 1933, he reckoned that most pre-war political beliefs were incompatible with his and made the first edition seem fantastic to his contemporaries. In the post-war era he thought the reception to his ideas was more favourable as the Great War had effected a transformation in political convictions.[51] Typical of veteran fascistswas Ludovici's bitterness against the 'old-gang' and non-combatants generally, who had cynically acquiesced in the bloody sacrifice of young manhood. In Ludovici's novel of 1918, Mansel Fellowes, the young Richard Latimer, like Ludovici, deplored the "cynicism of age all about him".[52] He was especially disillusioned with Paris, it was rather like meeting one's older brother; for that was the relation of France to the rest of Europe. Paris tasted of the morbid pessimism and scepticism of age.[53] After World War I, Ludovici spoke of the insolence, sterility and exhaustion of the old.[54] Ludovici could have no mercy for the "freakish stupidity of the 'brass hats'" and the "clamour made by our fattist and oiliest old poultices for the war to go on 'until the last young man'."[55] In his preface to The False Assumptions of "Democracy" of 1921, he proclaimed that the Great War had left Europe with its ideals and respective liberal principles shattered and destroyed. The old era he proclaimed was dead. He saw it as his task to develop the "ideology of our new and brightly illuminated age" for those who had doffed their khaki.[56] Indeed, it was a task that Ludovici set himself for the rest of his life - propogating fascism. He intended to punish the politicians who were responsible for the disastrous peace and who bungled the great task of reconstruction.[57] Politicians like Lloyd-George, during World War I, had not even scrupled to draw invidious comparisons between male courage and women working in munitions factories, to promote female suffrage. They forgot the "river of

blood that our young troupes were pouring over the ramparts of the Western Front alone."[58]

Ludovici's novel of 1924, The Taming of Don Juan, could be partly autobiographical. It is profuse with his bitterness at World War I and is introduced with a poem called "A Post-War Maiden" reflecting the grief of post-war women who had lost all hope of a full life by the sacrifice of husbands and young men in World War I.[59] In the novel Gilbert Milburn, Dr. Hale's protege, volunteers as an artillary observer Dr. Hale is outraged and proclaims that English civilisation could not justify the sacrifice of anything. The masses of old people and spinsters, who talked glibly and confidently about the necessary and noble self-sacrifice of the youth of England, were not worthy of the sacrifice of more than a single toad.[60] Gilbert Milburn writes to Dr. Hale from the Front, and declares that in spite of the misery, the discomfort, and the monotony of the trenches, war is to be exalted as it brings out the 'natural man' in the combatance. Danger imparts the capacity to go to extreme lengths and men appear more attractive, fuller, and rounder.[61] After a few months at the Front Gilbert had 'hardened' where he was inclined to be soft, and where his nature had consisted of good metal it was toughened and rendered unbreakable. Nevertheless, the more sensitive chords in his nature inclined him to feelings of revolt and loathing at the horrors and misery he witnessed, he questioned whether any prize could justify the abject misery he saw about him.[62] One of the lives wasted is that of Frances Yardgrove, son of a patent food manufacturer, who, like Gilbert, volunteers for active service, but is lost in an observation balloon and dies. Gilbert, more fortunate, is captured and taken prisoner. Two years later Gilbert returns to England and, whilst in a train going to London, with several other officers, he engages in a conversation with a civilian of sleek and opulent appearance:

> ...The officers, who were all young men, looked somewhat pale and drawn, while the civilian, a man well past middle age, presented by his florid and bloated features, a striking contrast to his companions. He smiled constantly, and there was about his whole person the air of one thoroughly contented with his lot - nay, wildly jubilant about it.[63]

The civilian explained, with a smile, that he had lost three sons during the war, and if he had had a dozen he would gladly have sacrificed them all. Gilbert replied that if he had had a father, he would have gladly sacrificed him.[64] Gilbert, flushed and angry, "stared the old civilian out" as he made hastily away. Having been through the worst of the war and pierced through its "clumsy shams" Gilbert had acquired a cynical view of humanity.[65] He complained to Almina Underhill, who was perturbed at the dearth of young men who survived the war and the frequently insipid character of the few that had survived[66], that priveliged sections of the community like the old are immune to the principle of sacrifice that the troops had suffered.[67] Ludovici deplored the power of the old.[68] He thought the mirage of internationalism that loomed in the sky for a few brief years in the early twentieth century, had been irrevocably shattered by the Great War.[69] Clearly the cynical view of man that Ludovici had learned through his martial experiences coloured his view of life, as will be seen.

According to Ludovici struggle is at the root of all Life. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, Ludovici idealizes the militant elite of the samurai.[70] Whilst, in his A Defence of Conservatism he delineates Life as struggle, and proposes it as a conservative ideal. He says in national life, as in the lifeof nature, there are two forces which constantly conflict with the inclination of all creatures to prefer stability before instability in their environment. They are, first, the renewal of the whole of the nation's

personnel, or the redistribution of all national roles with each fresh generation; secondly, the chafing of certain sections of the nation under circumstances which make adaptation impossible.[71] Ludovici refers to a third life force which conflicts with stability, but one which comes from beyond a nation's frontiers, which impels, or threatens to impel, change against the nation's will: "Examples of its action are to be seen in the sudden invasion of Peru and Mexico by the Spaniards, and in the appearance of the Boers and ourselves among the Bush men and the Zulus of Africa, etc.."[72] The first of these life forces tends to introduce change by means of peaceful invasion ., because the new arrivals representing this force are either above or below the standard required by the stable environment; the second life force tends to introduce change by means of individual or group revolt, because the creatures representing this force are unhappy.[73] As all flourishing life means not only growth, but through growth, expansion, the politics of a flourishing nation is not merely national preservation, but national expansion. To deny this is to deny that the life of a nation should continue.[74] If expansion is the extending of a nation, conservatism will become part of the process of expansion.[75] Ludovici reckoned that Charles II had realised the vital importance of this principle of identity in expansion, and had added a good deal of territory to the British possessions overseas.[76] The one feature that distinguished the Tories from their political opponents, from the end of the eighteenth century and after, is that they became more imperialistic in their aims, "and thus expressed that essential aspect of Conservatism which consists in providing for national expansion."[77] In a limited area like that of the globe, in which many different people wage a struggle for existence, and the nature of whose lives imposes expansion as a necessary consequence of health and vigour, invasion and expropriation of territory is inevitable.

As Ludovici supposes the principle of human equality, and of the equality of human races in particular, is fantastic, a superior race has a natural mandate to spread at the cost of an inferior race. In healthy conditions there is a natural tendency to sacrifice the inferior.[78] An isolated community, with one thatcher and 20 ploughmen, selects the ploughman or less desirable creature to perform any acts which involve the risk of life, that are essential to the preservation of the community.[79] Likewise, in the situation of a world shortage of vital food the reality of starvation would reveal the error of the notion of human equality, and one people would take the lead in a struggle for food. Life gives the mandate for such a procedure.[80] Christian objectors to the identification of might with right must also object to democracy as it is the same principle.[81] And the Christian who argues that the spread of England and of Christianity through might has been a blessing to the people whose territory has been invaded and expropriated is a hypocrite. The inhabitants of Canada, Australia and Tasmania were wiped out.[82]

Ludovici's interpretation of life as struggle is certainly consistent with his advocacy of Nietzscheism. According to Nietzsche a living thing seeks to discharge its strength - "life itself is a Will to Power".[83] To refrain mutually from exploitation and violence, and to make it the fundamental principle of society, is tantamount to a denial of life.[84] Life itself is essentially appropriation, injury, conquest and suppression of the weak. Even in an organisation in which individuals treat each other as equal it must, "if it be a living and not a dying organisation", do all that towards other bodies, which the individuals within it refrain from doing to each other. Because it lives, and life is 'will to power', it

will endeavour to expand as 'will to power' belongs to the nature of the living being as a primary organic function. Will to Life is the fundamental fact of all history.[85] According to Ludovici, Nietzsche had set out to show that the life principle, 'will to power', is the prime motor of all living organisms.[86] Nietzsche, with his intense realism, had realised life is the mandate for violence and struggle: "Life means struggle, battle - war. Where it ceases to be that, its standard falls; it degenerates. the attacks that life survives, as a rule, leave it stronger."[87] Nietzsche had defined life as it really is.[88]

It is the capacity for Life that distinguishes the heroes in Ludovici's novels. In Mansel Fellowes , Richard Latimer's features are described as promising a substantial enjoyments of life's fruits.[89] Mansel Fellowes lived an intense life. Her eyes revealed a concentrated expression of eagerness and vitality, like those of a cat, whilst her canines were prominent among her well-tended teeth.[90] She had a feline vitality that baffled analysis. The 'flame of life' in her was intensely and fiercely real.[91] She promised Life.[92] Mrs. Fellowes persuades Richard Latimer to see her daughter 'dying' of her thwarted affection for him. She could not bear her daughter to be spurned by life.[93] Richard Latimer, after visiting Mansel Fellowes and noting her immediate recovery, is very depressed over his choice between Mansel Fellowes and his future fiancée, the non-vital Gladys Morrison. He takes some relief by a sojourn in Europe. He first visits Paris, but the romanticism in his nature, which the Nietzschean Dr. Melhado had never succeeded in eradicating, was stunned by the bold realism of the French girls attitude to life.[94] When he visited Italy he found that everybody lived and realised that a great literature like that of France, England and Germany, is a sign that

lives are rarely being lived.[95] When Richard Latimer forsakes Mansel Fellowes and she 'dies', Dr. Melhado perceives that the full life was a matter of life and death to her.[96] In Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady Gerald Swynnerton says to his confidant, Knowles, that even after he had gone on an Oriental cruise to relieve himself of his 'appetite' for the intense vitality of Catherine Doyle who, apparently, had jilted him, the 'flame of life' still possessed him: "'I was only too well aware of the small piece of live coal that still glowed within my breast, and knew that the slightest indulgence in the way of deep breathing would stir it into flame again.'"[97] In Too Old for Dolls we are told that Leonetta Delarayne gave the impression of aggressive vitality. Her quivering freshness gave a soft shimmer to her skin.[98] In her faultless teeth the life philosopher could see the life hunger they revealed and "the full deep bite and fast hold they would take of Life's entrails." This large-canined virgin had more feelings than self-control.[99] Mrs. Edith Delarayne exclaims to Lord Henry Highbarn that Leonetta is more determined to live than her elder sister, Cleopatra.[100] Lord Henry Highbarn is perceptive enough to realise that Cleopatra's 'illness' had been occasioned by her jealousy of Leonetta's superior vitality.[101] Leonetta is the acid that is corroding Cleopatra's life.[102] Cleopatra attempts to shoot her sister through jealousy, when she is in a shooting-party. She fails. Lord Henry Highbarn takes the blame for Cleopatra and dissimulates that it was his shooting-accident. He knew that Cleopatra would act through thwarted passion, over her younger sister's success with Denis Malster, either against herself, or against Leonetta, "'you would proceed to violence.'"[103] Leonetta was not to be told the truth about the incident until she was old enough to see how 'natural' it was.[104] In What Woman Wishes, when Lord Chiddingly and Janet Perkins, the working class heroine, declare their mutual

attraction and enter into a turbulent romance, never before had the upper class hero felt so deeply that he was drinking life to her dregs. Never before had he felt danger at every second, it imparted a lack of deliberation and recklessness as though in a life-and-death situation that provided the impetus for 'extreme lengths'. Danger is life's most precious saviour.[105] In The Taming of Don Juan, we are told that the hero Gilbert Milburn was impelled by the force of life.[106] His girlfriend, Almina, is also described as vibrant with life:

> ...the plain check tailor-made frock she wore, and the soft felt hat, resting voluptuously on the rich folds of her hair, seemed like the skin of a beautiful animal, so thoroughly vitalised were they by her exuberance.[107]

Dr. Hale, later in the novel, was not surprised to hear from Mrs. Dart that the jilted Frances Platt had thrown the missile which injured Gilbert at a Conservative Association meeting, disrupted by opponents: "'the chemist of life knows that natural forces are not to be played with, not with impunity, at any rate!'"[108] In his Woman. A Vindication, of 1923, Ludovici says the immensely vast and intricate activities which go to make a modern nation serve but one "force" (his italics) for which it is organised, which gives the city, the country beyond, and all the activities which we see, a genuine meaning - Life.[109] This notion is of immense importance for the social and political thought of Ludovici, it is the theme that sustains most of his contentions. Most importantly it commits him to what liberals would regard as a non-rational theory of man and society and extends the domain of politics and government to a total concern with all areas of social activity. Furthermore, Ludovici generates a justification for total revolution from it. The following is an extremely important passage. He conceives 'Life' as the supreme force:

> It should not be forgotten that industry, commerce, the professions and the Civil Service are but institutions organised for the purpose

> of Life. The main stream of Life certainly runs through them, and derives its security, its relative permanence and its fluency from their harmonious function, but they exist for life, and not Life for them. It is Life that is important, the channels through which it flows are only significant, as auxiliary to the main purpose.[110]

If they do not fulfill this purpose, which Ludovici thinks they do not, they should be dispensed with. The purpose for which our organised State, and to which all activities and complex situations do but minister, is the stream of Life. The Government, like the bus service, is only an instrument serving the most important thing of all - Life.[111] Our civilisation stands or falls as a whole. The intricate adjustments which constitute its fabric are so inter-dependent and mutually subservient, that it is impossible to lay hold of any important portion of it, with a view to condemnation, without thereby condemning the whole.[112] And this sole purpose Life, for which the whole of our society should be organised, is a continuous process of inter-racial and intra-racial struggle, with no principles except the one of more life in each race or species, governing the whole.[113]

According to Ludovici society cannot escape from violence as it cannot excape from Life without extinguishing itself.[114] Life outside human society is neither more nor less than a process of preying and mutual suppression and incorporation. Every species behaves as if it alone had the right to prevail, and it endeavours by every means in its power - self-preservation, propogation, rapine and parasitism - to make its own kind proponderate on earth:

> ...We open the stomach of a shot leopard and we find in it the mangled remains of some other animal or bird. When we kill a bird and inspect its viscera, we discover the remains of insects, small quadrupeds, or smaller birds.

And there are few people who, upon dying a sudden death, would not

betray their violence towards the lower animals by the contents of their stomach or intestines. Violence is an essential factor in all life, even in human life.[115] Indeed, as violence is at the very portals of life, in childbirth, a society cannot exist in which violence in some form, will not appear.[116] With the free operation of the right of parenthood every society incorporates a piece of life in its organisation, and having done this, cannot hope to eliminate from its organisation the violence which attaches to the operation of all natural and vital laws.[117] He reckoned that most of the apparent injustices, asperities and disabilities of human society are the inevitable repurcussions upon individuals of the incessant working of the primitive act of violence at the basis of the social edifice - childbirth.[118] As the violence of the procreative act reverberates through society and the world, someone or some group must suffer.[119] Curiously, of the book in which the above vindication of struggle is to be found, The False Assumptions of "Democracy", Ludovici proclaimed that it is "really Conservative in spirit."[120] Similarly, in his book of 1928, The Night-Hoers: or, the case against birth-control and an alternative, Ludovici says that if our actions are not to be controlled by the old people in our midst, then we are to be a self-affirming people and regard the future as belonging solely to the English and their multiplication. The English should cynically recognise the truth that human sacrifice is inevitable on thos globe, decline to be the party that has to be sacrificed, and demonstrate in word and deed that they have a natural mandate to supersede all other peoples.[121] As Life means sacrifice of some or many, the charge of inhumanity against any scheme which merely proposes to shift the point of incidence of the sacrificial axe cannot be sustained.[122]

Ludovici's most brilliant panegyric of struggle is to be found in his Violence, Sacrifice and War, read before the St. James' Kin of the

English Mistery in October 1933. It was greeted, by some, as destroying the "superficial logic of the war-sick reader".[123] He says that man used to be part of the mortal struggle of nature. His first, longest, and probably fiercest struggle against violence consisted in his wars with the large beasts of prey. For thousands of years the sacrificial saviours of the tribe were probably those individuals, chiefly women and children, who fell back in the tribes fight for life.[124] The violence originating from predatory animals, however, was long ago settled. Similarly, the violence of the weather and of the cold in winter was eliminated as fire and shelter acquired perfected forms of application. Though not altogether:

> ...people are still killed and their homes wrecked by thunderstorms; cisterns and water pipes still get frozen to our cost in winter, and people and their cattle all over the world are still affected by droughts and floods, while seamen still suffer from the violence of the sea, though even this has been neutralised to some extent by the recent feats of giant shipbuilding.[125]

Earthquakes and volcanic eruptions remain as forces majeure and like thunder and lightening, allude the control of science.[126] The cruellest and most persisting form of violence, however, has been that which afflicts one group of men at the hands of another hostile group. Hitherto, powerful European countries had succeeded in localising to some extent the incidence of this violence by limiting, concentrating and specially selecting the defense, both as regards sex, age, and the scene of the conflict. However, recent developments had made it no longer possible specially to select the victims to be sacrificed to it. Ludovici thought it would not be altogether desirable to eliminate this form of violence from humanity until the best and highest race is in complete possession of the world.[127] Nevertheless, man had succeeded in neutralising or eliminating almost all her forces in his environment which might unexpectedly deal violently with him.[128] There is, however, one form of violence which all through history has been

a fundamental source of mischief to humanity, and cannot be eliminated like that part of uncontrolled nature like thunder, lightening and the wind. It is that part of nature in ourselves which partakes of the quality of lightening and earthquakes, and is as unscrupulous as they are - the reproductive function.[129] Although those born are not foreignors, they do precisely what foreignors would do. They displace many of the previous inhabitants, compete with them, or otherwise make claims upon them. The violence of the reproductive function is a peaceful invasion, and, in its essentials, as much an act of violence as any other form of invasion. Even in a community in which space and food are more than adequate, the forcible introduction of a person who outclasses the older inhabitants subjects some to an act of displacement. Even sub-parity may be a menace, in modern states, as those unable to support themselves exercise violence upon the existing members by extorting their life-keep from them. If technical progress keeps abreast of human expansion, so that food will always be plentiful by cultivating space on planets, through the discovery of means for traversing inter-stellar space, the introduction of new people into a community would still remain as an act of violence and demand sacrifice: "Even to be forced, for lack of space, to pack up and leave for Saturn, or Mars, is to submit to an act of violence."[130] The lesson of history is that vital expansion has with monotonous repetition introduced fresh violence into human communities, and since violence means the sacrifice of something or somebody, one of the perpetual problems of human society has been how to shift the ultimate effect of this violence upon a group or community other than the one in which the violence actually originated; and if this was not possible how to sacrifice portions of the community itself so as to neutralise the violence.[131] If there is no decimation of the population by war, the people themselves instinctively resort to some means of decimating

themselves.[132] Rome, like Greece, in addition to sexual perversities, wars and ilfanticide, further neutralised the violence generated by her peoples' reproductive function, by unloading it on other peoples. The prolific Huns and Vandals did the same by the Roman Empire. Similarly, the violence generated by the reproductive function of the British people between 1760 and 1840 led to the partial extermination of three or four and the complete extermination of at least two peoples.[133] The portion of violence generated by a peoples' reproductive function that can be shifted in this way depends upon the strength of their nation. Even when England was most active as a force destructive of other peoples lives, throughout the latter part of the eighteenth and almost the whole of the nineteenth century, she was torn with dissension at home through the violence generated by her peoples reproductive function, of which each class tried to shift the sacrifice on the heads of another:

> In fact, one might sum up the history of all social reforms, of all poor laws, of most revolutions and rebellions, of all the struggles for the extended franchise, and of all confiscatory taxation for the benefit of one class, by saying that they are merely events in the eternal struggle on the part of one class to shift the violence demanded from reproductive violence from one section of the community to another.[134]

If an unwise ruling class retains power, as it did in the case of the ancient aristocracies of Greece, Russia, France and England and elsewhere, the sacrifice was without scruple demanded almost wholly of the ruled class. The moment, however, that the ruled class was able to reverse the balance of power, the sacrifice was then demanded of the lives of the former rulers.[135] Violence is the inevitable concomitant of life. Sacrifice and violence are complementary features in life. To attempt to avoid violence and sacrifice is to avoid life itself. Therefore, if life is to be lived, so violence and sacrifice can only be overcome by the man or the nation that is prepared to live dangerously. No amount of renunciation of conquest

will ever remove violence from the core of human societies as there is a form of violence that is inseperable from human life, even within a peace-loving and unwarlike community, childbirth.[136]

In the second section of Ludovici's Violence, Sacrifice and War, "Pacifism, Internationalism and Nationalism"[137], he asserts that the pacifist's object in avoiding the terrible sacrifice of human life which war involves is based on an illusion. Even if the pacifist could stop war forever, he could not achieve the abolition of terrible sacrifice of human life.[138] Healthy human life presupposes multiplication. A healthy race necessarily increases and expands. To wish to limit the healthy expansion of a nation is to wish for an unhealthy nation. The pacifist is, therefore, a dysgenist.[139] The pacifist is a destroyer of his own nation's potential offspring. And, if the pacifist belongs to a superior race he is a vandal.[140] Pacifism conceals and continues degeneration, not standing armies or war. Without armies and the prospects of war, standards of physical efficiency would decline and propel the nation to degeneration.[141] Nothing in the pacifist's programme of activities reveals a fraction of the zeal about the nation's health which military authorities and military nations have always revealed, ever since the time of Sparta:

> ...The military standards of old demanded great endurance, energy, health and vigour in men; it also set certain minima as regards height, development, dental soundness, etc.; the military authorities had some idea of the hardships, trials and tests to which a soldier's physique is subjected in war.[142]

It is the capacity for life and struggle that Ludovici idealises. He thought the capacity for struggle was particularly evident in the history of the Jews. Crushing defeats at the hands of the Philistines forced the Jews to act in unison, and fight as one nation. Saul, their "great military hero", led his people first against the Ammonites

and then against the Philistines, defeated them, although only temporarily. However, half a millenium after the Exodus the Jews succeeded in establishing themselves in Palestine at the expense of the settled inhabitants, who were better armed and organised than themselves.[143] Their ultimate success proves their struggle had rendered them feroicious and resolute; their repeated wars and privations must repeatedly have winnowed the weaker from their stock.[144] Whilst they were aware of their distant relationship to the peoples lying north and east of them and of the people they were driving out - the Canaanites - the lesson they had learnt from Moses, and the certainty he gave them of their favour at the hands of their deity Yahweh, fortified their belief that they were specially privileged to the land they were invading.[145] Judah, the southern kingdom, after struggling for its existence against Assyria and Egypt in turn, and subsequently against Chaldea, ultimately succumbed to Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. Jerusalem was sacked and the elite of the Jews were taken into captivity in Babylon. After a lapse of about 70 years, Persia conquered Babylon, and Cyrus, King of Persia, set the tribes free to return to Judah. Once again there was rigorous selection by circumstances of the Jews of highest stamina and most patriotic sentiments.[146] And, throughout the Middle Ages in Europe, the fate of the Jews was very much the same. Everywhere the position of the Jews was more or less insecure, and yet everywhere they survived owing chiefly to the tremendous power of their law and religious traditions, their exceptional stamina, their inflexible will to maintain their unity in dispersion, and their capacity for adaptation.[147] Their stubborn "primitive desert traits" repeatedly moulded their history, despite their thousands of years of separation from desert life.[148] The early Semites were hardened and sharpened by the merciless life of the desert:

> ...a people fitted by milleniums of privation, uncertainty and simple living, to become formidible in any close struggle for existence with a type less hard and hardened; and a people accustomed to wait, to endure, and to be masters of their own destiny.[149]

Their history 'proves' that only a people capable of imposing the greatest hardships upon themselves, and capable of the greatest bravery, can survive the struggle that is life.[150] They are formidible exponents of the Nietzschean 'will to power'.[151]

Ludovici identifies five possible ways of restricting population when it exceeds the power of the soil to support it: A proportion of the males may be castrated and their sexual function sacrificed; homosexual practices may be encouraged, among males; selective infanticide; female sterilisation; female homosexuality.[152] Ludovici thinks that all of the latter, including birth control, are undesirable as they inflict sacrifice on the native population.[153] However, sacrifice of something or somebody is inevitable as "sacrifice of some kind is implicit in organic life as it is found on the globe."[154] He then proceeds to identify those whose sacrifice is desirable: The inferior foreign races who limit the multiplication of English life; the infanticide of degenerates and the prohibition of the marriage of degenerates; the prohibition of immigration and cancellation of existing naturalisations.[155]

It is significant that I have desisted from labelling Ludovici as a social Darwinist in the preceding discussion. I think it is a question that deserves caution. In Ludovici's The False Assumptions of "Democracy", of 1921, he says that Life's activities have a gravitating or descending tendancy. In a large number of organisms, acquired embellishments or acquired faculties and qualities have to be dropped in the course of generations.[156] This is a conviction to be found

elsewhere in his writings, especially in his interpretation of Nietzsche. He thought Nietzscheans, like himself, should regard the hope that better things will perforce arise from allowing things to take their course unguided by human endeavour as pure romanticism.[157] There is a curious ambivalence in Ludovici's attitude to social Darwinism. I do not think that Ludovici should be simply regarded as a social Darwinist,* that notion that progress is the consequence of competition between men, although, he does, on occasion, subscribe to the view that survival is the survival of the fittest. In the main, following Nietzsche, he ridiculed the Darwinian faith in the blind force of nature, working automatically through the survival of the fittest.[158] Nietzsche thought social Darwinists, like Herbert Spencer, had mistaken the true nature and function of life, which is 'will to power'.[159] He ascribed all the importance to the 'life-will' of the organism as the motive force of evolution.[160] Nietzsche transformed the Darwinian 'struggle for existence', which is passive and involuntary, into the 'struggle for power', which is active and creative.[161] Economy is not one of life's principles: "The blind Will to Power in nature therefore stands in urgent need of direction by man."[162] Although Ludovici concedes that Nietzsche's works bear the unmistable stamp of the theory of evolution as taught by Darwin, they differ seriously in respect of the question of the lines upon which the process of evolution worked. Nietzsche's theory involves a new development hypothesis. If the evolutionary process be a fact; if things have become what they are, and were not always so; then, Nietzsche contends, we may describe no limit to the aspirations of man.[163] The 'progress' of the Darwinians is by no means elevating. The environment, in conditions of spontaneity, is the

---

*A recent study has erroneously claimed Ludovici as such, cf. Rodney Barker, Political Ideas in Modern Britain (London: Methuen, 1978), p. 200.

determining factor, and if its means are best met by the degenerate then they will be the 'fittest', and survive.[164] Even the Puritan who opposes music halls and theatres, is more pregnant with promise for the future, though not from any deep philosophical motive, because he is preaching against the measures which threaten to adapt us to degenerative conditions.[165] Nietzsche objected to Darwin's mechanistic explanation of evolution and supplanted it with the 'will to power' as the more fundamental life motor.[166] Darwinists weave too much romance into life with their scientific formulae for a moral order of things.[167] Upon the basis of the 'will to power' Nietzsche developed a cosmogony which assumes that species have been evolved, but at variancewith Darwin, and points to an inner creative will in living organisms which makes environment and natural conditions subservient and subject.[168] Nietzsche, unlike the optimistic Darwinists, did not believe that out of the chaotic play of blind forces the best and fittest would survive.[169] Such faith in autonomous forces Nietzsche regarded merely as the survival of the old Christian belief in a moral order of things.[170] Arrested development or a retrogression along the evolutionary ladder is a common source of degeneracy, according to Nietzsche and Ludovici.[171] Provided that more life comes into being, nature is impartial towards the multiplication of species whether in a progressive or regressive direction.[172] The quality of those who survive depends upon the kind of survival value that prevails. Consequently, to allow the extreme effects of the struggle for existence to eliminate the 'unfit' of today, would amount to rearing a race who happens to succeed best in a commercial and industrial age.[173] Evolutionary processes do not possess either the infallibility or the reliability for progress which social Darwinians suppose. In the animal world the great majority of evolutionary changes hitherto have been in the direction of degeneration, and by far the greater portion of living

species are degenerate ancestors of superior ancestors.[174]

Nevertheless, Ludovici, on occasion, contradicted himself and reverted to social Darwinism:

> In natural and relatively stable conditions, the struggle for existence or power, rigid adaptation, and the absence of artifical medical aids, tends to create a standardised type Aberrations are usually eliminated, whether sub-normal or conspicuously super-normal, unless either state means better adaptations. And this process is so rigorous that the young, whether human or animal, set loose to choose, can hardly err.[175]

However, I think Ludovici's attitude to social Darwinism is ambiguous, in believing that 'evolution' covers millions of cases of retrograde metamorphoses[176], because he wished to emphasise the life and death , or vital, importance of the intense struggle to succeed. Therefore, any slackening in the struggle to become more and more potent is the beginning of the retrograde development:

> ...To assail the desire to become more and more is therefore tantamount to a conspiracy against life, it is tantamount to a denial of the healthy instinct of the species.[177]

This ambiguity towards social Darwinism recurs in Ludovici's last book devoted to Nietzscheism, Religion for Infidels of 1961. He says struggle is the mandate of life. Humanity still undergoes unprovoked violence from the attacks of wild animals; from insects, poisonous or disease bearing; from parasites, whether internal or external, and the micro-organisms of lethal illnesses.[178] From the first moment of organic life on earth, slaughter and mutilation under the crudest conditions has been the order of the day.[179] The 'life force' is the power behind phenomena:

> ...Given a high degree of sensitiveness and intelligence, it is conceivable that even a confined townsman might, without the panorama of vital phenomena as it is unrolled in all its rich manifoldness along the country-side, reach fairly shrewd notions about the basic trend of the invisible forces directing living things on earth.[180]

Ludovici proceeds to describe the attributes of the life forces: First, they are cynical in the treatment of the living; second, they are indifferent regarding quality and show no 'taste' or discrimination; third, they do not favour an upward trend in the evolution of living things; fourth, the forces governing life's processes have inplanted in all their creatures a will much more convulsive than the mere 'will to live'.[181] Animals and plants do not merely sustain their own lives, they obtrude themselves on other lives, even other lives belonging to their own species.[182] A striving after power or supremecy is the basic trend of all nature, whilst Schopenhaur's 'will to live' and Darwin's notion of the 'struggle for existence', give an inadequate idea of the life force.[183] Only the Nietzschean 'will to power', the dynamic factor informing all living matter, is able to contend with and often defeat the degenerate trends implicit in the first three characteristics of the lifeforces, as previously enumerated. The 'will to power' has accounted for all those triumphs of the evolutionary process, including man himself.[184] Life is cynical, it has no trace of any morality: "every kind of thuggery, deception, fraud, duplicity and mendacity, finds its ablest and most unscrupulous exponents in Nature."[185] Natural selection is not nature's discriminating choice of those races held worthy of survival, but a blind indiscriminate favouring of winners who, by favourable chance variations and their ability to adapt themselves to an environmental influence, have come victoriously out of the struggle for existence.[186] Ludovici believed that only when the Nietzschean 'will to power' is free to operate in the elite of mankind will the degenerative attiributes of the life forces be counteracted:

> ...Nor is it insignificant that in all periods of decline among the highest product of evolution - Man - will to power should be reviled in its highest manifestations only where surreptiviously, and in a manner unobserved by ordinary men and women, it does most harm; i.e., in women, children, the sick, the crippled, demented and the degenerate in general.[187]

In society the 'will to power' must invoke the life force to operate constantly against the omnipresent threat of degeneration, for in nature, there is no similar influence, "and degeneracy is just as likely as regeneracy to supervene".[188]

It is because England had ceased to be governed in accordance with the principles of life that Ludovici thought it had degenerated. I shall now proceed to explain, in detail, the reasons why Ludovici thought England had degenerated. The causes of degeneracy:-

1. Racial: Miscegenation and Dysgenic Mating

In his A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories Ludovici agrees with Gobineau that there is inequality between the races of men, and that barbarity is the inevitable and permanent state of certain races with instincts incompatible with any other condition, whilst civilisation is the creation of races with other instincts.[189] Races are destroyed through the extinction of those particular instincts constituting their identity, through miscegenation.[190] The gradual decay of the great cultured nations of antiquity was always synchronous with laxity in matters of race pride and prejudice towards the foreigner.[191] At times of promiscuous cross breeding instinct and will become confused and are no longer reliable.[192] The only thing that destroys character permanently is the miscegenation which becomes the rule and custom in democratic times.[193] Until the time of Elizabeth I the English were fortunate in their crosses; for their crosses were with closely allied races who could not introduce a very disturbing or degenerative element into their character.[194]

In his A Defence of Conservatism Ludovici proclaims that diffuse miscegenation is inconcsitent with conserving the identity of the nation.[195] Each race has a 'culture potential', by which is meant a certain people's capacity to evolve up to a certain plane of cultural organisation and not beyond it. The culture potential of the negro soon made havoc of the white culture imposed upon it in Liberia.[196] As the preservation of the identity of the nation throughout change is the object of conservatism, the facilities afforded to foreign settlers in England should be the object of very jealous and severe attention. The mixing of blood has so often throughout history proved the principle cause of a nation's decay, that a haughty attitude of aloofness towards the foreignor is justified.[197] Because a "strong Conservative attitude" based upon considerations of ethnicity was unrepresented in the governing body, in 1656 Cromwell allowed the Jews to return to England.[198] Hitherto, from Richard II onwards, a series of measures restricted the freedom of foreign merchants to trade within the realm. By Act 32nd, Henry VIII, c.16, para. 83, all leases, whether of a dwelling house or shop, within the realm or any of the King's dominions, held by any stranger, artificer, or handy craftsman, born out of the King's obeisance, and not being a denizen, were null and void, and the person taking such a lease was punished.[199] The fact that no amendment of this law took place until the Act 7 and 8, Victoria, c.66, in the year 1844, when aliens were allowed to take a lease of real property for the purpose of residence or business for 21 years, though they were still forbidden to hold real estate, Ludovici believed spoke "highly for the conservative spirit of England".[200] It was not until the Naturalisation Act of 1870, under Gladstone's first administration, that the civil disabilities of aliens were completely abolished and that naturalisation was made easy and inexpensive, and subsequent legislation was merely complementary to this measure.[201] He thought those who marvel at the

change that has come over the self-reliant and independent nature of the Englishman, should bear in mind the influx of foreign blood that had, he believed, undermined the Englishman's character and physique.[202] Regrettably, Disraeli's proclamation that '"all is race"'[203] had little meaning in English politics, otherwise Disraeli himself would have had no status in English political life.[204] It is hopeless to conserve a nation's identity if the blood of its people, and the unity of its culture, are exposed toalieninfluence on a large scale. Conservatives ignored the real nature of their creed: "We look in vain for any intelligence Conservative comment on these problems throughout the nineteenth century."[205] The Tories, although they consistently resisted the measures that were proposed to remove the disabilities of the Jews in the nineteenth century did not, as they should have, base their objections on the question of race.[206] No-one seemed to recognise the real conservative principle that a nation with individuality is a segregated ethnic unit, and that if its identity is to be conserved, it must be protected from the influence of other segregated peoples.[207] The object of conservatism is to conserve the identity of the nation in every sense, not "to be pleasant, hospitable and open-hearted at all costs".[208] Vague feelings of revolt moved the Conservatives to oppose the admission of the Jew to civil rights, but they never properly understood whether it was desirable to allow the Jew to influence English culture and a character by miscegenation.[209] In the debates on the Naturalisation Bill, both in the Commons and the Lords, not a sign of the "old Tory spirit" was manifested.[210]

Ludovici was most perturbed by the immigration of unprecedented numbers of Asiatics and Negros into Britain in the post war era. He thought to understand the "supine inactivity" of the Government in regard to the 'problem' of miscegenation requires a knowledge of what had happened in England since 1939. He thought this all the more

necessary seeing that during most of the period covering this black immigration, an alleged 'Conservative Party' had been in charge of the nation's destinies. The reason is that ever since 1939, the Conservative Party had felt itself compelled to embrace the opposition to facism. And, in so doing had surrendered "the wisest and most valuable Conservative principles". Like the politicians of other parties, the Conservatives, shouted 'Nay!' to every Nazi 'Yea!' to Life, and subscribed to a number of socialist beliefs, which with the traditions of the Empire behind them, were quite novel and strange.[211] When, therefore, from the standpoint of conserving the nation's identity, foreign races poured into England from her colonial possessions, Ludovici claimed that genuine 'conservatives' like he claimed to be, were perplexed. In the case of the determined opposition to Nazi racial laws, Ludovici thought English 'conservatives' had not forgotten the lies that had played their part in hostilities.[212]

Ludovici's racial diagnosis of degeneration was certainly not inconsistent with the beliefs of his mentor, Nietzsche.[213] In Mansel Fellowes, the Jewish Nietzschean, Dr. Melhado, proclaims that the glory of ancient Egypt still survives in his racial memory, and his heart, filled with its after glow, sickens at the sight of modern Europe.[214] In What Woman Wishes we are told that one of the heroes, Lord Firle, believed in the principle that England at her zenith had been the creation of the national character:

> ...Foreign blood, or foreign influences, however exalted they might be in their own home, could, if imported into this country, only dilute or destroy the national character, and ultimately undermine the fabric of the Empire.[215]

In Ludovici's Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition, of 1921, he interprets the 'myth' of Prometheus as embodying the truth of an actual racial cross. He reckons the gods

of the myth were descended from a superior race that had condescended to effect a union with an inferior race, and had, therefore, already experienced some degeneration. The natural attitude of a healthy superior race is one of aloofness and contempt to all other races.[216] Zeus, was one of the true-bred off spring of the cross, who resembled in every particular the superior, immigrant race. Prometheus, on the other hand, was a perfect blend of the two races, and therefore very much bigger than the men of either the superior or the inferior race.[217] The Holy Bible informs us that after the sons of God had taken the daughters of men as wives there were giants on the earth.[218] Ludovici believed the moral effects of racial crosses is that whereas fertility and size are increased, character is destroyed:

> ...Thus Eurasians and Mulattoes and cross bred Europeans and Chinese are proverbial for their unreliability, shiftiness and even dishonesty. Where the blend is perfect, obviously both moral characters are destroyed; both inherited moral attributes tend to neutralise each other, and leave but a residuum of savage primary characters behind, denuded of their usual overlap of social and aesthetic inhibitions.[219]

Prometheus, therefore, appears as of no moral character in the myth.[220] The right to fetch fire from the superior race, which was originally in possession of kindling it, was subject to rules wisely laid down by Zeus, as he knew of the deleterious effects of fire on food.[221] However, Prometheus the demagogue, had promised the inferior race concessions from Zeus, stole fire, and brought about evil for the inferior race.[222] Ludovici then proceeds to identify the gods of ancient myth. He reckons Uranus was of the same race as the God of the Semites - the Jehovah of the Old Testament. This race must have been sufficiently large and widely distributed to have had representatives both in Asia and Europe.[223] They are the 'Dionysians' rather than the 'Prometheans', who spawned Western civilisation. The 'dionysian type', the "men-gods"[224], are the ancestors of the

Cro-Magnon race who reached their zenith in the Paleolithic Age, were artistic, and became absorbed by other peoples in the Neolithic Age. They were the gods of the Jews, Greeks, Persians and Indians. They were the greatest race on earth and became absorbed by the Aryans.[225] Uranus was a Cro-Magnon. When, therefore, Aeschylus makes Prometheus say that he has lingered thirty thousand years in chains, after being punished by Zeus, he shows that he was aware of the vast antiquity of the myth.[226] A similar process of 'reasoning', applied to the first and second verses of the sixth chapter of Genesis would lead, according to Ludovici, to the conclusion that the God of the Jews and Christians was also a Cro-Magnon.[227] The modern European, the product of the miscegenation between the Cro-Magnons and Aryans, is very much inferior to the Cro-Magnon race which existed over fifty thousand years ago.[228] The fact that the Cro-Magnons have not survived, despite their superiority, demonstrates both the extreme danger of miscegenation and that the "struggle of life is indiscriminate".[229]

The democratic contempt of blood and family, which is based upon the belief in equality, and leads to miscegenation on a universal scale, must be reckoned among the deep causes of modern degeneration, according to Ludovici.[230] In his Violence, Sacrifice and War, he defines a nation as consisting of either a pure race, or else a compound of two or more races which have attained to homogeneity through long segregation and inbreeding.[231] Everything else is a mere population or biological proletarian, examples of which are:

> ...the Levantines, the hybrids of Haiti, Liberia, South America, North America, and South Africa, and the mongrel hordes which inhabit all the large trading ports of the world, such as Shanghai, Hong Kong, Columbo, Alexandria, Port Said, Cape Town, Zanzibar, and Marseilles.

In contrast, the ancient Egyptians, the Hindus, the Chinese, the Jews, the Greeks, the Romans, the English and the Japanese, are nations. Only they can contribute to culture and civilisation. To break down frontiers in order to merge people in one fraternal embrace would be to convert them into "mongrel hordes that ...swarm like chattering monkeys from Babel."[232] The instinct of aloofness in the races, whether pure or mixed, which became through their geographical position, or their artificial boundaries, segregated and inbred, and which produced the great civilisations and cultures of the world, was a special manifestation of the instinct of self-preservation, to preserve what was precious in the blood.[233] People who have long followed different lines of development, lived different lives, pursued different ideals, and evolved different characters, cannot unite without causing serious disharmonies both of physiology and psychology in their offspring. Especially, Ludovici believed, since the bodily parts of both parents are inherited independently.[234] In England by 1760, according to Ludovici, the wholesale miscegenation which began chiefly in Cromwell's time, had so far altered the fibre of the nation that she began to make successive mistakes in her domestic, colonial and foreign policy. But, still the garnered strength of her centuries of isolation and inbreeding allowed her to continue in military and naval supremecy until the time of Queen Victoria's Diamond Jubilee, in 1897, when at long last the inferior blood in her people caused the tide to turn.[235]

Miscegenation conceals and spreads ill-health and all qualities, desirable or undesirable, diluting and mixing them.[236] Ludovici believed the chief effects of miscegenation on the constitution are: Degeneracy, by inducing reversion; dysfunction and disease, by the production of individuals whose bodies are discordant jumbles of

unrelated parts from various unlike stocks; increase of national morbidity, owing to the spread of disease among sound stock.[237] He regretted that too little attention is paid in modern civilised societies to disparities of race in mating, and their effect on child birth.[238]

Ludovici's racial diagnosis of degeneration is most evident in his pseudonymous book of 1938, Jews, and the Jews in England. He asserts that the Jews are a highly selected group of the Semitic race.[239] Segregation, inbreeding, and long periods of communal life led under the rule of the same values, the conditions essential to the production of a race, were repeatedly imposed upon them by themselves or by their enemies.[240] Indeed, from a common primeval source, mankind ultimately became differentiated into Mongoloids, Negroids, Australoids and Caucasians, by segregation of groups, inbreeding, and the specialisation among these groups that comes from meeting different difficulties, different climatic conditions, and observing different dietary and other values over long periods.[241] In the Jews of the Great Dispersion, Europeans were still confronted with the members of a homogeneous race.[242] According to Ludovici's monism as the Jew has survived as a 'type', there could be no question of the Jews not constituting a distinct race.[243] The expulsion of the Jews from England by Edward I was right and necessitous.[244] But, many poor Jews settled in England, probably accepted baptism and were thence forward reckoned as English and adopted English names. Ludovici believed this constituted adequate evidence for assuming an influx of Semitic blood into the medieval English population, and accounts for the marked Jewish 'types' living as Englishmen, passing among their fellows as Englishmen and claiming to be of purely Anglo-Saxon or Celtic ancestry.[245] The Jews inherited from their original state as nomads a complex of mental habits, emotions, gifts and tastes, such,

for instance, as their inability to become, or to feel rooted to any territory, hence their lack of appreciation and capacity for a territorial national's attachment to a particular soil and environment. Such, too as their inability to understand property as a privelige involving duties and responsibilities; their incapability of building up a society in which the relations of the various classes and of their members are based on co-operation.[246] Owing to the Jews' characteristics inherited and acquired from their Asiatic Bedouin origin, their long association with civilisation and big cities, and their hard struggle for that narrow isthmus of land which included all the principal trade routes between three continents in the ancient world, they, according to Ludovici, naturally tend to scorn the more laborious and slower methods of accumulating wealth. The individualism of the Jew inherited from his ancestors, and combined with his native 'hardness', render the Jews incapable of understanding property except as individual possession free from all obligations and duties.[247] The rapacity of the Jews is predictable, according to Ludovici, when we bear in mind their derivation from a desert people:

> ...For how can an independent nomad, moving with all his personal family and goods from pasture to pasture and from oasis to oasis, conceive of any gregarious attitude towards property, or of any obligations implicit in his possessions, other than those he feels perhaps towards his own children?[248]

The Jews are an ethnic 'type' whose physical composition is different from that of Englishmen. Difference of morphology means they are incompatible as regards 'culture potential'. A truth regretably disregarded by the English legislature of the nineteenth century which liberated the Jews from civil disabilities and permitted their intrusion into English public life.[249] When the Jews oppose European conservatism they are oblivious to their own "fits of Conservatism" in the past, out of expediency:

> What Esra did in Jerusalem in 485 BC, what Nehemiah did in the same city in 445 BC, is conveniently forgotton, if it is a matter of ridiculing the actions of a Tory like the Earl of Malmesbury in opposing the Bill to repeal the civil disabilities of Jews, or if it is important that the National Socialists of Germany should be refuted and ridiculed.

On the other hand, when it is a matter of a Jew trying to get himself accepted as a conservative, nobody can speak in a manner more persuasive about the fundamental principles of conservatism that Ludovici thought actuated German National Socialism, than Disraeli himself.[250] The Jews have a tendancy to convert a society based on a mutualistic conception of property, and on a system of graded service with protection of the subordinate in return for his obedience, into modern capitalism. And, they ultimately have a tendency to meet the inevitable disintegration of capitalist society, by switching to communism.[251] For these reasons Ludovici thought prudence dictated a policy of exclusion of both the Jew and his influence from all those departments of English life in which Jewish influence may alter the identity of the nation, otherwise, it could not be conserved:

> There can be no doubt that, from the standpoint of a strictly Conservative attitude the Jew should be precluded from too much control over our institutions and customs, because as they are not an external expression of his type, his intervention as a power over them cannot fail to modify them in an un-English way.[252]

Ludovici submitted that when once a well-defined national character has established the institutions and customs suited to its peculiar tastes, capacities and virtues, these institutions can be modified only by attacking the national 'type' or stock.[253] He regretted that truths readily acknowledged in the breeding, health and satisfactory nurture of animals, are hardly ever applied to man.[254] A segregated people in a state of nature tend to become uniform in their somatology and psychology and conflictsof a physiological and psychological order

are gradually eliminated through natural selection. If they mix with others differently constituted such standardised people become disharmonious and disproportionate, unabalnced and, therefore, functionally faulty.[255] The English were once, and for a long period of their history, standardised.[256] They degenerated because in the mechanisms governing heredity throughout animal life, including humanity, mixture of races causes the offspring to inherit the disparate bodily parts of their parents.[257] One of the major consequences of miscegenation, Ludovici believed, is reversion; that is, the reversion towards a stage of development which each of a mongrel's parents has already surpassed and left far behind.[258] According to Ludovici, the prodigious increase in demented, neurotic and maladjusted person, has occurred because of the reckless miscegenation, whether of races, 'types', or merely occupational family strains, that had been going on for over three centuries.[259] The urgent need felt by the members of the Establishment to revile and reject every feature of Nazi Germany, especially the race measures which Ludovici believed most faithfully reflected the attitude of the Englishmen who established the British Empire, had meant that the British public had everywhere been inculcated with prejudices which even their aunts would have rejected out of hand at the turn of the century:

> The result was that fashionable opinion in England soon began, simply on the grounds that a point of view or a policy savoured of the Third Reich, to condemn out of hand many a sound judgement and attitude which the English nation at home and abroad formally championed with all their might, and which in Thackeray's day would have been stoutly advocated by Thackeray himself. And, foremost among such attitudes was the rooted objection to miscegenation.

Ludovici thought one needs merely to think of the lethal consequences to a patient if blood of the wrong group is introduced into his bloodstream to realise the mendacity of the opponents of racial discrimination.[260]

However, Ludovici's reasons for believing the race had degenerated were not merely confined to miscegenation. He cited indiscriminate breeding within the race as another potent cause of degeneration. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories he eulogised a caste system[261], and regretted the tendancy of Englishmen not to marry those to whom they are consanguineous, especially relatives.[262] His novel of 1918, Mansel Fellowes, is a diatribe against indiscriminate breeding. Both Mansel Fellowes and Richard Latimer, the heroes of the novel, are specimens of 'flourishing life', but the latter gets engaged to Colonel Morrison's daughter, Gladys, who is described as degenerate.[263] Richard Latimer did not have the perception to appreciate that Mansel Fellowes gave the greatest promise of Life.[264] Ludovici laments:

> ...What a ghastly thing it was that the taste of men was such that this beautiful virgin could have been overlooked for one instance, while inferior girls were being chosen by the score! that was the real tragedy! that was the real crime! it was the gruesome tragedy of all precious things in an Age that was gradually compassing its own doom by methodically and consistently choosing the wrong thing.[265]

In The Goddess that Grew Up, Peter Oliver never, unfortunately, transferred some of the bitterness he consumed in private over his marriage to the non-vital Maud, to a society which disregarded the eugenic aspects of marriage.[266] So accustomed was the world to the spectacle which Peter Oliver's household presented, and to the 'normality' of lives blighted by imperfect health that nobody in his circle was aware of any sorrow in his life.[267] Later in the novel Mrs Oliver's desire to live fades, her "spring of life had gone", and she dies.[268] Again, in Ludovici's novel of 1923, French Beans, although the "fire of life sparked and leaped" within Domina Biggadyke, she was less successful with men than her private secretary, Catherine Urquhart, who, frail, delicate and friable, aloof from the physical concerns of life, had many pressing admirers, so thoroughly misled were men as to the desirable mate.[269]

Ludovici thought a tendency whereby opposites are married, according to which, dark crossed with fair, tall with short, and the sick with the sound, is neither more nor less than a recipe for degeneration.[270] What happens to the body of the offspring of dissimilar types is necessarily reflected in its nervous controls and ganglia. If, therefore, there is conflict in the former, as there must be in people random-bred from disparate parents and stock, it also follows there is conflict, of varying degrees of gravity, in the psychological equipment.[271] Mongelisation does not merely occur when races mix. Ludovici thought that in England this is now probably its rarest manifestation:

> ...It occurs chiefly in healthy, sound stocks, mongrelising themselves by mating with unsound, weedy and tainted stocks; or in well-constituted and good-looking stocks mating with ill-constituted, badly-grown, and repulsive stocks; or by the mating of wholly disparate types - short and stumpy with tall and slim, fat and heavy with spouses whose endocrine balance is normal; vigorous and hard mating with weakly and soft. So that ugliness becomes not merely the hereditary feature of a family line, but is created afresh in every generation and family by the confusion and chaos resulting from the jumble of incompatible traits inherited independently from wholly disparate parents (his italics).[272]

Ludovici even suggested that actual race mixture was now a comparatively rare occurrence, at least in Western Europe. However, the very same consequences which result from race mixture, also result from what, in Western Europe, was, Ludovici thought, now so common as to be almost universal, the dysgenic mating of different types which accounted for the prevailing morbidity.[273]

2. Religious: The Christian Ethic, Protestantism, and Puritanism

One of the main reasons for England's degeneration that Ludovici continually

referred to was the prevalence of the Christian ethic and Puritanism in England. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, Ludovici says that the relation of the ecclesiastical body to the people in Europe had deleterious influences by being independent of the government or feudal ruler. By ministering to the hearts of the people, not for a national or racial purpose, but for a purpose that lay beyond races and nations, it undermined the jealous love of race and nationality, and , by divorcing the idea of aristocracy from the noble duty of caring for the hearts of the masses undermined the 'ruler-aristocrat'.[274] His diatribe against Puritanism is to be found in Chapter V, "The Metamorphosis of the Englishman of the Seventeenth Century"[275], in which he asserts that Puritanism, by reducing the Englishman's love of life, prepared the way for industrial capitalism.[276] Englishmen had to learn that vital beauty which leads and lures to life, to the joy in life and to the multiplication of life, is neither essential nor helpful to the factory. The profound problem with which England began blindly to grapple in the Seventeenth Century was to discover the religion essentially allied to trade and commerce. The religion that was to consolidate the masters and rear the slaves for capitalism was Puritanism.[277] Puritanism, hostile to the flesh, necessarily suppressed the highest spirits, vigour, and energy, of the working classes.[278] Though Puritanism did not become an organised force until the Seventeenth Century in England, the Puritan had always existed sporadically, individually and locally, "just as sick animals represent a certain percentage of all animals born every year."[279] The puritan, sick in body and mind, cannot lead a full life. Calvin was:

> ...a miserable, god-forsaken invalid who, racked with fevers, asthma, gout and the stone, dragged his foul body through this life as if the world were a mausoleum, and himself the gangreneous symbol of the death of all human joys.[280]

Essentially, the Puritan is a 'boy' who has acquired a moral standard of judgement, and transfers his inadequacies to the rest of mankind.[281] Commercial morality became and remained united with the morality of the Puritans. They shared a profound suspicion of flourishing, healthy and robust life; indifference to beauty, whether in the human body or an art; hostility to sexuality and high spirits; a preferance for meekness, inferiority of vigour and vitality; and a deteriorated love of life and joy of life, which rendered millions not merely resigned and submissive, but actually content in town, factory and office surroundings.[282] According to Ludovici, the metamorphosis of the Englishman into a devitalised creature that accepted capitalism, was accomplished by Puritanism, which met the requirements of human profit and greed.[283] The Puritans' depressing and life-sapping creed initiated a general decline in vitality by promoting industrial capitalism.[284] The first direct attack that the Puritans made upon the dietetic habits of Englishmen consisted in an attempt at suppressing the consumption of wholesome alcoholic beverages.[285] They promoted the introduction of the life-sapping drugs which contributed to the physical impoverishment of the working classes of England - tea and coffee.[286] Ludovici proclaims as "one who has written so much about Nietzsche the Anti-Christ, and who has been engaged for so long in propogating his doctrines", that the English working classes could expect little justice or mercy from the Puritans.[287] The life-despising morality of the Puritans and Whigs had been paramount in England since the last upholder of good taste and popular liberty, Charles I, was overthrown and murdered by them in the fifth decade of the seventeenth century.[288]

Nevertheless, not all of Ludovici's allusions to religion are deprecatory. In his A Defence of Conservatism , he concedes that the

earliest guilds were religious guilds inspired by the Holy Catholic Church, which in itself was an aristocratic institution with a strict hierarchy, although deprived of blood descent, and was largely responsible for the cooperative organisation of labour and trade, as it was for the greater part of the Middle Ages. Despite its non-pagan creed, Catholicism retained much of what was valuable in the classic world, including the insistence upon quality.[289] However, Ludovici's attitude towards Catholicism was ambivalent. This ambivalance was never conferred on his attitude to Puritanism and Protestantism. He thought the Puritans were the worst of the Christians, because they prepared the way for the Industrial Revolution, by inaugerating an era of bodily neglect and hostility to bodily concerns and concerns of beauty.[290] In Chapter V, "Religion and the Constitution",[291] Ludovici reckons that through the Reformation, an attempt at fortifying temporal authority against the international force of Catholicism, a stimulus was unintentionally given to a division of authority in the land by the creation of the Protestant Church. The Tories, as hereditary supporters of the Crown and Church, were saddled with a religious institution which, "from the standpoint of the Tory belief in authority, subordination and order", was a pure anomaly.[292] Protestants establish thedoctrine of private judgement which, while it was ultimately to be deployed as a means of opposing the authority of the Pope, became the great corrosive of authority and tradition in matters unconnected with religious controversy.[293] The principle of the right of private judgement soon became a disruptive and subversive influence in national life.[294] Ludovici believed English Conservatives had been most unfairly handicapped by the ecclesiastical polity which they had been obliged to carry along with them for four centuries. At least Catholicism was more compatible than Protestantism with authority in general.[295] The possession of such

doctrines as primitive Christianity offers, coupled with the right of private judgement, did not induce the English, or any other Protestant people to political stability: "least of all does it confirm them in their native and instinctive conservatism."[296]

Of course, in decrying Christianity, Ludovici was continuing the task of his mentor, Nietzsche, who had written that Christianity was the cry of the sick and the degenerate, those "who suffer from life as from a disease".[297] The Jews performed the inversion of valuations, which shunned life and led to Christianity's 'slave-insurrection' in morals.[298] Christian values represent the descending line of life, and with them, man must perforce degenerate.[299] Nietzsche could hear the weary and those incapable of the struggle of life, cry Christianity.[300] In Christian values, Nietzsche read nihilism, decadence, degeneration, and death. They were calculated to favour the multiplication of the least desirable on earth.[301] Nietzsche's charge of falsehood against Christianity was not a moral one but a charge of an error that led to humanity's degeneration.[302] That Christianity had 'lied' was a subject of alarm to Nietzsche, not on grounds of morality, but because it was hostile to life.[303] In Mansel Fellowes, although the Nietzschean Dr. Melhado concedes that the Catholic Church stands for order[304], he protests to Father Jevington that the socialist revolutionary discovers from the Christian source of Catholicism that God has chosen the base things of this world and the things that are despised. The masses learn that they will be called to judge angels later on, and that therefore how much more can they judge the things that pertain to this life. This was the discovery of thefirst Protestants, the first insolent Catholics. Thus, disorder springs from the creed of the Church itself.[305] That is why Dr. Melhado, who wishes to see his fellow men "'more certain of the essential

truths of Life'", cannot trust the Catholic Church. It led to Protestantism once, and might do so again.[306] Richard Latimer, who consciously disavowed Christianity, still unconsciously, like thousands of his heretical followers, felt and thought like a Christian in his choice of a mate, and other vital matters.[307] Nevertheless, he still saw about him all the degeneration that Dr. Melhado traced to Christian influences:

> ...He saw plainly the havoc Christian influence had made of human beauty, human health, and lofty human aims; he realised now almost acutely as Melhado himself, how dangerous had been the doctrine that lays such emphasis upon the soul and so little on the body; he saw how successfully two thousand years of Christianity with its ugly child Protestantism and the latter's still uglier abortion Puritanism had reduced the whole world to a huge commercial combine without either aesthetic aims or an aesthetic justification.[308]

However, Richard Latimer's unconscious Christian bias made him suspicious of his temptation for Mansel Fellowes's vitality.[309] In his choice between Mansel Fellowes and his non-vital fiancée, Gladys Morrison, he was sure that Dr. Melhado's insistence that he should marry Mansel Fellowes was right; but, he wavered, his deep respect for Father Jevington's insistence on loyalty to one's fiancée, and a growing doubt as to the finality of his atheism, made him question whether the standpoint of Life could always prevail.[310] Indeed, Richard Latimer is finally converted to Catholicism and renounces Mansel Fellowes. On this occasion, Dr. Melhado says to Father Jevington that life and he have lost, as usual, against Christianity.[311]

In What Woman Wishes, Mr. A.M. Landrassy exclaims to Lord Firle that his sons, Lord Chiddingly's, political ideal, that children should be taught that not every man has a right to his own opinion, and to say that he has is a dangerous and senseless lie would, regrettably, be regarded as an attack on the Church, though not on the Holy Catholic Church.[312] Maud Oliver, in The Goddess that Grew Up, becomes perfectly

adapted to her career of illness once she adopts Catholicism.[313] With all Peter Oliver's health, his vigour, and his youth, she begins to pity her husband, that much had her adoption of Roman Catholicism done for her:

> ...From a position of humble and pitiable helplessness, from which she had looked up to her husband's enormous vitality and health as something beyond her reach, and deeply to be envied, she had now been transformed into a creature who could pity him, who could afford to indulge his smallest whim, and smile peacefully and compassionately over his trifling pleasures.[314]

Sir Thomas Braintree, in French Beans, informs Andre de Loudon that Christianity, which does not value a man's and a woman's value according to the extent to which they guarantee in their own person the survival of the race in a desirable form, is one of the primary causes of contempory degeneration.[315]

Puritanism can deal with life only"by amputating and limiting it".[316] Christianity had exerted a powerful influence in favour of ugliness, degeneracy and disease.[317] The English people were misled by their prelates who vociferated according to Ludovici, against the relatively benign and creative regime of German National Socialism, whilst pretending there was anything or anybody worth respecting in the Government of modern Russia.[318]

There were in the Puritan attitude all the prerequisites of a democratic ideology, thought Ludovici. It appealed to the natural meanness of those who wished to exploit their fellows and who chafed under controlled conditions, particularly to those members of the governing classes who wished for a free hand in their relations with the working classes. It prepared the way for the rule of laissez-faire in every department of English Life.[319] The English Reformed Church

was riddled with Puritans, and since their doctrines had political implications, their followers were determined to fight for what they called freedom and independence, not only in religious but also in political matters. From the beginning Charles I opposed the demands of Puritanism, determined to continue the policy of those Kings who had protected the masses and been "the gradual socialisers of their particularist people", he tried to confirm the best features of medieval legislation.[320] Ludovici thought the need for all these measures on the part of Charles I shows that the old values which, in the past, had placed national before private interest, were beginning to be undermined, and his efforts to restore medieval feudal principles infuriated the powerful Puritans.[321] However, the Puritans ultimately succeeded, and by executions on the block removed the obstacles to their nefarious schemes. Once Charles I had been eliminated, the face of England changed completely as laissez-faire, exploitation and fraud, became rampant.[322] The Calvinistic element of hostility to the body and to the flesh, compounded with the license everywhere allowed, in both the food industries and the condition of labour, led to a general decline in the national health. Material prosperity became the aim, even at the cost of national degeneracy.[323] Puritanism implies a contempt of the body and is, therefore, negative to Life.[324]

What least ingratiated Ludovici to Christianity was the benevolence it prompted. In his A Defence of Conservatism, Ludovici says that many Christian doctrines and valuations, when once they are divorced from the firm and orderly framework of Catholicism, become susceptible of being used for revolutionary purposes:

> ...such doctrines and valuations as the equality of men; the hostility to riches; the desirability of 'unselfishness', the virtuousness of sacrificing the greater to the less; the notion that there is such a thing as

> a universal and immanent justice (which in the popular mind appears to be violated when one child is born in a slum and another in Park Lane); and the duty to do unto others that which we would they should do unto us.[325]

Extreme liberalism or socialism are indebted to the steady incalcation upon the masses, by Protestantism and its representatives in England, of the doctrine of Divine Revelation plus the right of private judgement.[326] The development of Catholic doctrine had been the work of interpretors who claimed that their interpretation of the New Testament was valid for all believers. However, Protestantism over threw Catholic interpretation and restored primitive Christianity to the faithful. A soon as the New Testament became once more the sole source of religious inspiration, the right of private judgement led to the same result as in the age preceding the complete establishment of Catholic doctrine - communism.[327] The immediate effect of Protestantism in Germany was so terrifying that Luther himself turned against the peasants whose contumacy he had helped to provoke with his doctrines.[328]

These views are consistent with those of Ludovici's mentor, Nietzsche. Christianity made life endurable for the 'slaves'.[329] The religion of pity and patient toleration allowed parasites to survive in our midst.[330] Egoism in him who is physiologically botched, meant the promotion and enhancement of an undesirable element in society.[331] According to Ludovici, the steady infection of the healthy mass of the people by the Christian perpetuation, preservation and propogation of the nation's unhealthiest elements, has acted as a gradual poison in four ways: As a depressing spectacle and a destroyer of joy to the sensitive; as an unnecessary burden upon the healthy, exacting too heavy a toll on their energy and good spirits; as a source of deterioration to the healthiest elements in the race; and by making it difficult for the desirable percentage of very successful creatures

to be born, those creatures who, "by their beauty, grace and wanton spirits, ennoble life, by holding up a lofty example of Life's highest possibilities."[332] Humanitarianism is merely an inverted form of cruelty; instead of directing their cruelty against the undesirable, humanitarians sacrifice the hale to the physiologically botched.[333]

In Ludovici's novel of 1924, The Taming of Don Juan, he laments that Almina Underhill did not feel as miserable as Ludovici thought was natural whenever she accompanied her aunts to the Underhill Home. Nevertheless, she always felt a shudder of 'instinctive' loathing when her aunts made her shake hands with the most nauseating and hopeless incurable among her audience:

> ...The only influence which had hitherto forced her resolutely to conceal this attitude, had been her own innocent conviction that she was really being good in behaving in this way, and that her aunts also were good, and the whole of England was good in concentrating all assistance, all succour, and all charity upon life's most hopeless products, while the growing minority of life's successes were harassed with ever increasing difficulties and obstacles[334]

All the 'natural' impulses in her that tended to make her the adverse critic of her aunts she regarded as selfish, impure, and bad. She began to feel uneasy in her conscience if she was aware of any revolt against the charitable work among the sick, the feeble, and the defective which her aunts imposed upon themselves and her.[335] However later in the novel, when Almina inherits her Aunt Clara's fortune, she was staggered by the vast sums she had to pay in merely continuing her Aunt Clara's extensive charities, and frequently, in consultation with her solicitor, began to question Christian pity and whether the claims on her resources might not be reduced.[336] She had witnessed so much harrowing poverty among the people of the surrounding villages, and so much misery among desirable people,

that charity for the undesirable began to appear illogical to her.[337] Life with her aunts had sufficiently awakened her to the danger of Christian benevolence: "the slow but steady degeneration of all vital impulses into mere useless and self-gratifying appetites."[338] This change in Almina is encouraged by the return of Gilbert Milburn, the hero, from the trenches of World War I. In conversation with Almina, about the principle of sacrifice, he upheld that the curse of modern England is the Christian principle according to which no-one hesitates to succour the degenerate and the undesirable.[339] Gilbert persuades Almina that Christianity is the sociological formula for degeneration.[340]

According to Ludovici, the Christian principle according to which all human life is protected, is supplemented by modern medicine which maintains a vast multitude of sub-normal and undesirable people alive. It does not endow them with a fresh joie-de-vivre, or with a capacity for leading full lives, but just about sustains them and allows them to multiply and perpetuate their decadent stocks.[341] The consequence was that "waste human material", consisting of idiots, defectives, lunatics, incurables, cripples, and the physiologically botched, constituted a gratuitous penalisation, an intolerable limitation, upon sound life.[342] Christianity had imposed pity, in the sense of an 'irrational' reflex at the sight of suffering, so that it must be forthcoming whether its expression promotes or hinders the welfare of the nation.[343] Christianity revealed an insufficient grasp of the nature of sound government, by stressing the duty of pity, charity, and unselfishness in the ruler, rather than inculcating on all believers the fundamental truth that the 'virtues' of charity were, in all but exceptional circumstances, alien to a healthy state of society.[344] The resources of the nation were lavished on preserving

what imprudence should have been discarded:

> ...even Royalty, when time hangs on its hands can think of nothing better to do than to grace a hospital, a home for cripples, the deaf and the dumb, and the blind, with its august presence, no-one makes a gesture, much less a bequest, which might promote the multiplication of the sound and desirable stocks still surviving in our midst[345]

Perhaps Ludovici's most trenchant criticism of Christian benevolence is to be found in his Religion for Infidels, of 1961. He reckoned that even if the "army of defectives" that Christian benevolence had promoted did not contaminate and infect the sounder elements, it handicapped them, imposed limits on their capacity to multiply and thus jeopardised their survival.[346] There was but one reason for contempory indiscriminate pity - Christianity enjoined its practice.[347] The fact that in the nineteen-twenties a Church of England prelate was tolerated on the council table of the Eugenics Society, Ludovici thought, indicated that there was no understanding of the essentials of the 'problem' of degeneracy. Incidentally, Ludovici declined an invitation to join the eugenic society because he could see no chance of realising its aims so long as its council could retain Dean Inge on its Board.[348] The compassionate plea for the least prescious specimens in the nation was revelatory of the powerful hold that Christian morality had on the impulses and sentiments of modern people.[349] The contempory prevalence of merely 'medicated survival' was only explicable as the deleterious influence of Christianity which rendered all indifferent to human repulsiveness.[350] Prone as modern people were to declare themselves agnostics, or even atheists, acknowledging allegiance to no denomination of the Christian faith, the majority of professedly emancipated Christians were still champions of the most deleterious of Christian moral precepts.[351] Ludovici's hostility to Christianity adequately summarised in his "My Testament" to his Religion for Infidels,

of which the following is an extract:

> Post no priest beside my litter;
> Carve no cross upon my bier!
> As a Christophobist bitter
> Let me pass unchurched from here
> .....
>
> Even if I be instructed
> To appear before the throne,
> Where a god head has conducted
> World affairs since time unknown;
>
> If moreover he engages
> His recording angel there,
> To recite a few score pages
> Of my sins let him beware!
>
> I will range his whole creation,
> From the tapeworm to the fly,
> And await his explanation
> As to why, and why, and why?
>
> So invoke no Heavens daughter
> When I'm laid beneath the sward,
> And don't waste your holy-water
> On my oak-stained coffin-board![352]

3. Ideological: Liberalism and Socialism

Indisputably, Ludovici believed the major cause of England's degeneration was liberalism. Some of his most virilant attacks on liberalism are to be found in his English Liberalism, written for the English Array movement in 1939. He believed in all countries liberalism had meant: The uncritical misunderstanding of all change as progress; the utmost extension of freedom to all whether for good or evil in determining the destiny of their nation, which entails the deterioration of the national standard and tradition, as only the elite can elevate the mass[353]; the acceptance of an extreme individualism in which private interests will take precedence over the national interest; the acceptance of the principles of independence and separateness,

which assumes the possibility of private rights in property. The consequences of these principles of liberalism has everywhere been, according to Ludovici, "the disintegration, decay and degeneration of the societies in which they have prevailed".[354] The accretions English liberalism received from such English and French thinkers as Locke, with his false assumption regarding the supposed equality of mankind; Bentham, with false assumptions regarding the contentment and happiness necessarily secured by democracy; Rousseau, with his false assumption that man, being born good, the evils of society must be due to environment - only augmented liberalism's specious plausibility, they never succeeded in correcting its fundamental unsoundness.[355] The denial of the value of good blood and good stock, by liberals, aggravated the havoc already wrought in England's health and stamina by the Puritan contempt of monism. A further specious claim of liberalism, according to Ludovici, is its unbalanced advocacy of humanitarianism as a means of mending the damage done to the masses by poverty, ill-health, and the general neglect of bodily concerns.[356] Congenital liberalism had become a reality. Although the many who were afflicted by it, particularly women, might imagine that their liberal beliefs were the spontaneous products of their own private cogitations, they were really little more than the victims of an atmosphere infected with it.[357] Ludovici thought England was faced with a colossal task of reconstruction and restoration - the eradication of liberalism. It meant restoring real liberty to the working masses; recovering the health and stamina of the nation; calling a halt to uncontrolled humanitarianism; reviving agriculture, the oldest and most essential industry in the country; re-establishing the old 'gregarious' attitude towards property; creating a fresh elite, who could inspire their followers to the reversal of the deleterious effects of liberalism.[358] He wrote one other book purportedly dealing with his

decryal of liberalism, The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion, of 1967, which was his last published book. Its twenty nine chapters coincide, approximately, with numerous articles and series of articles he contributed to the South African Observer during the preceding years.* He reckoned words such as

---

*Ludovici's The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion will hereafter be abbreviated to S.O.L.; the South African Observer will be abbreviated to S.A.O.; 'approximately coincides with' will be abbreviated to a.c.w.. In his series "The Specious Origins of Liberalism",(No.1)S.A.O., March 1961, Volume VI, No,11, pp. 8-9 a.c.w. "The Liberal Prescription" Chapter III of S.O.L., pp. 32-36;(No.II) S.A.O., April 1961, Volume VI, No.12, pp. 12-13 a.c.w. "Rulership and Responsibility", Chapter IV of S.C.L., pp. 37-42;(No.III), S.A.O., May 1961, Volume VII, No.1, pp. 9-10, a.c.w. "Phantom Life-Belts", Chapter VI of S.O.L., pp. 48-52; No.(5), S.A.O., June 1961, Volume VII, No.2, pp.9-10, a.c.w., "The Sanctity of Private Property", Chapter VII of S.O.L., pp. 53-57;-No. V, S.A.O., July 1961, Volume VII, No. 3, pp.11-13 a.c.w. "Liberalism and The Reformation", Chapter VIII of S.O.L., pp. 58-63; No.6, S.A.O., August 1961, Volume VII, No.4, pp. 9-10, a.c.w. "The Natural Iniquity of Man", Chapter VIIII of S.O.L., pp. 64-73; No.7, S.A.O., September 1961, Volume VII, No.5, pp. 10-12 a.c.w. "Left-Wing English Utopia", Chapter X of S.O.L., pp. 74-78; No.VIII S.A.O., October 1961, Volume VII, No.6, pp. 12-13 a.c.w. "Religious and Political Sophistry", Chapter XI of S.O.L., pp. 79-82; No.IX, S.A.O., December 1961, Volume VII, No.7, pp. 11-13 a.c.w. "Cloud - Cuckoo Liberal Humanity", Chapter XII of S.O.L., pp. 83-89; No.X, S.A.O., January 1962, Volume VII, No.8, pp. 11-12, a.c.w. "Heredity and Aristocracy", Chapter XIII of S.O.L., pp. 90-93; No.XI, S.A.O. , February 1962, Volume VII, No.9, pp. 9-11, a.c.w. "The Tone-Setting Elite", Chapter XIV of S.O.L., pp. 94-98; No.XII S.A.O., March 1962, Volume VII, No.10, pp. 11-12, a.c.w. "Constitutional Monarchy", Chapter XV of S.O.L., pp. 99-104; No.XIII, S.A.O., April 1962, Volume VII, No.11, pp. 13-14 a.c.w. "Quality in Human Heredity", Chapter XXI of S.O.L., pp. 133-137; No. XIV, S.A.O., May 1962, Volume VII, No.12, pp. 11-12, a.c.w. "Primogeniture and Selection in Matrimony", Chapter XXII of S.O.L., pp. 138-142; No. XV, S.A.O., June 1962, Volume VIII, No.1, pp. 11-12, a.c.w. "Primogeniture and Selection in Matrimony", Chapter XXII of S.O.L., pp. 142-145; No.XVI S.A.O., July 1962, Volume VIII, No.2, pp. 10-11, a.c.w. "The Profanation of Private Property", Chapter XXIII of S.O.L., pp. 149-152; No.XVIII, S.A.O., November 1962, Volume VIII, No.4, pp. 12-13, a.c.w. "Privelige and Public Service", Chapter XXIV of S.O.L. , pp. 153-155; No.XIX, S.A.O., December 1962, Volume VIII, No.5, pp. 10-12, a.c.w. "Indiscipline in Aristocracy", Chapter XXV of S.O.L., pp. 156-160; No.XX S.A.O., January 1963, Volume VIII, No.6, pp. 12-13, a.c.w. "Habitual Anarchy", Chapter XXVI of S.O.L., pp. 161-165; No. XX, S.A.O., January 1963, Volume VIII, No.6, pp. 13-14, a.c.w. "Psychological Myopia" , Chapter XXVII of S.O.L., pp. 166-169. In his series "The Importance of Racial Integrity", No. XVII, S.A.O., August 1959, Volume 5, No.4, pp. 12-13 a.c.w. "Louis XV", Chapter XIX of S.O.L., pp. 124-127 (of); No. XVI, S.A.O., July 1959, Volume 5, No.3, pp. 10-11 a.c.w. "Louis XV", Chapter XIX of S.O.L., pp. 121-124 (of); No. XV, S.A.O., June 1959, Volume 5, No.2, pp. 12-13 a.c.w. "Louis XIV", Chapter XVIII of S.O.L.,

'fascist', 'nazi', 'reactionary', and even 'tory', had acquired pejorative meanings which were beginning to associate them with guilt andshame, through the prevalence of liberalism.[359] He thought liberals had stepped into the vaccuum left by the abuse of monarchical and aristocratic government, and mistakenly believed their position was permanentthrough defect in the aristocratic system of government per se.[360] Liberals had severely limited the sphere of government. They overlooked the truth that government is not merely a matter of executive functions connected with the nation's relation with other countries, its armed forces, its maintenance of law and order, and the control of public finances, but essentially a matter of establishing a desirable way of life in the nation:

> ...the cry that did not fail to go up in the late nineteenth century and was enthusiastically taken up by men like Horatio Bottomley - I refer to the cry for a Government of Business Men - is evidence of how vulgarly limited the idea of Government was in the Liberal confraternity.[361]

Liberals pronounced man fundamentally good and ignored his instinctive aggressiveness, self-indulgence and secret indifference to the public good when it was incompatible with his own advantage.[362] With the democratic superstition, liberals deliberately associated all officially imposed discipline with 'fascism', so that it was generally frowned

pp. 117-120 (of); No. XIV, S.A.O., May 1959, Volume 5, No.1, pp. 12-13, a.c.w. "Louis XIV", Chapter XVIII of S.O.L., pp. 115-117 (of); No. XIII, S.A.O., April 1959, Volume IV, No.12, pp.12-13 a.c.w. "The Bourbon Dynasty", Chapter XVII of S.O.L., pp. 113-114(of); No. XII, S.A.O., March 1959, Volume IV, No.11, pp. 10-11, a.c.w. "The Bourbon Dynasty", Chapter XVII of S.O.L., pp. 111-113 (of); No. XI, S.A.O., February 1959, Volume IV, No.10, pp. 12-13, a.c.w. "Royalties Sins Against Itself", Chapter XVI of S.O.L., pp. 106-110 (of). Ludovici's "Western Europe's Social History - in one word", S.A.O., Volume VIII, No.12, July 1963, pp. 13-14, a.c.w. "The Danger Signal", Chapter V of S.O.L., pp. 43-47. Finally, of Ludovici's series "The Essentials of Good Government", No.I, S.A.O., Volume IX, No.2, September 1963, pp. 12-14, a.c.w. pp. 9-10 of "Aristocracy and the Mob", Chapter I of S.O.L.; No. III, S.A.O., Volume IX, No.5, December 1963, a.c.w. pp. 14-18 of Chapter I of S.O.L., "Aristocracy and the Mob"; No. IV, S.A.O., Volume IX, No.7, February 1964, pp. 10-11 a.c.w. pp. 19-21 of "Aristocracy and the Mob", Chapter I of S.O.L.; No. V S.A.O., Volume IX, No.8, March 1964, pp. 13-15 a.c.w. pp. 21-25 of "Aristocracy and the Mob", Chapter I of S.O.L..

upon by all those who wished to appear good democrats.[363] Ludovici thought the latest liberal hoax was that racial differences are quite insignificant and that racial discrimination is both wrong and superstitious, peculiar to fascists.[364] It took the clarity of a caustic foreigner, Oswald Spengler, to realise the cause of the degeneracy of Europe, liberalism:

> "What we recognise as order today and express in Liberal Institutions, is nothing but anarchy become a habit. We call it democracy, parliamentarianism, national government, but in fact it is the non existence of conscious responsible authority - a government."[365]

All the liberal misunderstandings of human nature and its plea for democracy could not possibly fail to pervert and corrupt the nation and wipe out all the accumulated treasure in virtue and sanity which had been fostered and stored during former, more rational and tasteful times:

> ...the Civilisation of Liberalism may be said to be still resting on human qualities cultivated in bygone times and is likely to survive only so long as the store of virtue and ability remains not wholly corrupted and frittered away.[366]

I shall now proceed to examine the constituents of liberalismand socialism that Ludovici thought the potent causes of England's degeneration:-

Utilitarian Rationalism

In his A Defense of Conservatism, Ludovici says that since the nation is a vital organism, constantly growing, it cannot remain in a position of stasis. Newcomers are either above or below the standard to which they are born. Therefore, they desire temporary instability and change. However, if the desire for change comes from the degenerate and it receives such euphemistic titles as 'The Fight for Progress' or 'The Struggle for Human Adancement' or 'The Battle for Light', a moral quality is imparted to their endeavours, which often paralyses or

disarms those who resist their proposals as vicious.[367] Charles I's opponents, who were the lineal ancestors of the Whigs and modern Liberals, never cared for the happiness and contentment of the people.[368] Although the first Factory Act was passed under a Liberal administration, it was chiefly the work of two men, Michael Thomas Sadler, a Tory, and the aristocrat Lord Ashley; and the whole of the Whig-capitalist section of the nation, including men like John Bright, Sir John Graham, Lord Brougham, Mr. Gladstone, and Richard Cobden, were fiercely opposed to it.[369] He believed the chief cause and consequence of the disease of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was a "completely uncontrolled and unreasoning Liberalism".[370] As the Nietzschean 'will to power' is fundamental to all life, no trace of realism is to be found when liberals speak of 'eternal peace' or a future 'living concord' for all mankind, or of any state in which violence, oppression and discord, have been eliminated:

> To hold typically liberal views, therefore, and to assume that if we like we could all settle down to love one another and live in perfect amity and harmony together, is possible only to those idealists who are congenitally blind to the true character of all life.[371]

In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, Ludovici opposes his anit-rationalist theory of human nature to that of liberalism and utilitarian rationalism. He says, as Bergson had shown conclusively, man, in acquiring an infintely greater range of adaptations has depended very largely upon his intellect, his rationalising faculty; "and this has been developed at the cost of his instincts."[372] Man had been cut adrift from a large mass of ancestral selectings and rejections of vital significance to life, and came to rely upon his inferior intellect.[373] Life is a factor in the world process with which we can only be acquainted through the living.[374] The 'taste of flourishing life' cannot be reached by merely taking thought or

deliberating.[375] The strong man is only directed by the 'inner voice' of his ruling instinct; the environment merely provides an anvil with which those who possess the instinct of ruling beat out their destiny, "beneath the racket and din of its titanic action."[376]

Ludovici reckoned no 'truth' could be attained in which race, family, class, and traditional bias or prepossession does not play its part. He neither conceded nor advocated the desirability of subordinating emotion to reason. He regarded the two as complementary and mutually limiting. This, he thought, explained the attitude of his mentor, Nietzsche, towards Socrates. Nietzsche thought Socrates had made a tyrant out of reason when the Greeks were suffering the dissolution of their instincts.[377] Nietzsche had asserted that behind all logic there are valuations, "physiological demands, for the preservation of a certain mode of life."[378] The criterion for the validity of an opinion should not be whether it is true, but how far it is life-promoting and life-preserving.[379]

Richard Latimer, in Mansel Fellowes, though no longer a Christian, still "unconsciously", like thousands of his heretical followers, felt and thought like a Christian in all vital matters, although he was an avowed Nietzschean.[380] Gerald Swynnerton, in Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady tells his confidant , Knowles, that at first he could not understand the marriage of James Gordon, Egyptologist, with Catherine Doyle, tea girl, due to his liberal disposition and city prejudices, "'except in the way in which a cold-blooded scientist examines the throbbing entrails of a creature he is operating upon, can understand what is taking place beneath his scalpel?'"[381] Later in the novel, he proclaims that he pities men who arrive at broad synthetical judgements concerning life, who

beleive that experience and the knowledge of facts form the best equipment for philosophising. 'Philosophical' judgements are already embodied within us. Facts and experiences are but load stones drawing us away from the treasures that lie embodied within us. The facts of our experience are but an insignificant veneer which threatens to conceal the vital instinctive knowledge that lies hidden within us. He despised English rationalists, from Locke to Spencer, who "'have been but children paddling in water which they have only helped to render turbid and muddy by their movements.'"[382] Janet Perkins, or 'Jimper', the working class heroine of What Woman Wishes, was not **an**alytical where her strongest wishes were concerned. When she goes to the offices of the Friends of Order in Pall Mall to look for Lord Chiddingly, whom she had first met fleetingly in France, she was not in the least conscious of the true motives actuating her, but only felt a longing to increase the interest of her life by becoming acquainted with Lord Chiddingly. Ludovici praises this lack of deliberation:

> How happy is the mass of mankind in not knowing the true nature of the motives that actuate them; how simple it makes their conduct appear, how open and ingenuous their most venal actions, and how unblushing and innocent their most life-promoting! perhaps a good deal of the joy of life would vanish if everyone knew his own and his neighbour's true motives, and perhaps the so-called Art of Life itself consists precisely in the concealment of the true reasons behind the bulk of humanity's apparently most innocent activities.[383]

Ludovici's Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition is, perhaps, his most anti-rational book. In the latter he exemplifies a typical fascist claim that history is a myth, a supra-rational myth that cannot be questioned by the individual's reason. The 'myth' of Prometheus is the narrative of a vast act of miscegenation that took place in pre-history. In the introduction,

"On Myths in General, and on the Prometheus Myth in Particular"[384], he says that the myths of antiquity embodied truths about natural or social phenomena as the men of the past, from whom we have degenerated, had remarkably good memories.[385] Ludovici then proceeds to an interpretation of the Prometheus myth of the Greeks, and assumes that Prometheus, Zeus, and the other gods of Olympus, like the gods of the Indians and Peruvians, and the gods of some Western Asiatic peoples, were derived rather from deified strangers than from ancestors of the same race. His reason for holding this belief is the traditions contained in the early myths themselves. The Earth, or the people of the earth, are the men and women who are regarded as everyday occurrences of the race perpetuating the myth. The gods that mingle with the daughters of the earth, are the new stock possessed of unaccustomed qualities.[386] The alleged crossing of the earth with the gods records an actual cross which took place between an inferior race, in the myth of Prometheus the remote ancestors of modern European people, and a race so much superior as to appear divine to the inferior race. Thus, in Greek mythology, Uranus, first ruler of the world, marries Ge, the Earth. In Indian mythology Dyaus (Heaven) marries Prithivi (the Earth). In Semitic mythology, '"the sons of God saw the daughters of men...; and they took their wives all of which they chose"'.[387] Ludovici regards the main features of the myth of Prometheus as true.[388] He reckons the lower races complicity with Prometheus in the theft of fire, is probably why Zeus included them in his general condemnation through the agency of Pandora's Box.[389] He then proceeds to identify the man-gods[390], the 'Dionysian type', as the descendants of a race which reached its zenith in the Paleolithic Age, which was simple, artistic, and degenerate in early Neolithic times; and which became absorbed by other peoples early in Neolithic times. They were a people numerous enough to extend over Europe and Asia and to supply

a representative who became the God of the Jews, representatives who became the Gods of the Greeks, and still more representatives who became the Gods of the Persians and Indians. This race was, according to Ludovici, the Cro-Magnons.[391] It became absorbed by an inferior race, the Aryans.[392] Ludovici had no doubt that the process of 'reasoning' which he applied to the myth of Prometheus, when applied to the first and second verses of the sixth chapter of Genesis would lead to the conclusion that the God of the Jews and Christians was also a Cro-Magnon.[393] Eve and Pandora were sent by the Cro-Magnon to punish men for their theft of fire, which led to the cooking of food with its associated debilitation, and modern degenerate civilisation. Satan and the Devil are archetypal 'Prometheans'; whilst Epymetheus and Prometheus, with both of whom Pandora became associated, belonged to the worst results of the cross between the Cro-Magnon and Aryans.[394] Although it would be inappropriate to explain the import of Ludovici's interpretation of the myth of Prometheus here, it should be noted, that his interpretation of the myth generates conviction for the fascist belief of racial purity, anti-feminism, homeopathy, and primitivism, - from suprarational premisses. It is this deployment of myth as a suprarational belief that liberals would regard as non-rational.

Ludovici decried what he considered to be the "rationalistic prejudices", of Western Europeans.[395] In Ludovici's novel of 1923, French Beans, when Dr. Glandry of the Womens' Independence League questions Domina Biggadyke as to why she has left the W.I.L., she complains that it is the weakness of women to have their reasoning centres bound up with their emotional and sexual controls: "' You can see that when you dissect the female trunk and follow the ramification of the longer nerves.'" It prevents them from being guided by pure reason,

which men can achieve without any promptings from the body. Domina recounts that pure reason can lead nowhere, because all direction begins with a bias or prompting. 'Reason' is always subordinated to pre-conceved notions or bias[396]. "'Isn't that why', Domina continued, 'the modern world doesn't know what its about, or whither it is going; because there is too much of this disembodied reason about?'"[397]

Ludcvici thought that all the vital actions we perform in our lives are the outcome of correlations of bodily parts sending instructions to our brain. In all vital actions we are "utterly unconscious" of the real springs of our action.[398] As woman is closer to Life than man, man must regard her as a creature who is constantly being actuated, unconsciously, by Life.[399] The will of animals and humans is inseparable from the instincts to which either their racial memory or bodily parts give rise.[400] The intellect, as Schopenhauer observed, is the servant of the body.[401] One of Ludovici's criticisms of feminism was that he believed a vital department of human life is dependent upon the voluntary cooperation of the female with Life's scheme. She can only play her part in Life's scheme if her emotional equipment is unimpaired:

> ...From the day of her betrothal to the moment when she takes her last grandchild to her arms, all the trials and difficulties of her role in life are alleviated and taken as a matter of course because she approaches them, not with cold and intellectual detachment, but with deep emotional impulses of all kinds.

Thus, to impose upon her a permanent preoccupation in which intellectual detachment is an essential prerequisite, such as voting, is to develop a side of her nature which will prove an obstacle rather than an aid in her vital functioning.[402] Ludovici thought no criticism of liberalism could be complete without appreciating the infirmities of

the human mind which play havoc with popular government. Gustave Le Bon, Georges Sorel, and other 'social psychologists' had revealed the rooted foibles of human nature which wrecks any nation that meddles with democracy. Man's non-rationality is exacerbated in crowds. In most of the deliberations on which popular government depends, according to Ludovici, from those conducted at election meetings to the 635 MPs in the Commons during the life of a Government, the mental state and judgement of those present is inevitably inferior as regards intelligence, objectivity, rationality and civilised impulses, to what they are when the average member of either of these 'crowds' deliberates alone.[403]

In his Religion for Infidels, the sixth conclusion that Ludovici reaches regarding the life forces is that life and intelligence are co-extensive.[404] There is intelligence in every particle, every cell, of living matter.[405] When we recognise the necessity of seeing intelligence wherever there is life, according to Ludovici, no matter how mysterious this co-extensiveness may seem, we take an important step towards a better understanding, even if we lack "a clear explanation", of most natural phenomena:

> ...We get an inkling of the reasons for the prodigious versatility and resource of Nature, whether in the vegetable or animal kingdom; we appreciate the unlimited possibilities of inventiveness, operating without hesitation through the vast armies of cells, all endowed with sense and sensibilities (my underlining).[406]

The fundamental problems of adaptation to ambient conditions, variation and natural selection, as these processes occur in nature to effect the evolutionary march of life, are inexplicable without assuming intelligence in living matter.[407] What Nietzsche properly denounced as the Darwinian theory, the absence of any allowance for the role of mind in evolutionary processes, suggests the solution

to the problem of variations and mutation. Unless we allow for the operation of mind in all living matters we cannot hope to discover how the variability, on which natural selection depends for its effects, ultimately arises.[408] Ludovici reckoned that prayer was an instance of how men may enlist the cooperation of the formative, improvisatory and innovatory forces of living matter, although the life forces are unamenable to the "conscious mental faculties".[409] Clearly, Ludovici is elaborating an anti-rational theory of human nature in the above. He reckoned creatures lower than man, not knowing, for instance, that fins may be changed into limbs, leave the means to the life forces, but in 'imagining' successful adaptation contribute to its positive force.[410] He thought there was nothing non-rational in considering life and intelligence as co-extensive:

> ...there is nothing mystical or magical in the intervention of the formative and improvisatory powers latent in living matter, in order to produce the organic changes needed for a successful response to an environmental change. It is simply the slow operation in Nature of processes observed to occur spontaneously and consequently on a much less elaborate scale in human beings subjected to hypnotism, or practicing passive auto-suggestion.[411]

Ludovici thought the difficulty of the improvisatory life forces acting through man was due to his lively consciousness.[412] He believed the practice of traditional prayer is instinctive, its muscular adjustment compatible with the supersession of volition, is a vestige of man's practice of enlisting the life forces in his evolution:

> ...a vigorous age-long and immortal vestige of that instinct in animals which, operating in response to an untoward environmental change places them in imagination in touch with the life forces and enable them to mobilise formative and improvisatory powers that secure improved adaptation.[413]

The imagination is the mental medium to be employed, rather than the will, to contact, intuit, and mobilise the life forces.[414] Ludovici cites the phenomena of telepathy, clairvoyance, the known injuries or lethal

effects of curses pronounced and prosecuted by the shamans, medicine men and witch doctors of primitive societies, as instances of using prayer, or its equivalent, with the object of stimulating the improvisatory and formative powers of the life forces to operate outside the person of the petitioning agent.[415]

Socratic Humanism

In his A Defense of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories Ludovici says that recklessly, and to great national peril, Englishmen have allowed the Christian doctrine of the soul to mislead and corrupt them on the question of human value . However, the truth remains that there can be no good spiritual qualities without beautiful bodily qualities[416]:

> What is cruel, what is inhuman, is to rear people on the sentimental and quasi-merciful belief that there is nothing degrading and 'unclean' (the good Old Testament adjective applied to disease) in disease and bungledom, but that a beautiful soul justifies everything; and then, when the world has got into such a state of physical degeneration through this doctrine, to suggest the organisation of a pre-nuptial check on all unions contemplated under the influence of this belief, without making any attempt to alter values.[417]

Centuries of humanism had killed healthy man's natural inclination to avoid the imperfect, the foul of breath, the ugly and the deformed.[418]

Ludovici's hostility to Socratic humanism was shared with his mentor, Nietzsche.[419] Ludovici even saw humanist values in the prohibition movement in America. He thought the proper reform was to purge modern beers, wines, and spirits, of their adulterative and deleterious elements, not to prohibit a portion of our daily diet which had been an essential factor in producing all the greatest civilisations that had ever existed: "Otherwise, on that principle we should get rid of human life itself; for has not Christianity with its abortion

Puritanism despoiled and blighted life as well."[420] Two thousand years of humanism and its consequent debilitation, during which the resisting powers of exuberant health had been steadily worn down, had effectively impaired the ability of recent generations to face the institutions of their forefathers with their forefathers' spirit, health and understanding.[421] Christian humanism had been exacerbated in Anglo-Saxon countries by the overlap of romantic obsessions, which had made a realistic view of primitive and natural needs almost impossible.[422] The preponderant values of the English population were those in which all stress is laid upon the soul, in which the severe standards are soul standards and in which the body and its completeness are almost entirely overlooked.[423] A nation ultimately becomes the image of its values[424]:

> ...the spiritual environment of all modern sub-human peoples is the outcome of our fundamental values, as also is their sub-humanity; and that this spiritual environment is characterised by a tendancy to neglect and despise the body and bodily considerations.[425]

Modern degeneration, science, feminism, Puritanism, and the increasing cleavage between the sexes was the logical outcome of these body-despising values.[426] If modern man felt no horror at the spectacle of degeneracy and disease, if he could be thoroughly ill, the victim of a foul disease, and yet thoroughly respectable it was due to the prevalence of Socratic humanism.[427] Although these values were not necessarily Christian, Christianity had been their chief inculcator and purveyor:

> ...By zealously garnering most of the morbid, foetid, and decrepit elements in antiquity, Christianity has been a sort of cold storage depot for almost every decomposed vestige of the ancient world, and has thus doled out from its refrigerators to every generation the worst products of Pagan decay.[428]

Amidst the decay of Greek culture there developed a tendency to exhort the soul at the expense of the body.[429] The degenerate Socrates

determined to create values by which he himself and his type could be regarded as desirable.[430] He transvalued the values of the Greeks by ensuring them there was no visible connection between a man's visible and invisible aspects.[431] Henceforward, people had been prepared to forgive stigmata which are nobody's fault when assessing their mates, and in thus forgiving forgot that he or she was cruelly foisting an undesirable parent in his or her offspring.[432] When this Socratic humanism is added to Christian pity, which is quite indiscriminate and makes people react with love and charity to all who suffer, irrespective of their value to posterity, Ludovici thinks this a combination of evils which makes complete degeneracy a culpable certainty.[433] He called his era one of socratic degenerates.[434]

Neither industrialisation, urbanism, or feminism, could have prevailed had their not existed a fundamental tendency to treat bodily questions and therefore bodily differences as of no importance. This fundamental tendency, due to the influence of ocratic values, had coloured all men's life:

> ...if we do not look with horror upon a man or woman under thirty who has false teeth; if we have ceased to regard foul breath as an argument against an alleged 'pure soul', and if we imagine that human rubbish and foulness can give us good laws, good poetry, good music, and good art it is wholly and exclusively due to Socrates and his influence.[435]

Thanks to his own repulsive features in the midst of a population of beauty venerators, Socrates found himself forced in self-defence to discover a dialectical method to excuse every kind of physical degeneracy and putrescence.[436] Modern Europe, according to Ludovici, had fallen completely under the sway of Socrates.[437] In the excess of the momentum of Socratic humanism which ultimately removed slavery from Rome man had been carried to unwholesome extremes in charity and compassion, which had culminated in the infection of all human stocks,

and universal degeneracy.[438] The average man was so ignorant of the signs of health, life, the 'points' of an efficient animal breeder, and his taste was so defective, especially with the exagerated attention to 'spiritual' qualities, that he was prone to prefer a degenerate girl.[439] Although socratic humanism in the working classes was neither deeper nor more intractable than in their "economic superiors", it was often more lethal, because it was untempered by contact with scientific thought in any form, and in the values and atmosphere of their urban life there was little to check it:

> The loss of all contact with the lives and living problems of creatures other than Man, through decades of urbanism, and the steady inculcation upon them of the duty of indiscriminate commiseration towards every kind of physical defect, has not unnaturally led to an attitude of subnormality which, by implying condonation, involves blind acceptance.[440]

The position established by Socrates was the duality of man into body and soul; the soul's independence of the body, the soul's superiority to the body, the despicableness of the body; the immortality of the soul.[441] A cripple, a hunchback, any degenerate, became as desirable as a normal man, because, on Socratic principles, it could always be argued that his blemish was not himself, and that his invisible or 'real' self redeemed everything. For humanity it meant pollution.[442] In the first chapter of his Enemies of Women. The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon feminism, "The Influence of the Prevailing European, or White Man's Philosophy"[443], Ludovici says the 'philosophy' of the white man originated with Socrates.[444] It pleased and flattered many[445]; degenerates could greatly enhance their prestige by passing as persons with superior souls.[446] The feminists, whether in Hellenistic Greece or in Renaissance or seventeenth century Europe, seized with alacrity the argument Socrates had afforded them. If bodily differences did not matter, if the soul alone counted, the visible or physical differences

between men and women were also negligible. Indeed, the more one adopted feminism, the poorer man became, because the less man was considering the despicable body - the vessel of life.[447]

Owing to the catastrophic Socratic humbug about the alleged superiority of the 'soul' and the negligibility of the body, health, stamina, and hereditary soundness rapidly dwindled without causing the slightest alarm among those who displayed the symptoms of decadence. Their neglect of physical quality also made them incapable of extruding a biological elite capable of leading them.[448] By directing the eye and the taste of mankind from the visible attributes of a fellow-being, and by minimising the significance of their visible attributes, Socratic humanism protected the ill-constituted from the repudiation which, in matrimony, would otherwise have caused them to be eschewed as procreators of the race.[449]

Ludovici thought only the "'lethal chamber'" solution was the appropriate means for relieving society of the crushing burden consisting of its biological trash and dregs, and of protecting the national stock and protecting it from further contamination. But nothing was done because of modern Socratic sensibilities which "cannot endure the thought of sacrificing so much as a single hair of a raving maniac's head. Thus, the problem of purifying English stock and relieving the precious minority of the sound, of the crippling burden imposed upon them by the prevalence of sickness, defect, incapacity, deformity and dementia, through which their own 'desirable' multiplication and survival are in peril was postponed sine die. Ludovici reckoned his mentor, Nietzsche, had realised that the 'problem' was fundamentally one of values:

> ...What had happened was that the pre-Socratic and wholesome values relating to man had been reversed, turned upside down, and that although..., other influences may have contributed to this volte-face, the principal present agency causing these topsy-turvy values to exert their sway, was Christianity with its baneful Socratic heritage concerning body and soul, health and sickness, pity and altruism.[450]

Ludovici thought the scourge of Socratic humanism was peculiar to Protestant countries, not to Catholic countries. Catholicism, according to Ludovici, had retained its Aristotelian influence. Despite the errors of Socrates, Aristotle was still able to hold to the ancient 'healthy' view that mind and body could not be separated and that any change in the one indicated a change in the other.[451] Socrates, as a townsman, was essentially a romantic. Ludovici expressed no suprise that urbanisation followed the Reformation, which was a turning away of Christianity from Aristotle in favour of Socrates.[452] Ludovici discriminated between three types of Christianity: Extreme Socratic Christianity; moderate Socratic Christianity; Aristotelian Christianity. The latter, which prevailed in the Middle Ages, "was compatible with a high degree of biological sanity".[453] In countries where Protestantism, "Socratism untempered by Aristotles sanity", had permeated the life and sentiments of the people, the sex-phobia arising out of the body-despising doctrine had promoted feminism.[454] Ludovici attributed the relative failure of feminism in Southern and Latin Europe, as compared with its success in England and America, to the powerful Aristotelian tradition which is a heritage of their long adherence to Catholicism:

> ...as I need hardly point out to the scholar, Aristotle was the chief Greek influence in Catholicism, just as Socrates was the chief Greek influence in Protestantism, and even the more normal morphology of Latin women [which he cites as another reason for their lesser advocacy of feminism] may be due to the healthier of the two Greek influences.[455]

Christianity's bequest to posterity had been the humanism of Socrates.[456] However, amongst the most formidible of Socrates's opponents was Aristotle. He insisted on restoring to credit ancient Greek monism.[457] Fortunately, for Catholic Europe, despite the Socratic elements tincturing the faith, it was Aristotle's teaching that saved medioval Europe from at least the more damaging effects of Socrates's attacks on old Greek monism.[458] Aristotle's influence on Catholicism by reinstating Greek monism enabled Europe, despite her morbid Socratic heritage, certainly up to the Reformation, to act and think wholesomely. The Reformation meant a re-enthronement of Socrates and a revolt against Aristotle. Ludovici thought this explained why, after the Reformation, there should have arisen, not only Puritanism, together with an increasing tendency to neglect bodily considerations, but a steady and substantial decline in the beauty and stamina of Europeans.[459] Christianity remained wholesome and sanitary, before the influence of Socrates was restored. Aristotle exerted a benign influence through the Holy Catholic Church, and encouraged by the realism of a population employed in agriculture which knew the essential needs of flourishing life, made the medeival authorities immune to an unreasoning favouritism for that which was defective and biologically depraved:

> ...It was, for instance, well recognised that, in times of famine and epidemics, the sound had to be considered first. If sacrifice was called for, it was the unsound and those who could give no promise of perpetuating the race in a desirable form, who were regarded as obvious victims. Thus, in periods of distress, the populace would clamour for the extirpation of useless mouths - that is to say, all lepers, cretins and idiots...; so that there should be enough to sustain the sound and all those biologically precious to the community (his italics).[460]

Only the unfortunate resurrection by the Reformation of the influence of Socrates, led to the reversal of this husbandman's attitude to life, especially in Protestant Europe.[461] Protestantism revived the morbid

and perverted Socratic principles deeply rooted in Christianity, with their "predilection for the foetid air of hospitals..., and their weakness for the bitter taste of corpses".[462]

Feminism

In his tirade against modern feminism Ludovici was regarded, by some, as writing "in the spirit of a stout Fascismo, who challenges Mill and Liberty and the rest of it with a bold manly gesture."[463] He deplored the effeminisation of men as the cause and consequence of woman's progress in the scheme of things. In the main, for "inwardly thinking of a masculine renaissance" and an "English Fascismo"[464], Ludovici was mocked as "beating a dead horse".[465] Although he was ridiculed by most for believing that there is an eternal struggle between the sexes[466], some, or, at least Hutchinson Publishers when advertising one of his anti-feminist novels never to be published, "Raw Virginity", applauded him for his intense realism in deploring the preponderance of woman.[467] There are good grounds for believing that Ludovici's anti-feminism is derived, or, at least consistent, with that of his mentors, Schopenhauer and, especially, Nietzsche.[468]

Ludovici's anti-feminism is not merely explained by his belief that feminism leads to man's degeneration, but reciprocally, that man's degeneration is the condition for feminism. In Ludovici's novel of 1918, Mansel Fellowes , the degenerate man, Richard Latimer, had not the vitality with which to confront Mansel Fellowes on even equal terms. Mansel Fellowes was like a tropical and voluptuous island that lay some distance south of the course Richard Latimer instinctively pursued, and millions of his contempories pursued, in a temperate

zone.[469] He could not navigate Life. He was a man of an era, of whom even the best are but miserable fragments. Richard Latimer was merely a pretext on which to train a hope and a trust that took its root in more vigorous and more vital ancestors.[470] The moment Mansel Fellowes's life-loving instincts receive their first disastrous check, when Richard Latimer gets engaged to Gladys Morrison, the obverse of her positive and life-loving instincts manifested itself at once in a desire for oblivion: "in a voluptuous alliance with thoughts of the grave."[471] The Nietzschean Dr. Melhado does not believe that contempory mens' weaknesses are the outcome of deliberate restraint.[472] He pursues, that generations of will-less men and Protestantism, with its doctrine of the sanctity of individual judgement, had made women impossible to master.[473] Mrs. Fellowes confesses to Richard Latimer that neither she, nor the world, could give her daughter that for which she is most gifted and equipped, love - "'I mean not by anybody that you can call a man (his italics).'"[474] When Richard Latimer visits France the realism of French women seemed curious to him, as a romantic, who believed in the possibility of "games and pleasant pastimes with full-grown virgins, free from arriere - hopes, and of slightly feverish conversations with pretty discontented young wives free from unladylike intentions."[475] Dr. Melhado warns Richard Latimer not to reject Mansel Fellowes as she is of a 'type' that is becoming increasingly rarer, as modern men are not worthy of such women.[476] However, Richard Latimer rejects Mansel Fellowes. The Nietzschean Dr. Melhado had given him the 'philosophical' formula for Life, but the physiological equipment of Richard Latimer had neutralised it. Richard Latimer's submission to Father Jevington indicates his degeneracy, as only the degenerate man requires assistance from outside to direct him when he is devoid of 'taste'

in matters of choice and selection. He was incapable of all vital decision.[477] Life had called out to Richard Latimer in Mansel Fellowes, and cured its instrument of every flaw in order that Richard Latimer should respond. Richard Latimer flouts it, and it is because of his and other mens' degeneracy that these vital women were becoming extinct in England. The climax of the novel is when Sir Robert Morrison, representing his daughter and wife, relinquishes his daughter's engagement to Richard Latimer. The latter then belatedly decides to pursue Mansel Fellowes who, thinking that she has been forsaken, commits suicide.

In Ludovici's novel of 1920, Too Old for Dolls, Mrs. Delarayne's eldest daughter, Cleopatra, had eagerly extended her hand to Life for all that Life had to offer, but was embittered that her outstretched hand had been filled with nothing satisfying. At the age of twenty-five her worldly wisdom answered 'nay' to the many whose proposals of marriage she had been compelled to refuse.[478] The fault Cleopatra found with the modern world was that it did not offer one man whole or complete but only a series of isolated manly characteristics[479]:

> ...The kind of fire that led to elopements, to wild and clandestine love-making, could now, with too few exceptions, be found only among ne'er-do-wells, foreign adventurers, cut-throats or knaves; while the stability that promised security for the future and for the family, seemed generally to present itself with a sort of tiresome starchiness of body and jejuneness of mind, and thought it childish to abandon itself to any emotions.[480]

Half-consciously, according to Ludovici, she divined that only 'fire' purified and sanctified the transition from girlhood to womanhood. Lack of a great passionate momentum, that carried everything before it, seemed to her something distinctly discomfiting.

She was realistic rather than romantic. Her 'taste' inclined to the adventurous idea of love, to the impromptu element, to the wild ardour of first embraces, than to the kind of graduated passion that begins with conversation, proceeds to a public engagement, and ends with the still more measured tempo of a church wedding. All the deliberation that these slow steps involved, ran counter to her deepest feelings, that her love must be a sudden kindling of two fires, "the burning not of green wood but of a volcano."[481] Cleopatra's mother, however, reckoned that as matrimony is entirely a matter of flesh and blood, provided a man has a clean mouth and "'the teeth of an African negro'"[482], then he is eminently suitable. She accuses Cleopatra of being romantic in rejecting Denis Malster, chief private secretary to Sir Joseph Bullion, who appears to meet these requirements. Cleopatra objects that a man ought to 'fire' a woman with something more exciting than the consideration of his means and dentition. Mrs. Delarayne rejoins that men in their class can no longer set 'fire' to anything, and that modern civilisation had reared men who can exercise self-control. Ludovici reckons that Mrs. Delarayne herself, a widow, is suffering like all modern women, from receiving no sure and reliable guidance from men.[483] Lord Henry Highbarn, the hero of the novel, advises Mrs. Delarayne to entrust her exuberant daughter to a continental husband, where they master women better than in England.[484] Ludovici's description of Guy Tyrell in this novel is typical of his indictment of the modern English male as degenerate. He was of a 'clean-minded' and healthy 'type', who loved all sports and believed in the possibility of being a companion to a girl. His age was twenty-seven.[485] Ludovici complains that in a man who displays all these characteristics there is no display, side by side with his mastery of games and his deep understanding of cricket in particular, of that mastery of life which

would constitute him a desirable mate.[486] Mrs. Delarayne confesses to Lord Henry Highbarn that when she first met him, she had felt what all modern women longed to feel, the inferiority of modern men suddenly relieved by an object they were willing to serve and obey. She had retained him as a therapist for her 'nervous illness' for this reason: "'We women suffer today because we have no such men as you to look up to.'"[487] The climax of the novel is that Mrs. Delarayne's eldest daughter, Cleopatra, and Lord Henry Highbarn get engaged to marry.

Lord Firle, in Ludovici's novel What Woman Wishes, unveiling the War Memorial on the village green at West Claughton on March 18, 1920, declares to those assembled that despite the recent war modern men are effeminate. The fact that in World War I women were able to take over mens' work could only mean that Englishmen were womanly and feeble.[488] As he says to Lord Chiddingly, his heroic son, even before the war the English were the mockery of Europe. They preferred to rule half the world rather than to rule their women: "'men are no longer male enough to subjugate the male in women'".[489] Dr. Thackeray in The Goddess that Grew Up, is described as a 'man' with the tired, slightly effete appearance of one who had spent too much of his life poring over books, rather than living, even if he had the capacity for it. Endowed with the bare minimum of vitality upon which life could be continued, he could not master his wife's contrasting liveliness.[490] Mr. Truck, an ornothologist, suggests to Mr. Peter Oliver that the removal of his cock birds is going to cause a very interesting phenomenon among his hens, and which throws a considerable amount of light on the feminist movement. The phenomena referred to is that one of the hens will develop male characteristics.[491] Later, one of Mr. Oliver's unattached hens does, indeed, begin to crow like a veteran farmyard cock, only

then does Mr. Oliver realise that Mr. Truck was indirectly referring to his possessiveness towards his mature daughter, Basilia.[492]

In Ludovici's novel of 1923, French Beans Sir Thomas Braintree's only son, Denis, was, on his father's admission, admittedly dutiful and clean-living. However, he was lustreless and despite all his hard living, hard riding, and single-minded concentration upon sport, "he could not rid his person of a certain softness and seraphic, almost feminine, sweetness", which Sir Thomas knew was unlikely to impress Domina Biggadyke who was the product of his training.[493] Domina's father , James Biggadyke, friend and colleague of Sir Thomas Braintree, informs the latter that his daughter has a theory, which is not altogether unscientific or improbable, that the trend of modern civilisation is ultimately to dispense with the human male.[494] His daughter then proceeds to explain her theory, as the inevitable outcome of our 'progress' in controlling disease, famine, and wars and gradually over populating those areas which are not yet under cultivation:

> ...'And then we can expect to see the worst war of all - the war for food stuffs. It will be continuous, desperate, and brutal. It will first involve continents, then hemispheres, and, finally, when light at last appears, it will be a sex war. For the women will want to save the food for their children, and being able to run the world by that time, they will realise that, as millions of men are a superfluous luxury, it would be to the advantage of all to proceed to their elimination, after the manner of the slaughter of the drones in the hive.'[495]

Selective breeding, would enable the victorious women to survive with only one sixteenth of the present male population. Sir Thomas Braintree reckons that if the supersession of man arises it will be because men have desired their own extinction.[496] Ludovici describes a similar course of events in Chapter III of Lysistrata; or, womans future and future woman, "Woman's Future".[497] He reckons that bitter rivalry between degenerate men and vital women will lead to riots and savage

street-fighting, in which, because moral indignation will be on the side of the women, the 'men' are certain to be routed, and to lose credit besides lives. The female domain will corrode that of the male, men will cease to be employers altogether, and become the poorest-paid workers in an industry run entirely by women.[498] There would be a revolt against cohabitation and the act of fertilisation will be consumated in surgery.[499] Seduction and rape will be punished by means of emasculation; and "men of vigorous sexuality will be eliminated in order to make way for a generation of low-sexed, meek, and sequacious lackeys."[500] With unusual prescience, Ludovici anticipated that the fertilised ovum will be cultivated in embryonic tissue-juice, independent of the uterus, and would mature as chickens do in incubators. Triumphant feminism would reach its zenith with this discovery, and in a few generations women would appear the only vestige of whose sex would be her smooth face and primary genital glands. Men would then be frankly regarded as quite superfluous, and their numbers would be felt as a source of irritation.[501] On the occasion of a threat of starvation, a few of the leading women would perceive with apocalyptic clarity that the reduction of the male population to the barest minimum indispensable for the purposes of fertilisation would releive the food crisis, and obviate forever the danger of a masculine or slave rising.[502] A sex fight at the distributing station of a large store would suffice as the spark for the inevitable conflagration in which the legislature would support the popular fury, and proceed to systematic slaughter of males, until, with the help of the regular troops, it would be found necessary to protect and preserve a small nucleus for fertilisation.[503]

Returning to <u>French Beans</u>, Sir Thomas Braintree proclaims that he is witnessing a decline of the male in Europe.[504] He declares that feminism

is the revolt of women who see the degeneration in their potential mates. Domina Biggadyke's, and other womens' revulsion of feeling at modern man expressed itself in a wish that man may be superceded.[505] Captain Ernest Biggadyke, Domina's brother, awarded the MC and DSO for gallant services during World War I, is described by Ludovici as a typical public school Englishman.[506] Not particularly handsome, but honourable, humorous, benighted and good at all games, his attitude to women was one of abject veneration:

> ...A lump always began to form in his throat when he pronounced the word 'woman', and his moral code, formed on the lines of cricket, forbade any action or scheme of life in which their was any danger of 'cutting' an 'unsporting' figure beside the fair sex.[507]

Andre de Loudon, a foreigner who, on becoming engaged to Mildred Hight, a confidante of Domina Biggadyke's, dissuades his fiancée from continuing to be a member of the Womens' Independence League, represents a contrast to the degeneracy of Englishmen.[508] He suggests in conversation with Sir Thomas Braintree, that England needs a masculine renaissance.[509] Sir Thomas Braintree thought the youthful 'fire' of Andre de Loudon's finely-chiselled features was an anachronism. He rejoiced in Andre's stimulating warmth and vitality.[510] The contrast between Sir Thomas Braintree's son, Denis, and Andre de Loudon is striking. The French man's eyes had greater 'fire', his mouth and nostrils quivered with vitality, and his physique had a "tigerish resiliance and flexibility"; the Englishman lacked "inner heat".[511] Sir Thomas Braintree says to Andre de Loudon that England is now a matriarchy due to the degenerations of men.[512] Although decent and wise women will admit in private how often women need violent handling, it is now condemned by everybody in Europe, especially in modern England.[513] Sir Thomas Braintree explains to Domina Biggadyke that the 'fire' of the red-blooded man is too strong for him to resort to mere insults if his mate lapses, therefore, he will instinctively

resort to violence. Despite the fact that Domina, Ernest Biggadyke, and Mildred Hight, claim that life on these lines would be intolerable, Sir Thomas Pursues, "'Is not love itself an act of violence?'", and would not the numerous discontented young wives accept it as such if, as a consequence, lifeand love were more thrilling.[514] It is due to the deficiency of tragic natures that makes its deepest wants a matter of life and death that life is becoming a desert of tedium and lassitude, according to Sir Thomas Braintree.[515] He exclaims to Mildred Hight, referring to Domina Biggadyke, that such vital women mother causes instead of children because men are too dwarfedand emasculated through commerce and industry: "'They find no mates with greater masculinity than they possess themselves.'"[516] Self-control is merely a euphamism for lack of passion.[517] However, the English woman's wilfulness did not suceed with Andre de Loudon as it did with Englishmen. When Mildred Hight abandons Andre de Loudon she challenges his "all masculine energy to action", and he beats her.[518] As Domina Biggadyke encounters Andre de Loudon she realises how easily she is outstretched so that she was filled with a new humility, spontaneous and natural, that dissuaded her of her feminist convictions which she had acquired by measuring her own mind and knowledge of things against that of Englishmen.[519] Andre was hard and metallic in his wilfulness.[520] When Domina Biggadyke and Andre de Loudon become engaged to marry, Andre's and Sir Thomas Braintree's belief that the masculine English woman completely unbends when under the impelling influence of a personality more masculine than hers, is vindicated.[521] Andre, unlike the man of northern blood, did not feel a sense of self-reproach when impelled by any undue excitement to trangress social conventions. However, when the northerner oversteps these boundaries he blunders through his lack of practice in "heated and violent expression",

and a sense of unlawfulness is induced in him which is equivalent to feeling himself in the wrong. Hence the exaltation of what Ludovici calls 'parliamentary' or deliberative language in England. He reckoned old English writers and speakers were accustomed to an 'un-parliamentary' mode of expression when they were provoked. That was when "blood was warmer"in England, before the deepening of Puritanical influences and the consequent "cooling of the blood of the nation". To remain moderate and tepid where excitement and great indignation were indicated, became the mark of good manners.[522] However, Andre was not aware of its being any more unbecoming to show violent feelings of anger when provoked than it was to remain serene when his mind was at peace:

> ...He had no concern with the preposterous rules of so-called 'Parliamentarian' temper, which came in with the worst form of Parliaments in the nineteenth century; he was, moreover, practiced in violent feeling, and it was not unfamiliar, untrodden ground to him.[523]

In England's Puritanical atmosphere the lack of 'fire' and vigorous ardour stifled emotion and caused it to tempo rise indefinitely. Sir Thomas Braintree, who belonged to a generation that had not felt this mood, regarded it as a bastard character in his son, untrue to his stock and taking no root in his family line. It never occurred to him that since the whole prejudice of modern England was to avoid danger a generation of young men had been produced who lacked 'fire' and ardent impulses. However, he realised how frivolous it was to grant the title 'manly' to his son, Denis, who could only aspire to the modern hoax of "tweed and golf-stick virility".[524] Tragically, Denis commits suicide after Domina Biggadyke disputes his virility. Lady Freeman, after pronouncing a few conventional regrets about the deceased to Sir Thomas Braintree comments, rather insensitively, that she does so miss Andre de Loudon: "'After seeing such a lot of him, as I used to do, my life seems a perfect blank nowadays. He was such

a vital creature, so full of stimulating thought and fire.'"[525] Initially, Sir Thomas Braintree was greatly disturbed by his son's suicide, and greatly shaken in his own vigorous attachment to life.[526] But, after some thought, he realises that his son's effeminacy is by no means unique among young men.[527]

Gilbert Milburn, in The Taming of Don Juan , the seventeen year old protege of Dr. Hale, is responsible for the illicit pregnancy of Miss Frin. Dr. Hale comments to Frances Yardgrove, that his protege is a vital contrast to the average degenerate man:

> ...'Of course Nature took the world by storm when she made him [Gilbert Milburn] , and, what is more, she intended to take it by storm. But imagine the imbecility of these absurd parents who, because the average young man of today is safe as a marble statue, fancied that they could let their young pussies run wild with him! Can you think of anything more foolhardy? Isn't it strange how one vital figure can demonstrate the inanity of any smug and slightly anaemic social organisation? Every girl in this area is as free to wander in the fields, or in the woods, with her particular apology for a young man, as I am to walk up my staircase. Everything is staked upon the subnormality or tameness of the male...'[528]

Gilbert, for his impropriety , had been dismissed from his job at the local 'milk factory' for producing pasturised milk, owned by four spinsters - the Underhills. The Underhill Dairy business was immensely successful[529], to the ultimate distress and consternation of the local farmers, but not of their wives. The local farmers desisted from revolting against the Underhill dominion because they were dominated by their wives, who had been released from butter-making, cheese-making, and other dairy work, by the innovations of the Underhills. The women could not be expected to realise the morbid features of this change, and it was they who had built up the Underhills' fortune. As Dr. Hale frequently observed, it was ultimately the mens' fault: "'for if they had had their women under proper control Underhill Ltd. could

never have developed.'"[530] Dr. Hale accuses Mr. Frin, a farmer, of being mastered by his wife.[531] Mr. Frin timidly retreats from Dr. Hale's charge that he, like the other farmers, have as much masculinity as "'gelded porkers'". Although Mr. Frin knew that his wife's health would have been better if they had produced their own butter, he had desisted from supporting Dr. Hale's movement for the overthrow of the Underhill 'milk factories' because his wife had not permitted him.[532] Only the women of this novel possess vitality. Frances Platt, a friend of the Underhills' niece, Almina, possesses a "vicious curiosity about life": One who could remain after dark at the mouth of the drain, down which an unfortunate fox had taken refuge, for the kill; and one who could never complain of the hare's plaintive cry when she had been out coursing with the menfolk of the locality.[533] Dr. Hale explains to her that modern commerce, industry, and politics, have no masculine bravery or love of danger left in them, and that soon the only manly job left will be burglary.[534] When Gilbert Milburn contests the constituency of the northern division of Wessex, in the General Election of November 15, 1922, as an unofficial Conservative candidate with a programme for the prohibition of patent and 'artificial' foods, he is opposed by a band of militant viragoes.[535]

Ludovici believed the only hope for the world lay in a masculine renaissance.[536] A group of men endowed with a vigour of intellect and will which would make all attempts at a comparison between the sexes a piece of foolery; and who would make it one of their first constructive duties to repeal the female franchise clause of the Representation of the People Act of 1918.[537] It is the degeneration of man that is the cause of woman's mal-adaptation.[538] Because woman is Life's uninterrupted stream[539] and custodian she cannot help feeling

miserable at the muddle that man has made of Life. The historical fact that feminism is undeniably a phenomenon of male degeneration, "the swan-song of male constructed societies shows how inevitably Life comes forward at the last moment in order to save itself when all else is failing."[540] However, feminism cannot lead to salvation for woman is only equipped to carry on Life's business, not for ordering it:

> ...You cannot be a thing and above it, or out of it, at the same time. The part is not greater than the whole. And as Woman is immersed in Life, she has not the dualism that is necessary for placing and ordering Life. She knows, because she feels, when Life is going to pieces; she knows when Life has been outraged, when hostility to Life is working havoc with Life's material; but she can only ascertain the fact, she can only protest against the fact; she cannot remedy it.[541]

Woman's respect for man, must of necessity fall to pieces when the order which it is his duty to establish by means of his 'social instinct', either collapses, or in any way proves inadequate.[542] When woman becomes positive to the 'social instinct' it denotes a decline of her power as the breeder, the mother, the custodian of Life.[543] England's great past had left an inheritance of thousands of virile women; but, owing to the degeneracy of man, there were not the males to hand with which to make these women.[544] Feminism is dangerous because woman, like nature, is unscrupolous in her promotion and preservation of Life, and thus immoral.[545] Nature's cry is for more Life irrespective of whether the success of the struggle falls to the superior or inferior.[546] Unfortunately, the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic races are too firmly wedded, according to Ludovici, to the liberal doctrine of individual experience to learn from the accumulated history of mankind that the intrusion of women into public life must lead to degeneration.[547] Feminism was particularly dangerous because it struck close to the roots of Life.[548] Ludovici prophesied an increasing degeneration of life in England, that would reach its nadir

with the zenith of feminine influence.[549] Human nature is so malleable, and the freaks of its adaptation so manifold, that it had not proved impossible to convert woman into a creature with masculine aspirations which must, however, come into constant conflict with a non-masculine physique and a non-masculine racial history.[550] It was not woman that was in need of transformation but man himself for the return to the "eternal segacity of Nature".[551] One of the effects that Ludovici believed feminism had caused was a decline of the chivalrous spirit. Men and women were competitors, equals, in the struggle for existence, resenting each other's rivalry. Men had declined in sensitiveness of 'natural' reaction in the presence of women: "The development of modern fashion in womens' morning, afternoon and working attire alone is a sign that far more potent stimuli can be borne without prompt reaction than formerly." Ludovici thought the constant association of young men and women would be impossible if this were not so. One of the effects of feminism on women themselves was the destruction of their versatility, as they enter the narrow specialisation of what had previously been male callings, and do not escape their besotting effects.[552] Through their improved economic resources and lack of tradition in money control, as also through their increased freedom, women acquire a pronounced accentuation of their hedonistic impulses. Exposure to the asperities of the struggle for existence brings out the combative, predatory and latent side of female nature and represses its sequacious side. One result of feminism affecting men is that selection operates in favour of men of inferior attractiveness and vitality. In all businesses, industries, and public offices selection operates in favour of the more or less unattractive male at the cost of men more vigorously endowed and naturally alluring. Whilst, owing to the masculine aspirations of feminism, the exorbitant demands made on

young bones and muscles by boyish athleticism led to a premature ossification of the pelvic structures and to morbid rigidity in the pelvic and upper femoral regions in the adult female.[553] Sterility and agonising confinements were the inevitable outcome of these conditions. Another effect of women neglecting domestic interests and pursuits, according to Ludovici, was the appearance of patent and proprietary foods which are a poor substitute for the natural foods of our ancestors. One of the social results which Ludovici enumerated as a result of feminism was a marked increase in luxurious tastes in every class. Emancipated the modern woman was like a nouveau riche, tasting expensive idleness for the first time, with the consequence that luxury and excitement were the order of the day.[554]

Ludovici believed feminism, which touches the very heart of life, was preparing disasters for future generations.[555] Feminist reformers did not realise the limitless end to which they were tending as the facts of evolution show little is impossible in the matter of fresh adaptations and their resulting transformations: "When once the end desired is clearly presented to consciousness, there is hardly any modification, within reason, which slow development may not bring about."[556] The enfranchisement of women was tantamount to depriving them of their vital emotional direction by fitting them for political participation.[557]

As all life is a striving after power, and power only extends so far as the point where it meets with effective resistance, the extension of womens' power must be commensurate with man's weakness.[558] Feminism coincided with the downfalls of Athens and Sparta.[559] The rise of female power does nothing and can do nothing to check or cure the vices in a civilisation which are contributing to its downfall. Least of all can the rise of female power lead to the production of anything great

by women, or bring about the only condition which can restore health to a people's institutions, namely, a regeneration of manhood:

> ...Greece and Rome never recovered, and France had the good fortune to be saved by a genius, who was a stranger in the nation, and whose virile lead alone restored the vigour of her male population.[560]

The unadaptedness of women, their free expression of their maleness at the cost of their femaleness, was a sign of male degeneracy, because it meant that their menfolk had not remained sufficiently beyond them in male characteristics, to make their masculinity recessive.[561] The manly man in England's effeminate civilisation was unadapted and could only find escape in burglary:

> ...having no taste for the effeminate callings open to a full-grown and able-bodied man in our grossly over-urbanised and safe civilisation, insists on pursuing a calling in which he can find danger, risks and the vicissitudes of the chase or of war. But he is not a degenerate.[562]

Ludovici reckoned that the harm done to women and the race by making masculine standards, whether in respect or ideals, occupations, pas times, morphology or sexual habits, the only standard, was immense.[563] Ludovici even attributed the dominance of pecuniary values in Anglo-Saxon culture to feminism.[564] Similarly, he ascribed what he regarded as the excessive and deleterious humanitarianism of the English to the influence of the feminist movement.[565]

Ludovici believed the 'White Man's ideology' originated with the degenerate Athenians of the fifth century BC who, being homosexual, could obtain little stimulation from women. Therefore, they sought their stimulation, both in art and sex, in the male.[566] Especially in countries afflicted by Protestantism, which was influenced by Socrates and the worst in Greece, there arose a tendency to exhort

the boyish figure in women, and insensibly to accept a masculine accent over every aspect of civilisation. The Greek homosexual tradition made men choose masculinized women as mates. Hence selection had been in favour of viragoes.[567] With our effeminate manhood there was an automatic tendency for the male components in the female to cease from being recessive.[568] Owing to the Puritanical tradition in Anglo-Saxon countries, there was an abundance of men who lacked 'fire' and that mastery over life and over sex which makes women feel gratified for being women, thus women revolted against their role in life.[569] Feminism was merely a phase in the degeneracy of the male which had brought more misery, disease and death than satisfaction and joy to the majority of women.[570]

Urban women had, according to Ludovici, travelled a vast and dangerous distance from a realistic view of life and especially of themselves, owing to the degeneracy of the male.[571] He believed that once women had got a firm hold of the guiding reigns of civilisation, there would immediately follow a degenerative tendency towards town life. Feminine influence had led to the degenerative multiplication of towns and cities in England, and the migration of the rural population to urban districts during the nineteenth century.[572] Feminism, by increasing womens' power, had also contributed to the emancipation of the child, and thereby made sound education or discipline more difficult.[573] Britain had become a womanised society, according to Ludovici.[574] Women had striven to obliterate as far as possible their biological differences from the male, and striven to make their sexual lives conform to the life-pattern of the male. An army of apparently sane English women in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries had been so hard driven by their neurotic contempt of femaleness as to question the palpably obvious interest all women have in preserving the home as

the ideal site and scene for the reproductive period of their lives. With dire results:

> ...the increasing stupidity of the population resulting from the Feminist way of life, the considerable loss of native genius due to the same cause, and the increase in anarchy and crime which, with the best will in the world, cannot be separated from the Movement led by the viragoes of recent times and their predecessors of the 18th and 19th centuries, whose clamours culminated in the clownish militancy of a precocious dement like Mrs Pankhurst and her deluded followers.[575]

Due to their hatred of the male women showed between the two World Wars, according to Ludovici, an irresponsible loathing of the leading dictatorships because of the masculine ascendancy they implied, and did nothing to emulate what was commendable in those polities; "nothing, for instance, to raise the status of the mother and housewife, or to increase the prestige of domestic duties, which at least the German Dictatorship did succeed in doing."[576] Although their sex is the foremost custodian of Life, emancipated English women did nothing to check the dangerously mistaken attitude of their society to the psycho-physical shortcomings of the population. Indeed, by the way of life evolved by feminism, they actually added to the factors causing racial deterioration. Ludovici mentioned one possible sphere of action - the elite of womanhood were drafted into occupations dooming them to infertility: "earmarked for a sterile life by such vast modern industries as the Films, the Stage, including Ballet, and Haute Couture (models and mannequins), besides the Call-Girl traffic."[577] Women, animated by their secret loathing of the masculine accent over the dictatorships, fiercely opposed appeasement in the months preceding World War II and created a mood conducive to Britain's engagement in a debilitating war. According to Ludovici, the enahncement of womens' power had been coterminious,

not only with a steady decline in English prestige, prosperity, and standards, but also with World War II.[578] Ludovici even believed modern womens' reluctance to breast feed their children had contributed to the "moronization of modern England", as cows milk is deficient in lecithin, a brain builder.[579] Woman's unreflecting, uncritical, imperious impulse to succour, protect and feed her offspring is essential to Life. She will spring eagerly into action and blindly perform all the Life-preserving duties that devolve upon her. Unfortunately, however, the same saving grace of non-discriminatory maternal care, may also act in a manner favourable to reversions and degenerate processes. Ludovici deduced from the above that the female is biologically conditioned to be lacking in discrimination and taste. This is mostly favourable to survival in desirable form; but, when unchecked and uncorrected as it now was in human life, it favoured degenerate changes; whilst, in its operation as a social influence, it had gravely untoward consequences: "This is shown not only by the prevailing ugliness and vulgarity of our Age and even of the higher arts of our Age, since women have seized the helm."[580] Women were especially responsible for the untoward state of the modern world since they were now paramount in the home and the adult's formative years.[581] Owing to womens' dislike of male ascendancy, and aversion to long-term reforms, they favoured the scrapping of old and tried, and the improvisation of new and untried, institutions, rather than efforts to improve the men who control old institutions.[582] The female taste in mating also tends to vulgarity; because of the importance Life forces her to attach to adequate means of support for her progeny. When free to choose her mate woman is congenitally prone to favour the affluent male, regardless of his other qualities, if any.[583] Due to the absence of 'grit' and realism throughout all quarters of national life fathers had been handicapped in understanding the essentials of child management.

They had abandoned every attempt at exercising their former rights over children to women. This abdication by most men of the role of leaders in the home had contributed to the growth of anarchy and lawlessness in modern England, according to Ludovici.[584]

Rousseauan Romanticism

Ludovici believed the conservative reformer had a virgin field in deprec ating the "complete and romantic ignorance into which the bulk of the nation has sunk".[585] In his A Defence of Conservatism , Ludovici says that with the delusive banner of 'progress' at their head, the romantic forces of disintegration and disorder aim constantly at inaugerating more change without ever giving a thought to the direction in which changeismoving, whether towards decomposition or higher organisation.[586] Impossible ideals are associated with liberalism. It is opposed to conservatism, because liberals imagine that the preservation of the nation's identity throughout change can be achieved otherwise than by the observance of eternal laws. Liberalism takes its origin in romanticism, the fantastic, hence the preposterous nature of its principles. It reveals a neglect of sound stock and lineage. Liberalism is in favour of elective offices as opposed to hereditary offices; it seizes on those instances in history when herèdity seems to have failed in human families, without considering whether the conditions which alone enable heredity to operate successfully, were or were not fulfilled in the instances it adduces.[587] By unwisely rejecting the hereditary principle, liberals have relied on the romantic principles that virtue and character come from nowhere, and have therefore incited the world to a degree of miscegenation, both between stocks, nationalities, and 'types', or occupationally distinct families, which has dissipated

the character and capacity of every Western nation.[588] Ludovici believed nothing could be more fantastic than the assertion that every man is the best judge of his own interest, and that the cumulative effect of everybody's directing his energies to the securing of his own interest makes a nation happy and prosperous.[589] The romantic principle of the equality of mankind colours the whole mentality of thinkers like Locke and Rousseau, and is equally fantastic with the rest of their principles[590]: "It is taken direct from the early Christian doctrine that created Romanticism; it has no basis in fact; it is contrary to nature, and it is useless as a principle except for the purpose of creating social disorder."[591] The romantic condemnation of authority and discipline by both liberals and socialists had led to the parlous decline of discipline.[592] Liberals suppose, fantastically, that a nation may be preserved if those responsible for its government pay no heed to the health of its people, that the body is of no concern - which is incompatible with permanence of any kind.[593] While liberals shirk the protection and guidance of the people, it is their fantastic belief that it is impossible to give the people too much political power.[594] Another fundamental principle of liberalism, according to Ludovici, is its fantastic belief in the radical goodness of human nature. Liberals construct their schemes as if angels and not venal, acquisitive and egotistic human beings are the object of them.[595] The preferance for democratic before aristocratic control is based upon the romantic assumption that man in the aggregate is better and wiser and more trustworthy than men in small exclusive bodies selected from the elite of a particular generation. However, it does not and cannot lead to permanence in the institutions of the state which gives it practical expression.[596] Socialism goes even further than liberalism in its romantic flights. Fancy and not a sound knowledge of human nature

directs the supporters of socialism in the framing of their utopias.[597] In the pure romance of socialism it requires a good deal of the vicarious experience of the failure of socialist settlements to destroy its mischievous illusions. Ludovici lamented that the majority of able writers were either liberal or socialist for they, being fantastic and romantic, offer more scope to the imagination:

> ...From Locke to Herbert Spencer, there has been not one true follower of Aristotle in the domain of realism and sound human psychology. Everywhere we can discern that strain of loose thinking which inclines so readily to the fantastic notions of equality, the radical goodness of human nature, liberty, and the whole of the nonsensical rigmarole of romanticism.[598]

Ludovici even condemned Burke and Disraeli for their mysticism.[599] The preponderating influence of a romantic and fantastic ideology in Europe ever since the downfall of the realistic pagan world, had made the task of conservatism in modern Europe an extremely difficult one.[600] Ludovici hoped a great disaster, the nemesis of romanticism, would bring all aberrant elements sharply to their senses, "and dissipate their morbid dreams".[601]

Even before the dawn of the eighteenth century, the very principles that were at the base of European life and aspirations, like the principle of liberty for liberty's sake, the principle of the pursuit of general truth, and the principle that experience, a direct appeal to nature was the best method of furnishing the mind, had been leading steadily to one conclusion, romanticism, and this conclusion Rousseau was the first to embody in his fulminating protest against culture, tradition, human power and society.[602] Mrs. Delarayne, in Too Old for Dolls, mother of Leonetta, a vital youth, asks Lord Henry Highbarn, the hero, why grown men are so susceptible to "'raw flappers'"[603] He replies that it is occasioned by romanticism, the trend of modern

sentiment and prejudice. Hence, too, the contempory exaltation of childhood as everything immature or uncultivated is sacrosant, according to romantics.[604] Denis Malster, Joseph Bullion's private secretary, is attracted to Mrs. Delarayne's youngest daughter, Leonetta, due to his romanticism. But, it was not entirely his fault: "'We are all threatened with infection. They had it in the eighteenth century in France.'"[605] In Ludovici's novel of 1921, What Woman Wishes, we are told that Lord Chiddingly, apart from the reputation he had won in the War Parliament as a powerful and fearless champion of the people, had discovered a number of unsuspected causes behind social unrest. The most striking of which were the romantic assumptions lying at the basis of liberal and socialst thought, and ignorance of realistic principles concerning life and humanity.[606] He maintains that the masses are striving to realise three conditions which are utterly fantastic and unattainable - liberty, equality, justice.[607]

Ludovici's The False Assumptions of "Democracy" is devoted to his denunciation of romanticism. He proclaims, in the latter, that one of the reasons for our present degeneracy, besides the decline of a common and uniform culture, is romantic literature and journalism.[608] He believed that both the French Revolution and the Russian Revolution were the outcome of a romantic confusion of language.[609] The French Revolution was traced by Ludovici to the radical misunderstanding of three words, nature, freedom, and man by Jean Jacques Rousseau. After having formed a totally fantastic and false conception of nature, Rousseau began to speculate upon the unhappy contrast that human civilisation presented in comparison with the fairy like figment of his mind.[610] He lacked the realism to see nature as it really is: immoral, hard, merciless and tasteless.[611] When Rousseau proceeded

to plant his 'natural man' down in the utterly fanciful scenarios of Rousseauesque 'nature', he drew a picture even more distorted of humanity than he had already drawn of nature, and thus proceeded to his ultimate romantic conclusion that man was born free and good and everywhere he is in chains.[612] He poisoned his own country and the world.[613] Ludovici then proceeds to re-define nature, freedom, and man, in accordance with what he regards as a realistic outlook on life and humanity. He says, cynically, that if we contemplate the world as a whole, there is no justification for postulating a moral order of phenomena.[614] Romantics, like Wordsworth and Rousseau, by ignoring the cruel suffering of animals and insects in nature, were able to present a false picture of Life to the world. Much damage had been caused by their "pleasant lies".[615] The violence which the socialist deprecates as the power that one man can exercise over another, in determining his occupation and in exacting service or else food from him, still remains even in their proposition that the state should exact the service and not the individual.[616] Furthermore, so long as the individual's right to parenthood is accepted as inviolable, society will continue to be perturbed by an uninvited access of one or more mouths from certain individuals.[617] Thus, in a healthy society, which is an expanding society, procreation is not merely a transitory but a perpetual source of violence. It is a fundamental truth of life and, therefore, it would be romantic to devise any new scheme of society in which it is not allowed for.[618] This original act of violence, procreation, is rooted in Life and enters into every form of human society willy-nilly, and its reverberations must proceed rythmically throughout all the sections of any human community.[619] What romantic socialists had forgotten is that since procreation and its consequences are part of the original elements of life and nature, which are allowed to persist in the more

or less artificial arrangements called society, then these arrangements must partake of the harshness, the inequalities and the apparent injustices of life and nature.[620] Ludovici implores us to accept Life as it is:

> ...On its shadow side it may appear harsh, but seriously would we have it otherwise? and are not those who pretend it can be otherwise merely romanticists who want all life to be the perpetual white glare of a noonday sun without any noonday shadow?[621]

Even conceding procreation's inevitable repurcussions, inequality and injustice, the free operation of the individual's right to parenthood has immense advantages:

> In nature it is the violence and inexorable character of the forces at play that give life its manifold beauties and contrasts, the mountain and the valleys, the rivers and the lakes, the table land and the gorge, the forests and the open plain.[622]

Much of the joy of life springs from the thirst and thrill of adventure, from the consciousness of being an individual trying to establish one's right of citizenship among people who are sufficiently unequal to one to introduce an element of uncertainty and 'sport' into the undertaking. The vast repertory of different virtues and powers which inequality alone makes possible gives life its charms, its light and shade.[623] Therefore, to inveigh against the necessary consequences of life, as socialists and communists do, is to open war against Life itself. Socialists are the advocates of a principle of death.[624] After all socialist reforms, there would still remain a residuum of violence in all civilisations, which it would be impossible altogether to eliminate, so long as nations recognise the individual's inviolable right to parenthood. These truths of realism should be carefully remembered and reckoned with as a defense against the Rousseauan romanticism of liberals, socialists, and communists.[625] Ludovici hoped an enlightened generation of historians would one day

arise who will regard it as their mission to inform mankind concerning the repeated instances in the past when "romantic illusions" alone, have led to disastrous upheavals in the life of the race.[626] Where the desiderata striven and struggled for have been wholly chimerical a romanticization of life has ensued which, "like all romanticism, has to be paid for very heavily, and the price of which is frequently the peace, order and happiness of centuries."[627] Ludovici thought the extreme danger of the ideology now prevalent in Europe and America is that it is replete with romanticism of this kind, it is a catalogue of chimerical hopes, objects, and desiderata. Superficial statesmanship was due to the prodigious romanticism of our era.[628]

In Ludovici's novel of 1922, The Goddess that Grew Up, on the occasion of Mr. Peter Oliver's complicity in the death of his daughter's suitor, Cyril Bashfield Streeter, by giving him an unsafe mount, Ludovici says that cynical writing is deplored, unfortunately, by modern romantic Westermers.[629] The "elites of the five villages" would never acknowledge publicly that the sudden and tragic demise of Mr. Streeter had occasioned them any secret pleasure. When the local newspaper, the East Kent Mercury, declared that this tragic occurrence had cast a gloom over the whole neighbourhood, none challenged its trustworthiness as a purveyor of accurate information, and "caused a lump to rise in throats which, only a day or so previously, had been accompanying the operation of the composite Evil Eye with a strong implication upon Mr. Streeter's head." Ludovici narrates, cynically, such as humanity, but those who paint a more pleasing and romantic portrait, " touched up with lies and illusions", about their fellow men, are the real favourites in the world's literature.[630]

Ludovici believed that one of the best indications of the effeminacy of men was the spread of socialism and communism all over Europe.[631] If covetousness and envy were the principal emotional factors behind the socialists attitude, the modern world would have nothing to do with it; for the modern world, unlike the world of classical antiquity, was obsessed chiefly by moral considerations. The modern world had no conception of the intellectual cleanliness of the populaces of classical Athens and Rome who were covetous andhad the courage of their infirmities, and a clean conscience in their immorality.[632] If the modern man wished to indulge in the infirmities of covetousness and envy he clothed them in a moral and romantic garb which would appear to provide him with a motive more exalted than cupidity, and at the same time supply his opponents with virtuous reasons for capitulating. The issue between them, far from being a trial of strength in which the more powerful must prevail, becomes a dual of casuistry.[633] The moral justification of socialism is the plea of justice. However, socialists had not yet realised that the 'justice' which forms its moral justification is "a pure illusion, a meaningless fable, the most elaborate 'eye-wash' that has ever been contrived by man."[634] This same notion recurs in Ludovici's novel of 1923, French Beans. Andre de Loudon, the hero says that the menace of the covetousness of socialism is that it has a moral basis.[635] He then proceeds to assert that universal justice means simply nothing at all, it is a figment.[636] Sir Thomas Braintree thanks Andre de Loudon for his "'lucid analysis of the greatest hoax of modern times'".[637]

Ludovici deprecated the demand, among liberated women, for fictional and romantic literature. He thought it was a "neurotic solution" which amounted to a fantastic escape from reality, as their is a

tendency, both in these novels and those who read them, to hold a view of life which is unrealistic and false.[638]

Ludovici's Violence, Sacrifice and War of 1933, was welcomed as an attempt to disillusion the prevailing mentality of Britain's inter war statesman. He had realised that the inter war age was afraid of the truth, to desert the dogmas of its eighteenth century liberalism that man was born free and noble, and that nature is opposed to struggle.[639] Ludovici regretted that what had characterised all romantic reformers, hitherto, is that they had invariably regarded the sacrifices imposed by the elite upon the ruled, not as the outcome of a naturally generated form of violence, procreation, which must find sacrifice somewhere, but as a form of violence generated wholly by the vices of the rulers themselves or by their iniquitous laws. Ludovici called the latter charge romantic. It was true to life only to the limited extent that some rulers had intensified the sacrifice, or deliberately restricted it to a section of the community other than their own, or made it fall on the sections of the community least deserving of immolation. It was not real in the sense that, without an elite, violence and the need for sacrifice would vanish. Overlooking the sacrifices which procreation entails, romantics had been too hypnotised by the fact of human sufferening to see the inevitability of it, and had always turned to the quarter of privilege as the source of the violence occasioning the sacrifice. Ludovici saw fascism as the elite's realistic denial of this mistake of romanticism:

> The aristocratic revolutions against kingship, insofar as they were partly prompted by compassion for the masses, were characterised by this mistake. The bourgeois, or middle class, revolutions against the aristocracies were the same. And the present movement of proletarian or mob revolutions against the middle classes which finds its counter-current in such middle class organisations as Fascism and Nazism are the same.

The socialist and communist idea that the abolition of capitalism and capitalists can ever remove violence from human society was purely illusory.[640] The promotors of all revolutions had been ignorant and romantic enough to imagine a condition of no violence and no sacrifice.[641] The internationalist's and pacifist's ideal of eternal amity and concord on earth overlooked reality and was a pure romantic illusion.[642]

Ludovici believed the advent of a saner world would be ensured only if a sufficiently large body of people were persuaded of the errors of the romantic nebulous Liberal or Boleshevistic fantasies" of the last two centuries.[643] In his The Child: an adults problem of 1948, Ludovici attributed the growing adoration of children, those "unthumb marked by life"[644], and aversion to their discipline, to the influence of romanticism.[645] Indeed, among liberal politicians and ideologues, as also in the schemes and programmes of socialism, Ludovici thought we everywhere encountered the determination to frame policies and to legislate on the hasty and superficial assumption that Rousseau was right:

> ...No attempt is first made to justify Rousseau by careful examination of the data, or by an assiduous study of human psychology. It is assumed off-hand, presumably because the assumption pleases, that Man is born good.[646]

It was this romanticism, that had grievously affected the disciplining of children, according to Ludovici.[647] Thus, a school of romantic educators had arisen who advocated an absolute minimum of adult interference with the wiles and wills of children. By means of the Wordsworthian and Rousseauan romantic standpoint with its implied moral superiority of the child the parent or educator was rendered passive, with ultimate detriment to their charges: "A degree of freedom is thereby secured for the permanent fixation of childlike tendencies in our growing population."[648] The wholly false and

romantic view of children as revealed in Wordsworth's "Intimations of Immortality", undermined the adults confidence in his right to mould childrens' characters, for it made the adult appear the child's inferior.[649] Ludovici dismissed the romantic belief in the fundamental goodness of man as naive.[650]

Socialist Welfarism

Ludovici thought the conservative should question whether many contempory evils are not to a very great extent the outcome of a too heavy burden of human incapacity and wreckage that had been imposed upon each fresh generation of efficient and sound citizens.[651] The burden of social welfare hampered the whole machinery of national endeavour more or less equally as it rested quite as heavily on the hearty and sound among the working classes as upon the more desirable members of the elite. Ludovici thought the heavy toll that was levied on the people by the dissolute aristocracy of eighteenth century France was nothing compared withthetoll that was exacted by humanity's wreckage from the surviving percentage of sound citizens in Britain.[652]

In his A Defense of Conservatism Ludovici claims that he is amenable to the system of State-aided voluntary effort in education that existed before eighteen seventy.[653] However, not to Mr. Forster's Elementary Education Bill which became law in eighteen seventy and effected three radical reforms: It placed the building and support of elementary schools upon the rates; it instituted the principle of compulsion; and it made elementary education practically free.[654] The principles laid down in the Act of eighteen seventy were never departed from; on the contrary, subsequent Bills had been merely

complementary to them.[655] What perturbed Ludovici was that Conservatives supported Mr. Forster quite as enthusiastically as moderate Liberals:

> Thus, Lord Sandon's Bill of 1876, which marks the contribution of the Conservative Party to the national system of education, far from reversing the policy of 1870, confirmed and extended it, and the only modification it embodied was to take a further step towards universal direct compulsion.[656]

Ludovici questioned whether the Public Health Act of 1876, which established an efficient control over nuisances of all kinds and obliged local authorities to institute such services as the public health required, was more Whig than Tory in its conception. Although sound conservatism must endeavour to preserve the national health, it should also be committed to the policy of preserving the national character. One of the most valuable elements of the Anglo-Saxon character, according to Ludovici, was its independence and self-reliance. Therefore, to introduce the principle of gratuitous medical service was a dangerous innovation. It was anti-Tory. The practice of defraying the cost of a slight service in order to encourage its use, was to initiate the indirect subsidisation of industry out of the pockets of the whole community - it was gradually to undermine the character of the working population.[657] It would have been preferable to have demanded a small fee for the service, and where poverty forbade the use of the service, to have started then and there an enquiry into the prevailing system of wages with a view of discovering why workers were insufficiently remunerated to be able independently to provide for their own medical needs.[658] The latter would have been the real conservative policy because it would make industries and their workers self-supporting and at the same time conserve character. Seeing that the gratuity people relieved industrialists of the onus of raising wages, and to spend part of the money due to the workers before it

actually reached their pockets, it was also Whig in its conception besides being unconservative. This vicious principle was extended throughout the latter half of the nineteenth century until with Lloyd-George's Insurance Act of 1912, the method of spending a portion of the poor man's wages for him, before it reached his pocket, was established on a prodigious scale.[659] However, this vicious Liberal principle of favouring industry and not caring for the character of the people was one already endorsed by Conservatives and Tories alike. It revealed the Conservative Party as inadequately equipped in the knowledge of their own principles.[660] No Conservative ought ever to have been party to a Liberal measure which went anyway towards establishing free compulsory education, which undermined character.[661] The free labourer, unlike the slave, can develop character traits such as independence, self-reliance, self-respect, and thrift, which are ultimately useful to the nation as a whole.[662] Ludovici believed it was natural for the Liberals to abet the enslavement of the working people by welfare schemes for not only were they the patrons of the towns and of industries, and thus interested in keeping down wages, but, in their fantastic attitude they were not concerned with preserving anything so real as the character of the people.[663] He thought that as the Conservative Party neither took steps to control foreign immigration or attempted to secure a fair competence for the working masses, this "is the best demonstration of the supine indifference of the nineteenth century Conservatives of the principles of their party."[664] The easy course was to enslave the workers through State enforced services, and this was proceeded with:

> Thus today, we find ourselves saddled with a proletariat largely deteriorated in character through the enslavement they have suffered, and with all this the problem of wages still remains unsolved. So we are practically in the same position with regard to the condition of labour

> as we were in 1860, plus a proletariat whose moral fibre has been vitiated and completely transformed.[665]

Although, it is important to get the reasons for this degeneration that Ludovici cited, in proper perspective. He reckoned that the corruption of English character and self-reliance had only been partly due to welfare legislation. It was mainly due to the passing of the Nordic element in the country and its replacement by Mediterranean stock through indiscriminate immigration.[666] Nevertheless, in his A Defence of Conservatism, Ludovici reckoned trade depression and unemployment were ultimately caused by the financial burden of the degenerate and unproductive on the sound and able-bodied.[667] He found it deplorable that money which was intercepted on its way to the pockets of wage earners was spent on the sick, degenerate, and crippled.[668]

Ludovici is correctly regarded as employing the doctrine of liberty in the defense of hierarchy and orthodoxy and against the Welfare State. He complained of the effects of social reform:

> ..."its two fold effect in character deterioration and in penalising the more industrious, thrifty, responsible and self-reliant members of the population for the sake of the indolent, unscrupolous and least disciplined."[669]

For Ludovici, socialism was the bitter effluvia of death[670], it was the morbid indolence of the sick. Socialism was a force of decay and disintegration for private property is a principle of Life.[671] Development describes the changes of a species that has grown in the sense of becoming cumulatively capable of multifarious activities and adaptations.[672] As development implies becoming more and extending identity it is a principle of higher life. When applied to humanity it means that the ascending line of life by physically striving to become more and more extends identity. To assail this desire to become more and more is therefore tantamount to a conspiracy against

life: "It is the hand of death outstretched across the ascending road of the animal man (his italics)."[673] Private property is so closely identified with individual extension that even women and children have been included in this category. The individual of a species cannot manifest this incessant striving to become more and more, which is the conscious counterpart of the physical evolution of the race, except by means of private property.[674] Socialists are the convinced and determined opponents, not only of a particular class, but of Life itself.[675] The morality of development identifies growth in the individual with the general growth of the species, and therefore sanctifies the 'instinct' of self-extension which is the 'instinct' of private property. Those who assail the principle of private property paralyse the life 'instinct' of their fellows, and limit their life on the globe.[676] The institution of private property was not an evil in itself, only its present distribution.[677] The desire to eradicate the institution was the resort of sick and exhausted people, who were incapable of repairing or recreating anything; and the action of people who were not merely hostile to private property, but to Life in general.[678] Ludovici thought the elite on which the successful survival of the race depends were being sacrificed for the comfort, ease, and daily welfare of the defective, the lunatic, the incurable, the half-witted, and the blind.[679] Socialist welfarism had led to the desire to live by 'unselfish' mutual support and dependency, instead of by the virile qualities of self-help and individual enterprise.[680]

According to Ludovici, personal liberty and freedom, the spirit which once made England great would vanish under socialism.[681] Socialist welfarism was the canker that was destroying everything valuable and great in our civilisation:

> ...So long as it is desirable, for the life of one desirable and fragrant family to be penalised even to the extent of sixpence a year, in order to maintain human rubbish in existence, we are obeying the value which demands, when sacrifice is necessary, that the greater should be offered up to the less. We have obeyed this value too long, and it has necessarily landed us in disaster.[682]

Ludovici thought that past experience and the common verdict of mankind indicated private ownership as a desirable institution for the following reasons: It is the first prerequisite of individual freedom; it is the first prerequisite in the formation of character and the practice of self-discipline; it is the first prerequisite in the exercise and development of taste; it is essential for purposeful leisure; it is economically superior, besides promoting the nobler side of human nature in generosity and patronage, by providing a condition for energetic and ambitious activity.[683] The wise man should follow Aristotle's reply to Plato, that wherever communism is applied, a condition in which the best administrator of property is assumed to be the central government[684], waste, inefficiency, daily robbery of the national exchequer, and above all chronic dereliction of duty in all ranks and departments, prevails.[685]

In contempory welfare schemes it was the most competent and healthy person who lost, "while the degenerate who is capable of producing nothing but degenerate offspring has the public purse at his disposal."[686] Ludovici deplored the spectacle of a national Government sparing no pains to foster and pamper "human rubbish", and sacrificingthe sound to that end.[687] He believed the danger of the Welfare State was that it contributed to the decline of the stock of desirable people in Britain, and attracted immigrants.[688] The British had degenerated from a proud, independent, thrifty, and self respecting race into one that had become expert in shifting its legitimate burdens onto its neighbours,

in battening on charities expected from its fellow men, and expecting State aid and compensation even for performing the primitive function of procreation.[689] It was unjust to penalise self-controlled, industrious and responsible people in order to succour contemporaries whose lack of responsibility and reckless hedonism, dissolute habits and sloth, had reduced them to a pitiable condition. Ludovici also deplored reckless benevolence towards criminals, particularly murderers, as undermining discipline and order:

> It is unjust to allow people who have deprived others of the sweetness of life to continue enjoying the sweetness themselves. Therefore, the just man, disregarding the relief from envy vouchsafed by the spectacle of the murderer awaiting the hang man in the condemned cell of jail, and not wholly forgetting the man's victim, deprives the murderer of the benefits of which he has shorn his victim, and leaves it to the mob high and low to wallow in their charitable grief.[690]

He believed abuses of the compulsory charities extorted from the responsible, thrifty and industrious elements in the population occurred with disturbing frequency. Socialist welfarism had also contributed to overpopulation in Britain.[691] Ludovici attributed socialist welfarism in part to what he called the 'parti honteuse' in pity, which Schopenhauer, but not Nietzsche, had discerned. Wherever envy is widespread people's peace of mind is disturbed by the spectacle of any marked superiority in a neighbour. Only the spectacle of any inferior plight in a neighbour and the consequent pity and charity evoked relieves the ache of envy.[692] It was manifested in the prevalence of indiscriminate charity, and its degenerative effects:

> ...behold all the unwise and reckless benevolence and charity in modern England which is now undermining the will to work in the masses, and converting our prisons into second-rate boarding houses; ... about us all the inevitable results of the concessions that have been made to popular self-indulgence and lack of self-restraint.[693]

4. Institutionals: Democratic Government

Ludovici claims his purpose in writing A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories is to conclude that aristocracy means life and that democracy means death.[694] As life is a matter of choosing and rejecting correctly, there is one opinion on vital matters that is right and another that is wrong. Democracy is therefore a condonation of suicide for some mens' opinions on vital questions, by being erroneous, must lead to death. Democrady also involves a condonation of murder, for those who hold and act upon lethal opinions will not only cease to exist as men either in their own or subsequent generations, but they may stand in the way of the life of others.[695] Ludovici attributed the gradual crescendo of "emotionalism and claptrap" in the speeches of politicians, particularly Lloyd-George, after the extension of the franchise in nineteen-eighteen, to the pernicious effects of democracy.[696] It is difficult to sustain a serious and profound political role in a democracy without thereby forfeiting, through the loss of popular favour, the very opportunity and power one may have of contributing to the wise government of the country.[697] Democracy forbade the presentation of sound and far-reaching reforms in a shape sufficiently attractive and garish to provoke popular enthusiasm.[698] In his A Defence of Conservatism, Ludovici wrote that in a degenerate age the majority of newcomers to a country fall below existing standards and are, therefore, anti-conservative. Their claim for the modifications they propose as 'progress' is exacerbated in a democracy where their lethal and morbid influence is not limited.[699] Democracy amounts, in practice, to a failure to distinguish between changes which are demanded by undesirable, and those which are demanded by desirable elements in a nation.[700] Under

democratic influence, bulk and numbers begin to take the place of quality in every department of the national life.[701] The competing political parties are inherently opportunist in their competition for popular support:

> ...the practice, so much favoured by Conservative politicians in the past, of stealing the clothes of the Liberals or the Radicals or even the Socialists, while these gentlemen are away bathing, becomes the highest wisdom, and party differences become mere make-believe.[702]

Democracy rendered it impossible to distinguish in the confusion of the polls, between the clamour for change which was regressive and that which was progressive - the task of conserving the nation's identity becomes impossible.[703] Liberals were wrong in thinking that where democracy is witheld the intelligence of men stultifies and their capacities decline. The people of self-governing England were no more intelligent than the people of England a hundred and fifty years before.[704] Contrary to what romantics believed, political activities are the most corrupting a man can engage in.[705] The multiplication of State controllers, far from improving the control, depreciates its quality.[706] Democratic institutions tend inevitably to destroy the belief in national purity and good stock: "Miscegenation might even be regarded as the peculiar device of democracy."[707] No class in the community feels its interest are satisfactorily secured by democracy because of the power of the caucus, and of the party leaders over the body of backbenchers in Parliament.[708]

Ludovici believed democracy brought the 'slaves' to power,[709] In democracy no real struggle for rulership took place as there was no desire to master.[710] Ludovici shared his belief that democracy causes degeneration with Nietzsche, who reckoned democracy "the anhilation of all higher aims and hopes."[711]

The inherent vice of democratic control was that it ultimately degraded politics into a matter of emotional appeal through the instrumentality of demogogues. Politics had become a matter of divisions, Conservative and Labour, without any attempt to make a unifying appeal. Ludovici cited as an example of the increasing bitterness and the fantastic nature of the promises made by the candidates the election of the young Labour MP Oswald Mosely at Smethwick, commenting on which The Times said '"personalities played a bigger part than politics."'[712] Not only did democracy contribute to national decline, but as the ignorant masses formed a powerful body of opinion in a democracy, it became increasingly difficult to get the country to regard the fact of national degeneracy as a problem. Hence the reluctance to take "drastic steps" to arrest national degeneration.[713]

One of Ludovici's reasons for admiring Hitler was that he believed Hitler was fulfilling Nietzsche's anti-democratic bias in action. Ludovici eulogised Hitler's belief that democracy is the precursor of anarchy and communism because as the suffrage is extended to the ranks of the ignorant, subjective, and foolish, who cannot see beyond the limits of their own self-interest, the democratic form of government necessarily leads to a chaotic clash of self-interested groups, who are prepared to see their country perish before they will yield what they concieve to be their immediate advantage. Similarly, Nietzsche believed democracy is wrong because the elite are swamped by the mediocre and inferior mass: '"I am opposed to parliamentary government and the power of the press", he said, "because they are the means whereby cattle become masters."'[714] Hitler emphasised the value to Germany of having rid herself of democracy, her 'talking institutions', 'chatterboxes', and the voice of degeneracy at her council table.

By condemning the 'chatter' of democracy and its defence of the liberties of degenerate nonentities, Ludovici believed Hitler was a laudable Nietzschean:

> ...When, therefore, the Fuehrer repeatedly assures Germany of the benefits of her silence, it is only a therapeutic measure, and points to the advantage which, as a silent nation, she now enjoys overall the vociferous and chattering nations of Western democracy, he once more reveals, if not the Nietzschean influence, at least a deep sympathy with the ideas of the latter-day German sage.[715]

The democrat, motivated by sick and degenerate values, by participating in the nation's affairs occasions its death.[716] The only 'freedom' that democracy confers on the people is to allow their ignorance and stupidity to be exploited by demogogues.[717] The Control Commission in defeated Nazi Germany failed to see that whilst condemning national socialism they were engaged in putting across another ideology by propoganda - the democratic. They should have realised, as Dr. Salazar of Portugal did, that: '"One of the greatest fallacies of the nineteenth century was that English Parliamentarianism and English democracy were adaptable to every European country."'[718] Democracy amounts to a condition of suicide and death to the nations that adopt it because a majority are not merely incapable of voicing the taste of flourishing life but make selections adverse to flourishing life, or actually lethal.[719] The capacity to distinguish good from evil indoctrine, diet, conduct, form, stature, appearance, and the daily routine of human life - taste - is essential to the conservation of a people. The people who lose their elite, who can exercise this vital taste, are thus doomed. Only an elite of flourishing life can give their people life-promoting values concerning all the vital alternatives of life.[720] Ludovici thought democracy was a pernicious form of "mass neurosis" which afflicted civilised communities in their decline.[721] Under popular government the people's cumulative influence

ultimately has a degenerative effect on all standards, whilst the machinery of democracy, with its elusive sources of control, allows of opportunities for swaying the ill-informed and emotional populace in any direction that may seem expedient to powerful, and alien, minorities.[722] Unfortunately, so carefully had the mass been indoctrinated by the fanatical and 'interested' champions of democracy, "with their dark insinuations about Fascism", that they frowned upon any critics of democracy.[723] Democracy millitated against the recognition of national decadence:

> ...Noone, who like myself, has had much experience of public debating, can fail to have noticed that it is not the truthful realist, dwelling on unpalatible facts, who is acclaimed, no matter how eloquently he may speak; but the speaker who leads everyone to believe that everything is all-right, or, as even the so called educated prefer it today: quite all right.[724]

Democracy was the political institution of a sick generation. Before men could devise it the elite, down to the meanest operative, had to undergo a marked deviation from the normal and forget a more 'golden age'. Men possessed of forest stamina, with bouyant health and high spirits, are immune to the infirmity of envy and the institution that appeases it - democracy.[725] Democracy was in the control of every unscrupolous and skilled 'wire-puller' who, once he had acquired control of publicity channels, had secured the means whereby the pathetic apathy, mental indolence, indiscipline and sentimentality of crowds could lead to any 'majority decision' he desired.[726] Licence masquaraded as liberty, discipline declined, and the nation's fibre slowly softened as anarchy spread because of democracy: "Can anyone doubt that the basic evil of our system results from Party Government and the bitter rivalry it fosters?".[727] The most elementary knowledge of human nature should suffice to warn of the inanity of assuming that political parties will consider the

national interest before their chance of winning an election; and that the electorate in estimating the merits of a party's policies, will always forego immediate benefits in order to serve the best interests of the nation.[728] The wise, intelligent and discriminating members of the community always constitute an elite. Thus, majority rule must mean government by the least able and least gifted elements in the population: "Can we wonder then, that wherever today Democracy is established things go from bad to worse and that chaos and anarchy are becoming universal?"[729] According to Ludovici, we condemn what the Establishment had taught us to regard as the fascist and nazi slogan that might is right, yet in our democracy we unhesitatingly accept that right resides where there is popular might.[730] Democracy attacks aristocracy, and the world is left with plutocracy, a grandiose device for appeasing envy. However, plutocracy is but a stage in a process towards the total elimination of all causes of envy. Aristotle foretold the inevitable transformation of democracy into socialism and finally communism over two thousand years ago in his Politics.[731]

The conclusion to which Ludovici's reasons for the degeneration of the world constantly refer is that the natural hierarchy and order of nature has been inverted. At the beginning of Chapter III of his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, "The English Aristocrat as a Failure in the Tutorship of Ruling"[732], Ludovici says that whilst the English aristocracy had failed hopelessly in the 'craft', or protection of the populace, of their ruling, his charge against them in regard to the 'tutorship' in governing is even more severe. For centuries the Lords had neglected the principle of flourishing life: "'Respect the burden.'"[733] Since the middle of the eighteenth century, but for a few brilliant exceptions, such as

the seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, the voice of flourishing life had been entirely silent in England:

> ...all the confusion and doubt which we now see about us, all the ugliness, vulgarity, misery and uncontrolled Hedonism which now prevail, are nothing but the outcome of the fact that the voice of impoverished life, of inferior life, has been practically the only guiding voice in our island for one hundred and fifty years.[734]

The misery of the lower orders was matched by that of the 'superior' orders who had lost all sense of a grand scheme of life, and who were uncomfortable in their position of merely material superiority.[735] Conservatives showed themselves incapable of even the elementary self-preservative caution of preserving the health of the elite and that of the people, which would have followed. They committed their party to an unprincipled opportunism.[736]

Ludovici shared his conviction that all government had lapsed[737] with Nietzsche.[738] All sense of gradation and rank had been lost in our democratic age, according to Ludovici; the virtues of modesty and humility had to be preached as a corrective against the vulgar pretentions of "wretched nobodies".[739] Lord Henry Highbarn, the hero of Too Old for Dolls, says to Aubrey St. Maur that the elite has decayed: "'where are the great men today?'"[740] Ludovici found it deplorable that everybody imagines that they not only enjoy but also exercise the right of private judgement.[741] He reckoned the low taste, intellectual inferiority, and indolent hedonism of the degenerate elite had gradually diffused to 'lower' strata in the population. Everything despicable today was present in germ generations ago in the elite, and needed only time to reach the emulatory masses:

> ...whereas in 1860, a Salvation Army for the 'Upper Ten' would probably have sufficed to regenerate the whole nation - a fact entirely missed by William and Charles Booth - today the imperative need is a Salvation Army for the whole population, a much more difficult undertaking![742]

The record of aristocracy in England had, except for a few individual nobles, been one of deplorable incompetance, hedonism, and self-indulgence.[743] Throughout the classes high and low, or the affluent and the less affluent, no elite existed.[744] The limitation of the power of the 'aristocrats' who comprised the personnel of the House of Lords had been due to the fact that only exceptionally were they aristocrats at all[745]:

> Indeed, in speaking of England alone it is no exaggeration to say that for a period of 1100 years - from St. Boniface to Asquith and the Parliament Act of 1911, which was a rude conge hurled at the heads of England's worthless aristocracy - we know of no age in which the English ruling class, as a body subordinate to the sovereign, displayed even the minimum of wisdom and prudence which would have assured their retention of the national leadership.[746]

Ludovici thought it would be worthwhile , before the ultimate reckoning arises, for those unfamiliar with the social history of England, to ponder on the centuries of inarticulate suffering before the old French word "dangier', signifying dominion, authority, jurisdiction - the relation of a Lord or master to his dependant or subordinate, with all its undertones of protective benevolence could, through the behavious of bogus aristocrats, have become a warning of imminent injury.[747] The absence of an elite had been responsible for England's degeneration:

> ...it must be obvious that it is the complete absence from our present day Western societies of any elite able to set a high standard of decency and good tone, that is chiefly responsible for the steady deterioration of our way of life and the decay of our civilisation.[748]

Conclusion

Ludovici is a typical fascist in condemning all the extremes of the political spectrum, and their associated parties, as contributing to

the degeneration of the nation. In the latter part of Chapter 2 I have described Ludovici's condemnation of the Conservative Party, whilst throughout this Chapter, the Conservative Party, in either thought or action, is invariably implicated by Ludovici as having some complicity in the various causes, which he alleges, of England's degeneracy. Similarly, in his tirades against miscegenation, the Christian ethic, rationalism, humanism, Rousseauan romanticism, socialist welfarism, democracy, and the like, Ludovici condemned the heritage of both liberalism and socialism. Indeed, his condemnation of the established ideologies of the party system overlaps. No aspect of the political spectrum of the party system escaped his denunciation. His is a fascist diagnosis of national degeneration.

In the following chapter I shall demonstrate that Ludovici synthesises the political extremes of the party system, which he intends to succeed, in an extreme nationalism. It will be maintained that by rendering conservatism commensurable with fascism he intended to regenerate England.

Notes to Chapter 4: The Desparate World

1. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915),p.3.

2. ibid., p.168.

3. David Lloyd-George, The Times, September 13, 1918; cited in Anthony Mario Ludovici "The Conservative Programme: A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 113, (April 1923), p.601.

4. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.175.

5. H.J. Massingham, "Values and Nature," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXI, No.23, September 24, 1942, p.187.

6. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, (4th ed., 2nd impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), pp.144-145.

7. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche: his life and works, Preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910), pp.59-60.

8. ibid., p.61.

9. idem., Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.229.

10. ibid., p.16.

11. ibid., p. 41.

12. ibid., p.42.

13. ibid., p.91.

14. ibid., pp.91-92.

15. ibid., p.92.

16. idem., Too Old for Dolls, A Novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.48.

17. ibid., pp.48-49.

18. ibid., p.49.

19. ibid., p.52.

20. ibid., p.117.

21. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), pp.165-166.

22. idem., The False Assumption of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.27-28.

23. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.115.

24. Anthony Mario Ludovici, French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.7.

25. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), pp.143-144.

26. ibid., p.304.

27. idem., Lysistrata; or, Woman's Future and Future Woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.29.

28. ibid., p.12.

29. ibid., p.29.

30. idem., The Secret of Laughter (London: Constable, 1932), p.6.

31. ibid., p.14.

32. ibid., p.16.

33. ibid., p.88.

34. ibid., pp.109-110.

35. ibid., p.112.

36. Friedrich Nietzsche, Will to Power, authorised English translation by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Volume 1, p.74; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.113.

37. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., pp.113-114.

38. ibid., p.115.

39. idem., Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), p.3.

40. idem, Some Reasons for Fear, English Mistery Leaflet, No.3., 1936, p.3.

41. idem., "The Political Misuse of Words," New Pioneer, Volume 1, No. 2, January 1939, p.47.

42. idem., The Quest of Human Quality, How to rear leaders (London; Rider, 1952), pp.132-133.

43. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.82.

44. Albert Ludovici Jnr. An Artist's Life in London and Paris, 1870-1925 (London: J. Fisher Unwin, 1926), p.193.

45. ibid., pp.193-194.

46. ibid., p. 194.

47. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.vii.

48. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.260.

49. Interview with John Ludovici," March 18, 1980.

50. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.432.

51. ibid., (2nd ed; London: Constable, 1933), p.xi.

52. idem., Mansel Fellowes [A novel], (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.159.

53. ibid., p.160.

54. idem., "Conscience and Fanatacism [Review of Conscience and Fanatacism: An Essay on Moral Values, by George Pitt-Rivers (Heinemann)]," New Age, Volume XXV, No.24, October 9, 1919, p.395.

55. idem., "Review of The War Diary of a Square Peg, by Maximilian A. Mugge (George Routledge and Sons Ltd., 1920), New Age, Volume XXVII, No. 26, October 28, 1920, p.370.

56. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.ix-x.

57. idem., "The Folly of Feminine Franchise," English Review, Volume 37, November 1923, p.571.

58. ibid., p.575.

59. idem., "A Post-War Maiden (To Agnes Birrell) [A poem]," in his The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), pp.6-7.

60. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p. 164.

61. ibid., p.189.

62. ibid., p.190.

63. ibid., p.202.

64. ibid., pp.202-203.

65. ibid., p.203.

66. ibid., p.236.

67. ibid., pp.272-273.

68. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.299.

69. idem., Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), p.27.

70. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.363.

71. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.6.

72. ibid., footnote to p.7.

73. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp.6-7.

74. ibid., pp.15-16.

75. ibid., p.16.

76. ibid., p.83.

77. ibid., p.88.

78. ibid., p.251.

79. ibid., pp251-252.

80. ibid., pp.253-254.

81. ibid., pp.254-255.

82. ibid., p.256.

83. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed., 2nd. impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), p.20.

84. ibid., pp.225-226.

85. ibid., pp.226-227.

86. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Will to Power, Books I and II, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18. vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume XIV: p.ix.

87. idem., Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), p.114.

88. idem. Nietzsche: his life and works, preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910), p.65.

89. idem., Mansel Fellowes [A novel], (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.20.

90. ibid., p.34.

91. ibid., p.42-43.

92. ibid., p.58.

93. ibid., p.150.

94. ibid., p.160.

95. ibid., pp.162-163.

96. ibid., p.220.

97. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), p.201.

98. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Too Old for Dolls. A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.64.

99. ibid., p.65.

100. ibid., p.92.

101. ibid., p.176.

102. ibid., p.191.

103. ibid., p.282.

104. ibid., p.284.

105. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.236.

106. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p.207.

107. ibid., p.240.

108. ibid., p.310.

109. idem., Woman, A Vindication (London: Constable, 1923), p.236.

110. ibid., p.264.

111. ibid., pp.236-237.

112. ibid., p.249.

113. ibid., p.306.

114. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.98-99.

115. ibid., p.99.

116. ibid., pp.107-108.

117. ibid., p.110.

118. ibid., p.111.

119. ibid., p.113.

120. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.130.

121. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), pp.234-235.

122. ibid., pp.238-239.

123. John Green, "Youth Speaks Out II, - A Political Writer [Anthony Mario Ludovici]," National Review, Volume 103, (August 1934), p.221.

124. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Violence, Sacrifice, and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), pp.1-2.

125. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), p.2.

126. ibid., p.3.

127. ibid., p.2.

128. ibid., p.3.

129. ibid., p.4.

130. ibid., p.5.

131. ibid., p.6.

132. ibid., p.7.

133. ibid., p.9.

134. ibid., p.10.

135. ibid., pp. 10-11.

136. ibid., p.12ff.

137. ibid., pp.17-31.

138. ibid., p.18.

139. ibid., p.19.

140. ibid., p.20.

141. ibid., p.22.

142. ibid., pp.21-22.

143. Cobbett [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Jews and the Jews in England (London: Boswell, 1938), p.31.

144. ibid., pp.31-32.

145. ibid., p.32.

146. ibid., pp.34-35.

147. ibid., pp.41-42.

148. ibid., pp.65-66.

149. ibid., p.67.

150. ibid., p.68.

151. ibid., p.90.

152. idem., Enemies of Women, The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism (London: Carroll & Nicolson, 1948), p.144ff.

153. ibid., pp.146-147.

154. ibid., p.149.

155. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Enemies of Women, The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism (London: Carroll & Nicolson, 1948), p.150.

156. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.32-33.

157. idem., "Nietzsche and Art," Letter to the New Age, Volume IX, No. 19, September 7, 1911, p.455.

158. idem., "Review of Nietzsche et les Theories Biologiques Contemperaines, by Claire Richter, (Paris, Mercure de France)," New Age, Volume IX, No. 20, September 14, 1911, p.473.

159. idem, "Notes" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarasthustra, translated by Thomas Common, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume XI: p.434.

160. ibid., p.439.

161. ibid., pp.439-440.

162. ibid., p.454.

163. idem., Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy (Edinburgh and London: T. N. Foulis, 1909), p.87-88.

164. ibid., pp.92-93.

165. ibid., pp. 161-162.

166. idem., "Nietzsche and Science," Letter to the Spectator, January 8, 1910, p.52.

167. idem., Nietzsche: his life and works, preface by Dr. Oscar Levy (London: Constable, 1910), p.64.

168. ibid., pp.69-70.

169. ibid., pp. 71-72.

170. ibid., p.72.

171. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), pp.144-145.

172. idem., The Night-Hoers: or, the case against birth control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), p.65.

173. ibid., pp.66-67.

174. idem., Health and Education through Self-Mastery (London: Watts, 1933), pp.8-10.

175. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), pp. 10-11.

176. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.33.

177. ibid., p.34.

178. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.91.

179. ibid., pp.92-93.

180. ibid., p.149.

181. ibid., p.149-152.

182. ibid., p.152.

183. ibid., p.159.

184. ibid., p.161.

185. ibid., p.163.

186. ibid., p.194.

187. ibid., pp.228-229.

188. ibid., p.277.

189. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.296.

190. ibid., p.302.

191. ibid., p.309.

192. ibid., p.319.

193. ibid., p.325.

194. ibid., p.326.

195. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.4.

196. ibid., pp.39-40.

197. ibid., p.115.

198. ibid., p.118.

199. ibid., pp.120-121.

200. ibid., p.121.

201. ibid., pp.122-123.

202. ibid., p.123.

203. ibid., p.133.

204. ibid., p.134.

205. ibid., pp.147-148.

206. ibid., p.150.

207. ibid., p.151.

208. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.4.
209. ibid., p.155.

210. ibid., p.158.

211. idem., " A British Conservative looks at the Black Invasion of Britain," South African Observer, Volume 1, No. 3, July 1955, p.5.

212. ibid., p.6.

213. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a philosophy of the future, translated by Helen Zimmern with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed., 2nd. impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), p.122.

214. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards; 1918), p.112.

215. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.60.

216. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), pp.43-44.

217. ibid., p.45.

218. Genesis, vii.4, cited in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., pp.45-46.

219. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., pp.47-48.

220. ibid., p.48.

221. ibid., p.56.

222. ibid., p.57.

223. ibid., p.172.

224. ibid., pp.179-180.

225. ibid., pp.181-182.

226. ibid., p.184.

227. ibid., pp.184-185.

228. ibid., p.185.

229. ibid., p.194.

230. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.304.

231. idem., Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), pp.22-23.

232. ibid., p.23.

233. ibid., p.24.

234. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), pp.22-23.

235. ibid., p.30.

236. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.72.

237. ibid., p.135.

238. idem., The Truth about Childbirth. Lay light on maternal morbidity and mortality (London: Kegan Paul, 1937), p.172.

239. Cobbett pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici , Jews, and the Jews in England (London: Boswell, 1938), p.14.

240. ibid., p.15.

241. ibid.

242. ibid., p.17.

243. ibid., p.125.

244. ibid., pp.53-54.

245. ibid., pp.60-61.

246. ibid., p.67.

247. ibid-, p.79.

248. ibid., p.180.

249. ibid., pp.93-94.

250. ibid., p.109.

251. ibid., p.113.

252. ibid., p.115.

253. idem., English Liberalism (London; English Array, [1939]), p.1.

254. idem., The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), p.14.

255. ibid., p.20.

256. ibid., pp.21-22.

257. ibid., p.23.

258. idem., "The Importance of Racial Integrity (II)," South African Observer,Volume 1, No.4, (May 1958), p.12.

259. idem., "The Importance of Racial Integrity (IV)," South African Observer, Volume IV, No.3, (July 1958), p.19.

260. idem., "Public Opinion in England (VIII)," South African Observer, Volume XI, No.7, March 1966. p.13.

261. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, (London: Constable, 1915), p.345.

262. ibid., pp.384-385.

263. idem., Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), pp.14-15.

264. ibid., pp.238-239.

265. ibid., p.278.

266. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.30.

267. ibid., p.31.

268. ibid., pp.264-265.

269. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.9.

270. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.102.

271. idem., The Child: an adult's problem (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), p.215.

272. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), pp.94-95.

273. idem., "The Importance of Racial Integrity (III)," South African Observer,Volume IV, No.2., June 1958, p.13.

274. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915)., p.26.

275. ibid., pp.162-237.

276. ibid., p.172.

277. ibid., p.173.

278. ibid., p.175.

279. ibid., p.177.

280. ibid., p.178.

281. ibid., p.180.

282. ibid., p.183.

283. ibid., pp.188-189.

284. ibid., p.204.

285. ibid., p.206.

286. ibid., pp.218-219.

287. ibid., p.234.

288. ibid., p.235.

289. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.46.

290. ibid., p.66.

291. ibid., pp.168-207.

292. ibid., p.171.

293. ibid., p.172.

294. ibid., p.173.

295. ibid., p.176.

296. ibid., p.180.

297. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed., 2nd impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), p.82.

298. ibid., p.114.

299. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), p.137.

300. idem., Nietzsche: his life and works, preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910), p.53.

301. ibid., pp.56-57.

302. idem., "Translator's Preface," to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Twilight of the Idols, The Antichrist, Eternal Recurrence, Notes to Zarathustra, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume XVI: p.xii.

303. ibid., p.xiii.

304. idem., Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.103.

305. ibid., p.110.

306. ibid., p.111.

307. ibid., p.144.

308. ibid., p.180.

309. ibid., p.236.

310. ibid., p.237.

311. ibid., p.286.

312. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.167.

313. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.99.

314. ibid., pp.100-101.

315. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), pp.191-192.

316. idem., The Secret of Laughter (London: Constable, 1932), p.47.

317. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.165.

318. idem., "In the Worker's Paradise [Review of The Rabbit King of Russia, by R.O.G. Urch (The Right Book Club)]," New Pioneer, March 1939, Volume 1, No.4, p.105.

319. idem., English Liberalism (London: English Array, [1939]), pp.18-19.

320. ibid., p.20.

321. ibid., p.21.

322. ibid., p.22.

323. ibid., pp.22-23.

324. idem., The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), p.128.

325. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp.176-177.

326. ibid., p.177.

327. ibid., p.178.

328. ibid., p.179.

329. idem., Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), pp.46-47.

330. ibid., p.143.

331. idem., Nietzsche: his life and works, preface by Dr. Oscar Levy (London: Constable, 1910), pp.92-93.

332. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.173-174.

333. ibid., p.174.

334. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p.84.

335. ibid., p.85.

336. ibid., p.234.

337. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p.234.

338. ibid., p.236.

339. ibid., p.271.

340. ibid., p.272.

341. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.162.

342. ibid., p.175.

343. ibid., p.281.

344. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.193.

345. idem., "Personality in Statesmanship (III)," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.8, December 1955, p.6.

346. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.68.

347. ibid., pp.69-70.

348. ibid., pp.72-73.

349. ibid., pp.76-77.

350. ibid., p.81.

351. ibid., pp.130-131.

352. ibid., pp.134-135.

353. idem., English Liberalism (London: English Array [1939]),pp.4-5.

354. ibid., p.5.

355. ibid., p.28.

356. ibid., p.29.

357. ibid., pp.30-31.

358. ibid., p.31.

359. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.8.

360. ibid., p.36.

361. ibid., pp.50-51.

362. ibid., p.68.

363. ibid., p.78.

364. ibid., p.136.

365. Oswald Spengler, The Hour of Decision; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici ibid., p.163.

366. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.180.

367. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp.8-9.

368. ibid. p.58.

369. ibid., p.125.

370. idem., The Future of Woman (London: Kegan Paul, 1936), p.137.

371. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.160.

372. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.240.

373. ibid., pp.240-241.

374. ibid., p.245.

375. ibid., p.246.

376. ibid., p.314.

377. Friedrich Nietzsche, Twilight of the Idols, pp.14-15; cited in Anthony Mario Ludovici "Conscience and Fanatacism. A reply to Mr. G. Pitt-Rivers' 'The Sick Values of a Sick Age (A reply to A.M. Ludovici's review of G. Pitt-Rivers' Conscience and Fanatacism) of November 13, 1919'," New Age, Volume XXVI, No. 10, January 8, 1920, p.156.

378. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed. 2nd impression; London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967), p.5.

379. ibid., pp.8-9.

380. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.144.

381. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), p.37.

382. ibid., pp.70-71.

383. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.106.

384. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), pp.1-12.

385. ibid., pp.7-8.

386. ibid., pp.42-43.

387. Genesis, vi.2; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.43.

388. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.64.

389. ibid., pp.57-58.

390. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), pp.1-12.

391. ibid., p.181.

392. ibid., p.182.

393. ibid., pp.184-185.

394. ibid., pp.218-219.

395. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.215.

396. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.205.

397. ibid., p.206.

398. idem., Woman, A vindication (London: Constable, 1923), p.41.

399. ibid., pp.42-43.

400. ibid., p.44.

401. ibid., p.58.

402. idem., "The Enfranchisement of the Girl of Twenty-One," English Review,Volume 44, (June 1927), pp.653-654.

403. idem., "The False Assumptions of Democracy (XI)," South African Observer, Volume III, No. 6, (October 1957), p.13.

404. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.171.

405. ibid., pp.176-177.

406. ibid., p.180.

407. ibid., p.193.

408. ibid., p.206.

409. ibid., p.210.

410. ibid., p.219.

411. ibid., pp.219-220.

412. ibid., p.230.

413. ibid., p.237.

414. ibid., p.241.

415. ibid., pp.249-250.

416. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.333.

417. ibid., p.337.

418. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.345.

419. Friedrich Nietzsche, Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by Maximilian A. Mugge, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche,18 vols, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Vol. II: p.170.

420. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Wine and Spirits [Review of Wine and Spirits, by Andre L. Simon, (Duckworth)]," New Age, Volume XXVII, No.2, May, 13, 1920, p.24.

421. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.27.

422. idem., Woman. A vindication (London: Constable, 1923), p.137.

423. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.14.

424. ibid., p. 16.

425. ibid., p. 20.

426. ibid., p. 74.

427. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), pp.20-21.

428. ibid., p..21 .

429. ibid., p.22.

430. ibid., pp.22-23.

431. ibid., p.24.

432. ibid., p.25.

433. ibid.

434. ibid., p.476.

435. idem., The Future of Woman (London: Kegan Paul, 1936), pp.33-34.

436. ibid., pp.34-35.

437. ibid., pp.36-37.

438. idem., "Slavery, Life and Revolution," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XIX, No.1, April 24, 1941, p.8.

439. idem., "A Study in Human Responsibility [Review of Infant and Maternal Mortality in Relation to Size of Family and Rapidity of Breeding, by C.M. Burns, with preface by Lord Eustace Percy (Department of Physiology, King's College, University of Durham)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXII, No. 13, July 15, 1943, p.14.

440. idem., "The Worldly Philosophy of the English Working Classes," New Pioneer, No.9, August 1939, p.222.

441. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Enemies of Women. The Origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), pp.5-6.

442. ibid., p.8.

443. ibid., pp.1-31.

444. ibid., p.11.

445. ibid., p.13.

446. ibid., pp.13-14.

447. ibid., p.14.

448. idem., "Personality in Statesmanship (III)," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.1, December 1955, p.6.

449. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.69.

450. ibid., pp.128-129.

451. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.239.

452. idem., "Review of England and the Farmer, A symposium, ed. H.J. Massingham (Batsford)," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XIX, No.26, October 16, 1941, p.241.

453. idem., "Review of The Defence of Democracy, by John Middleton Murray, (Jonathan Cape)," New Pioneer, Volume 2, No.14, January 1940, p.332.

454. idem., Enemies of Women. The Origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), pp.22-23.

455. ibid., p.102.

456. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.100.

457. ibid., p.111.

458. ibid., p.112.

459. ibid., p.113.

460. ibid., pp.117-118.

461. ibid., p.120.

462. ibid., pp.120-121.

463. Austen Harrison, "Woman Understood [Review of Woman, A Vindication, by Anthony Mario Ludovici]," English Review, Volume 37, (September 1923), p.339.

464. idem., "The New Anti-Feminism," English Review, Volume 38, (January 1924), p.84.

465. ibid., p.86.

466. Hutchinson Publishing Co., "Review of Anthony Mario Ludovici's "Raw Virginity"," in Anthony Mario Ludovici, Too Old for Dolls, A novel, (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p. [296].

467. R.B. Kerr, Our Prophets [Studies of Living Writers], (Croydon: R.B. Kerr, 1932), pp.91-92.

468. cf. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed., 2nd impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), p.187.

469. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Mansel Fellowes [A novel], (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.43.

470. ibid., pp.92-93.

471. ibid., p.94.

472. ibid., p.106.

473. ibid., p.107.

474. ibid., p.150.

475. ibid., p.162.

476. ibid., p.222.

477. ibid., p.281.

478. idem., Too Old for Dolls. A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.23.

479. ibid., p.24.

480. ibid., pp.24-25.

481. ibid., pp.25-26.

482. ibid., p.79.

483. ibid., p.82.

484. ibid., p.94.

485. ibid., p.106.

486. ibid., p.107.

487. ibid., p.122.

488. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), pp.36-37.

489. ibid., p.59.

490. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), pp.61-62.

491. ibid., p.118.

492. ibid., p.186.

493. Anthony Mario Ludovici, French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), pp.10-11.

494. ibid., p.13.

495. ibid., p.14.

496. ibid., p.15.

497. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), pp.74-99.

498. ibid., p.86.

499. ibid., p.88.

500. ibid., p.89.

501. ibid., p.93.

502. ibid., p.94.

503. ibid., pp.94-95.

504. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.16.

505. ibid., p.17.

506. ibid., pp.25-26.

507. ibid., p.26.

508. ibid., p.23.

509. ibid., p.34.

510. ibid., p.41.

511. ibid., pp.42-43.

512. ibid., p.73.

513. ibid., p.74.

514. ibid., p.91.

515. ibid., p.95.

516. ibid., p.109.

517. ibid., p.115.

518. ibid., pp.122-123.

519. ibid., pp.173-174.

520. ibid., p.180.

521. ibid., pp.98-99.

522. ibid., pp.223-224.

523. Anthony Mario Ludovici, French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]),p.224.

524. ibid., p.262.

525. ibid., p.288.

526. ibid., p.291.

527. ibid., p.298.

528. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), pp.17-18.

529. ibid., p.35.

530. ibid., p.36.

531. ibid., p.77.

532. ibid., p.78.

533. ibid., p.86.

534. ibid., p.143.

535. ibid., p.302.

536. idem., "The Need of a Masculine Renaissance," English Review, Volume 37, (August 1923), p.199.

537. idem., "The Folly of Feminine Franchise," English Review, Volume 37, (November 1923), p.579.

538. idem., Woman, A Vindication (London: Constable, 1923), p.x.

539. ibid., p.29.

540. ibid., p.35.

541. ibid., pp.35-36.

542. ibid., p.61.

543. ibid., p.66.

544. ibid., p.161.

545. ibid., pp.301-302.

546. ibid., p.306.

547. ibid., p.361.

548. ibid., p.362.

549. ibid., pp.365-366.

550. ibid., p.367.

551. ibid., pp.367-368.

552. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Woman's Encroachment on Man's Domain," Current History, Volume 27, (October 1927), p.22.

553. ibid., p.23.

554. ibid., p.24.

555. idem., "The Enfranchisement of the Girl of Twenty-One," English Review, Volume 44, (June 1927), p.651.

556. ibid., p.652.

557. ibid., p.655.

558. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.xiii.

559. ibid., p.72.

560. ibid., p.77.

561. ibid., p.89.

562. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.78.

563. idem., The Future of Woman (London: Kegan Paul, 1936), p.135.

564. idem., "Thorstein Veblen [Review of Thorstein Veblen and this America, by Joseph Dorfman, (New York: Viking Press, 1940)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXVII, No.6, May 24, 1945, p.61.

565. idem., "Review of English Saga 1840-1940, by Arthur Bryant (Collins and Eyre and Spottiswoode)," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XVII, No.23, March 27, 1941, pp.265-266.

566. idem., Enemies of Women. The Origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism (London: Carroll and Nicholson, 1948), p.32.

567. ibid., p.37.

568. ibid., pp.65-66.

569. ibid., pp.68-69.

570. ibid., p.73.

571. ibid., p.138.

572. ibid., p.140.

573. idem., The Child: an adult's problem (London: Carroll and Nicholson, 1948), p.130.

574. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (1)," South African Observer, Volume 1, No. 10, (February 1956), p.9.

575. ibid., p.10.

576. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (II)," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.11, (March 1956), p.11.

577. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (II)," South African Observer, Volume 1, No. 11. (March 1956), p.12.

578. ibid., p.13.

579. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (IV)," South African Observer, Volume II, No.1, (May 1956), pp.11-12.

580. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (V)," South African Observer, Volume 2, No.2, (June 1956), p.12.

581. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (VI)," South African Observer, Volume 2, No.3, (July 1956),p.3.

582. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (IX)," South African Observer, Volume 2, No.6, (October 1956), p.13.

583. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (X)," South African Observer, Volume 2, No.7, (November 1956), p.13.

584. idem., "Education in Modern England (XIV)," South African Observer, Volume 6, No.10, (February 1961), p.12.

585. idem, "The Conservative Programme: A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series Volume 113, (April 1923), p.612.

586. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber and Gwyer, 1927), pp.v-vi.

587. ibid., p.61.

588. ibid., p.62.

598. ibid., pp.62-63.

590. ibid., pp.63-64.

591. ibid., p.65.

592. ibid.

593. ibid., p.67.

594. ibid., p.68.

595. ibid., p.71.

596. ibid., p.72.

597. ibid., p.73.

598. ibid., p.132.

599. ibid., footnote to p.132.

600. ibid., p.135.

601. ibid., p.261.

602. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Nietzsche and Art (London: Constable, 1911), p.160.

603. idem., Too Old for Dolls, A Novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.157.

604. ibid., pp.157-158.

605. ibid., p.158.

606. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), pp.133-134.

607. ibid., pp.166-167.

608. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.15.

609. ibid., pp.16-17.

610. ibid., p.17.

611. ibid., pp.17-18.

612. ibid., p.18.

613. ibid., p.19.

614. ibid., p.51.

615. ibid., pp.52-53.

616. ibid., p.101.

617. ibid., p.102.

618. ibid., p.106.

619. ibid., p.108.

620. ibid., pp.108-109.

621. ibid., p.116.

622. ibid., p.117.

623. ibid., p.118.

624. ibid., p.119.

625. ibid., p.125.

626. ibid., p.179.

627. ibid., p.183.

628. ibid., p.184.

629. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.255.

630. ibid., pp.255-256.

631. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "The Need of a Masculine Renaissance," English Review, Volume 37, (August 1923), p.195.

632. ibid., pp.196-197.

633. ibid., p.197.

634. ibid., p.198.

635. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.33.

636. ibid., pp.33-34.

637. ibid., p.34.

638. idem., "Woman's Encroachment on Man's Domain," Current History, Volume 27, (October 1927), p.23.

639. John Green, "Youth Speaks Out II - A Political Writer [Anthony Mario Ludovici]," National Review, Volume 103, (August 1934), p.222.

640. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), p.10-11.

641. ibid., p.14.

642. ibid., p.22.

643. idem., The Future of Woman (London: Kegan Paul, 1936), p.141.

644. idem., The Child: an adult's problem (London: Carroll and Nicholson, 1948), pp.15-16.

645. ibid., p.39.

646. ibid., p.41.

647. ibid., p.47.

648. ibid., p.55.

649. idem., "Education in Modern England (IV)," South African Observer, Volume V, No.12, (April 1960), p.12.

650. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.172.

651. idem., "The Conservative Programme: A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 113, (April 1923), p.606.

652. ibid., p.607.

653. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.111.

654. ibid., p.113.

655. ibid., pp.113-114.

656. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London; Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.114.

657. ibid., p.139.

658. ibid., pp.139-140.

659. ibid., p.140.

660. ibid., p.141.

661. ibid., p.143.

662. ibid., p.144

663. ibid., pp.144-145.

664. ibid., pp.145-146.

665. ibid., p.147.

666. ibid., p.156.

667. ibid., p.230.

668. ibid., p.239.

669. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967); quoted in Rodney Barker, Political Ideas in Modern Britain, (London: Methuen, 1978), pp.200-201.

670. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.28.

671. ibid., p.32.

672. ibid., pp.33-34.

673. ibid., p.34.

674. ibid., p.35.

675. ibid., pp.35-36.

676. ibid., p.36.

677. ibid., p.37.

678. ibid., pp.37-38.

679. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.105.

680. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.223.

681. ibid., p.230.

682. ibid., p.341.

683. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Sanctity of Private Property (London: Heath Cranton, 1932), pp.35-36.

684. ibid., p.31.

685. ibid., pp.32-33.

686. idem., Some Reasons for Fear, English Mistery Leaflet No.3, 1936, p.11.

687. idem., The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), p.11.

688. idem., "Subsidised Sloth and Subnormality in the Socialist State," South African Observer, Volume V, No.8., (December 1959), p.13.

689. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government (VI)," South African Observer, Volume IX, No.9, (April 1964), p.15.

690. idem., "Public Opinion in England (XVI)," South African Observer, Volume XII, No.5, (February 1967), p.5.

691. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London:Britons, 1967), pp.171-172.

692. ibid., p.175.

693. ibid., p.177.

694. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), pp.viii-ix.

695. ibid., p.241.

696. idem., "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 111, (June 1922), pp.954-955.

697. ibid., p.955.

698. ibid., pp.955-956.

699. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp.10-11.

700. ibid., p.22.

701. ibid., p.21.

702. ibid., p.27.

703. ibid., p.32.

704. ibid., p.69.

705. ibid., p.71.

706. ibid., pp.72-73.

707. ibid., p.157.

708. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.200.

709. idem., "Mr. Chesterton and Anarchy," Letter to the New Age, Volume XI, No.7, June 13, 1912, p.167.

710. idem., Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), p.170.

711. idem., Nietzsche: his life and works, preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910), p.80.

712. The Times; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Woman's Encroachment on Man's Domain," Current History, Volume 27, (October 1927), p.25.

713. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.181.

714. Friedrich Nietzsche, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Hitler and Nietzsche," English Review, Volume LXIV, No. 1, January 1937, p.51.

715. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.52.

716. idem., "Review of The Defence of Democracy, by John Middleton Murray (Jonathan Cape)," New Pioneer, Volume II, No.14, January 1940, p.331.

717. idem., Enemies of Women. The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism (London: Carroll and Nicholson, 1948), p.138.

718. Dr. Antonio de Oliveira Salazar, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Quest of Human Quality, How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.30.

719. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.36.

720. ibid., p.36ff.

721. ibid., pp.46-47.

722. ibid., p.48.

723. ibid., p.50.

724. idem., "Personality and Statesmanship (IV)," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.9, (January 1956), p.14.

725. idem., "The False Assumptions of Democracy (XII)," South African Observer, Volume III, No.7, (November 1957), p.15.

726. idem., "Feelings Masquerading as Thoughts in the Modern World (I)," South African Observer, Volume VIII, No.9., (April 1963), p.9.

727. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government (XI)," South African Observer, Volume X, No.2, (September 1964), p.13.

728. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Public Opinion in England (XII)," South African Observer, Volume XI, No.12 (August 1966), p.13.

729. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism: the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.13.

730. ibid., p.92.

731. idem., "The False Assumptions of Democracy (III)," South African Observer, Volume II, No.10, February 1957, p.10.

732. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), pp.77-102.

733. ibid., p.78.

734. ibid., pp.78-79.

735. ibid., p.79.

736. idem., "In Defence of Conservatism," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.2, June 1955, p.6.

737. idem., "Review of The Mastery of Life, by G.T. Wrench (Stephen Swift), New Age, Volume XI, No.5, May 30, 1912, p.112.

738. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil. Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed., 2nd impression; London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967), p.84.

739. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Translator's Introduction," to Friedrich Nietzsche, Ecce Homo, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume XVII: p.viii.

740. idem., Too Old For Dolls, A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920])., p.115.

741. idem., The Child: an adult's problem (London: Carroll and Nicholson, 1948), p.190.

742. idem., The Quest of Human Quality, How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.56.

743. ibid., p.68.

744. idem., "The False Assumptions of Democracy (X)," South African Observer, Volume III, No.5, (September 1957), p.14.

745. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government (X)," South African Observer, Volume X, No.1, (August 1964), p.13.

746. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London; Britons, 1967), p.38.

747. ibid., p.47.

748. ibid., p.97.

The Revolution

As fascists speak of their commitment to total change and a new civilisation so does Ludovici. They share the belief that a regenerate state of man and society can be achieved through revolution. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, Ludovici informs us that he is outlining a 'solution' to the problems which democracy and socialism are really attempting to redress. A solution which Ludovici believed is more fundamental and "consonant with the passions and foibles of human nature, more practical, and above all more vital and full of promise for the future than anything Socialism does and can bring forward."[1] Hitherto, reformers had merely tinkered with the legal system and applied correctives. Such reforms had been 'patchwork'. The need was for a scheme of life that would dispense with the necessity for any future correctives.[2]

It is logically inconsistent to claim that man is irrevocably degenerate and yet possesses the means for his regeneration. Nevertheless, logical inconsistencies never sapped the vigour of Ludovici. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories this logical inconsistency arises. Ludovici despairs of modern Europe approaching a nadir at which it would be too late, too hopeless, too appalling to arrest the torrent of national decadence.[3] Again, in Chapter XII of his Lysistrata; or woman's future and future woman, "Woman's Future", Ludovici claims that the culmination of woman's total ascendancy over degenerate manhood is that society will petrify, as it is not in woman's nature to be inventive or to make great discoveries, at the level of mechanical and scientific progress

reached at the moment of man's most serious decline.[4] However, it is hinted that regeneracy may supervene as a few rebellious women will realise they have made a tragic and futile blunder.[5] Indeed, in the next Chapter, "Future Woman", Ludovici concedes there is an alternative to the degeneration described in the previous chapter.[6] Similarly, in his Recovery. The quest of regenerate national values Ludovici claims England is hopelessly degenerate, but proceeds to a 'solution'. He says that three terms, 'instinct', 'tradition', and 'leader', are being abused in the English History, which he is addressing.[7] He suggests that the word 'instinct' be dropped from the movement's vocabulary because there are no instincts in modern Englishmen which are reliable guides to conduct. Only if 500 Englishmen of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when they were pure bred, could be collected together would instinct still have a meaning and the rulings of such a body have validity for Englishmen.[8] The only rigid and uniform habituation, from which instincts were forming, are degenerate: "Liberalism, Romanticism, and a fantastic Utopianism, based on an unsound psychological theory of man".[9] Although the task of the English History was to establish the uniform conditions in England which would spur the sound instinctive equipment for correct and reliable human conduct that time had not yet come. Ludovici then questioned the validity of the term 'tradition' when applied to modern England. English traditions were devoid of life and vigour and were, therefore, untrustworthy guides for sound political action. The tradition of the Puritan, the teetotaller, the liberal, the Nonconformist, the usurer, the tradition of the patent drug, the cocktail, the nightclub and the lipstick, promised no Life.[10] Finally, Ludovici claims that the English Mystery's emphasis on leadership is also faulty. Too much emphasis on leadership denotes a decline in the dynamic force of

their inspiration. The doctrine of the movement should be their strength, and loyalty to the cause should not be contingent upon devotion to official leaders[11]; "It is only women who become attached to Causes through their attachment to men." Since everybody was marked with the stigmata of degeneration, Ludovici suggests that the English History's emphasis on personal leadership be dispensed with.[12] Ludovici despairingly asked the English History that since Englishmen "have neither instincts, undifferentiated tradition nor a man or a leader as your authority, what are you to do?"[13] He then proceeds to a 'solution' of modern degeneracy by suggesting that as all modern values, unconscious motivation and guidance, are no longer trustworthy, mankind is thrown back on his consciousness. He reckons psycho-analysis and science itself are but an effort to find a conscious means of orientation and mastery in a world in which the instinctive means have vanished.[14] Ludovici believed every advance of consciousness and intellect in history had been due to an era of bewilderment when old or vitiated instincts were no longer serviceable. There had been many such crises in history:

> ...The disruption of classical antiquity was one. The downfall in Europe of north-western Catholicism was another. While as to countries outside Europe we know that Confucius came at a moment of grave disorder in China when the old feudal conditions were breaking up and the country was yearning for a fresh orientation. Moses, too, appeared at just such a moment in the history of his race, and no doubt applied much of what his intellect had gathered in Egypt to the fresh indoctrination of his followers. Even in Persia, Zarathustra's doctrine came as a reform.[15]

History, therefore, warranted the belief that when instincts fail or become corrupt, an intellectual search for the recovery of sound values is the only available, although imperfect, remedy.[16] If truth of a high validity is to be attained by the intellect then it must

not be a conclusion or judgement attained a priori.[17] Ludovici suggests a final check which may be applied to findings reached with scrupulous objectivity and inductive reasoning. That check is the history of the races which flourished, their table of values, and the ultimate causes of their degeneration.[18] The English are committed to their intellect for salvation, but must act quickly for the whole of their civilisation is in flux.[19] Thus, degeneracy does not arouse fascination and despair for Ludovici. The same notions as occur in Ludovici's Recovery. The quest of re/generate national values regarding degeneration had occurred over twenty years before in his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories.[20] In the latter, Ludovici claimed that nations, unlike individuals, can regenerate their strength and youth.[21] Rebellion is the only means by which a subject people can rid themselves of tasteless rulers whose guidance has degenerated.[22]

Similarly, in his A Defence of Conservatism Ludovici states it as his intention to reveal conservatism not only as a policy of preservation, but of discernment in change:

> ...Both in my criticisms of Conservatism in the past and in my outline of a Conservative philosophy of the future, I have argued from the standpoint that true Conservatism should preserve not only by the obstructive principle of 'no change', which may at times amount to stagnation and mere negativism,...[23]

He intends to reveal conservatism as the only force in the nation which is able to resist degeneration and maintain a critical attitude towards every stage by which this end is being compassed by fantasy.[24] Ludovici calls the policy of no change 'exoteric conservatism' and thought it neither wise nor rational for statesmen to accept or to practise conservatism in this exoteric form.[25] Ludovici alleged that Edmund Burke was an exoteric conservative as he never distinguished between a desire for mere change, which may come from

the most undesirable elements in the nation, and the creative innovations of the elite, the sole dynamo of national progress: "And, as he does not make this distinction he naturally fails in defining the duties of those who, in their political activities, strive for conservation."[26] If conservatism is to be saved it must be elevated beyond its popular and exoteric connotations, and must come to be regarded as merely a position of political caution.[27]

Non-conservative politicians constantly made the mistake of assuming that if an old established institution began to reveal serious flaws, the fault must inevitably lie with the institution itself and not with the men trying to run it. As the conservative is concerned with maintaining the institutions of his country then he must be concerned above all with the maintenance of his nation's psycho-physical quality and be committed to whatever regenerative measures that commitment may entail.[28] Unfortunately, in England the "old" Conservative Party was oblivious to their obligation to maintain the psycho-physical quality of the nation if its traditional institutions were to be conserved:

> ...For, ever since the dawn of their existence, back in the 17th century, they have not only constantly neglected this task, but have also aggravated their difficulties by not even caring about the psycho-physical quality of the men and women of their own persuasion, including, of course, their ruling edifice.[29]

Ludovici found inspiration for the task of regeneration from his mentor, Nietzsche, whom he believed to have shown how much still lay in man's power.[30] Nietzscheanism to prove, that, to the sculptor of values, the world is an open field of yielding clay provided they have a profound faith in the fundamental will which others had hitherto based in God, natural laws, truth, and other euphemistic fictions.[31] According to Ludovici, Nietzsche had realised that our aim should be

the perfection of the society and race, and that our morality and religion should be subordinated to that end.[32]

Man himself had to be regenerated. The mere change of institutions could not even erase the surface of the deep causes of degeneracy, according to Ludovici.[33] He thought it had been man's besetting sin, throughout history, to trace what evils befell him to the institutions of society rather than to himself and his fellows.[34] It is possible for institutions to outlive the quality of men.[35] In typically Nietzschean vocabulary, Ludovici declared that 'Dionysians' stoutly deny that degeneration is inevitable. A civilisation other than our present 'Prometheans' and degeneratecneveas possible.[36] The 'Dyonysians' would not fail "when the great turning point reappears again."[37] Modern mankind was too lowly evolved to see what would be desirable in the institutions of the future harmonious and integrated national life, when once mankind would have raised itself from its present degradations: "That is why the less we destroy at present the better." Men must first regenerate themselves to prepare the way for the only possible 'solution' to the world's difficulties and problems, - a better generation of men. As modern mankind is too degenerate to tackle the problems that surround it satisfactorily, the reorganisation of institutions would follow, not precede, the regeneration of the male sex. Then mankind would begin a new era in its evolution. Unlike the past and present, in which man had played a game of chance with himself and his fellows, the future would be radically different as man would enlist his consciousness in the moulding of his destiny.[38] Ludovici says of his proposal for the regeneration of man: "It is a practical and perfectly possible solution capable of certain fulfilment."[39]

Man still possesses both a potential strength and courage to rid

himself of degeneracy, and step into the future.[40] Addressing the English History movement in 1935 Ludovici described the genesis of their movement, in 1930, as a band of patriots, alarmed at the innumerable forces of decay and corruption which in the course of the two preceding generations had crept into England's institutions and the very "flesh and bones of her people". They had combined together to consider how this progressive gangrene and disillusion could best be stopped. With unique daring, according to Ludovici, the English History correctly discerned that something more was amiss than merely England's laws and institutions, and the vices of its economic condition, that it was in the living nationals about them that the real degeneracy actually found its source.[41] It became apparent to them that before anything could be attempted in the external structure of the nation, the values of the "standardised hero, high and low - for all the classes are one in this respect - would have to be transformed."[42] The English History was, according to Ludovici, a militant body that should represent a solid and determined phalanx of men, all standing for the same loyalties and attachments, to new and regenerate standards and values.[43] They were all preparing for the time when they would be in a position to bring about radical change in England.[44]

Ludovici demanded that the populace set "to usher in the new civilisation of health, beauty and good taste".[45] Whilst acknowledging formidible obstacles to the movement of regeneration, Ludovici thought they were "at bottom continental".[46] If England was to avert degeneracy then its people must be prepared to make a "radical change in our outlook and the rules that govern our lives."[47]

As early as 1923 Ludovici saw the kind of regeneration he desired

taking place in Fascist Italy. Although he reckoned it was difficult for Englishmen to understand the domestic politics of foreign countries due to differences of race, national tradition and culture, especially in the cases of Bolshevik Russia and Fascist Italy[48], Mavrial proceeded to contradict himself. He believed Italian fascism was greater than it was represented by others to be.[49] Fascism's popular inspiration and national enthusiasm could not overstep right.[50] The novelty of fascism was that it was not utopian yet promised to postpone Italy's disintegration sine die. Mavrial lauded the fascist denial that socialism or communism are the inevitable developments of modern civilisation. Englishmen should adopt Mussolini's statement that "'Our aim is reality'" as their watch word.[51] For example, nothing couldbe less real than Englishmens' grasp of the relation of right to right. Whilst Englishmen accepted any new and inconvenient right, they were too apathetic to gather right about an old and long established right when it was being assailed or undermined:

> ...It is too easily forgotten by a people accustomed to Parliamentary debates, and lulled into somnolency by their soporific effect, that in order to act with power in the political world today Right is just as necessary as ever it was; and Nelson's maxim that, to negotiate with effect, force should be at hand and in a position to act, has not lost any of its validity since that famous leader of men successfully concluded his negotiations in the Baltic in the year 1801.

The English conceded to it at elections, the right to strike, hold up transport, coal supplies, or the food of the community. But, they shrank from it when vindicating right long established and traditional. It is this principle of Nelson's that formed part of the fascistic aim, which is reality. The state of Italy was lamentable. The whole country deplored Italy's small and inadequate share in the fruits of victory and began openly to attack the war party, the Government, and

the war profiteers.[52] The formidable state of the C.G.T. made the Socialist Party more truculent in their manner and more extravagant in their claims. When the public transport and postal services, industry and agriculture, were disrupted, the Italian fatalists, like the English, proposed to negotiate in surrender. However, Mussolini and his followers were less romantic and fatalistic. They realised the socialists and communists were claiming ever greater rights, because they were gaining ever greater might.[53] Viewing this situation in the fascist or "realistic spirit" they concluded that the only chance of making opposing rights prevail was not by tolerating their implacable opponents[54].

> ...it was to fling across the whole front of the Communistic and Socialistic forces another and, if possible, a superior form of Might. Nay, more! - they saw with the clarity of Southerners that this Might must not merely consist of a strong party with a voice, it must consist of a strong party with a weapon, ready to return violence for violence, blow for blow. And what was the result? everywhere, almost, the Fascists vindicated their right.[55]

The strength of the Fascists and their movement, was their speedy recognition of the realities behind the situation of post-war Italy. Ludovici believed the distinctive contribution of Italian fascism to modern politics was its realism. And provided Italian fascism retained this ideal it could not fail to flourish. Though Englishmen could not learn anything from Fascist methods, because national characters are too dissimilar, or from their programme, because national problems are too different, from Mussolini's first principle, "Our aim is reality"[56], Ludovici thought they had a tremendous deal to learn:

> ...For if the political life of England today is both feeble and decrepit everywhere except in the very quarters that are struggling for the overthrow of the existing order, it is precisely because there are no more principles urgently needed by modern Englishmen than the pursuit of reality, that hatred of fatality, that suspicion of clap-trap and romantic ideals,

> and, above all, that fervent patriotism, which
> are the heart and soul of the Fascist movement.[57]

The above is precisely what Ludovici desired, a movement sufficiently powerful to arrest the tide of degeneracy that threatened to ruin everything of value any.[58]

Ludovici shared with Fascists a concern on the importance of action, in the cause of national regeneration. Oswald Mosley, in Ludovici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle the romance of a thirteen-hundred lady, is bemused that the hero, James Gordon, a scholarly Egyptologist, advocated a race of 'supermen' and yet failed to grasp "'the very first principle of his teaching'" - by his inaction.[59] However, we are later informed that James Gordon did, indeed, realise the first principle of his teaching. Oswald Mosley recounts that James Gordon had invited him alone, among his friends, to his marriage to Catherine Doyle, a ten girl, because he thought Mosley appreciated that actions are everything:

> ..."'You seem to be the exception who realised that
> nothing one says matters, and that actions are
> everything. This is a fundamental law which I
> confess I did not believe you were vile enough to
> act upon, but when I saw that you did act upon it,
> I knew your worth.'"[60]

Similarly, when Oswald Mosley had visited James Gordon on his death bed, the latter had said that he could make no justification of his life, its only justification lay in his actions.[61] However, the invocation of action is rather a general characteristic of Ludovici's writings. The image of action and movement is evoked throughout his writings and cannot be found confined to a section of his works. Nevertheless, Ludovici did on occasion make the need for action more than just an offcut of his writings, and made explicit recognition of its primacy. He said, addressing the English History in 1935, that until they had succeeded in completely changing the unconverted populace any distinction between the deliberative and active side

of their movement in the business of purveying the new doctrine was artificial and unreal.[62] Even when the time came to translate the ideology of the English History into national institutions and customs, the distinction between the thinking and active functions of their movements would be pretentious because "it is impossible to separate thought from action, and executive cannot therefore be divorced or cut off from thought."[63]

Thus, as Indoviel believed there were no impediments to England's regeneration this chapter will describe his proposals for conservation to regenerate England. I shall introduce this with a discussion of Indoviel's principles for selective breeding:-

Introduction:
Health, Purity, and Discipline - the Principles of Selective Breeding

The prerequisite of Indoviel's scheme of selective breeding is his avowal of monism. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Workers, Indoviel says that will, conscience and spiritual strength, are impossible without those instincts being established through a long line of ancestors practising disciplined breeding leading to bodily symmetry.[64] Indoviel's denial of humanism was consistent with the ideals of his mentor, Nietzsche.[65] The Nietzschean Dr. Helmdo, in Eternal Fellows, believed that where a body is beautiful the soul can look after itself, and depreciated the modern tendency to see and to find desirable souls in foul, botched or ugly bodies.[66] Later in the novel, when Richard Latimer has to choose between his de-vitalised fiancée Gladys Morrison, and Eternal Fellows, he reminds his father, a view, that the choice is one of life, the living tissue, of flesh

and blood.[67] Gerald Weymorton, in Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, describes the second husband of Catherine Doyle, Mr. Symes, purely according to his physical qualities: "He was a fine animal."[68]

Ludovici believed that once people are valued according to the promise which they give in their own bodies and minds of guaranteeing the survival of human life in a desirable form, eugenic mating would supersede dysgenic mating.[69] Socratic humanism would be exploded and beauty would be cultivated in the human body as an indispensable factor in a full life:

> ...The old Puritanical belief that it is possible to have a beautiful soul, a beautiful character, and a beautiful mind in an ugly body with evil-smelling breath, will have to be recognised for what it is - that is, merely a credo for the comfort of repulsive people.[70]

Like the bugle, the visible aspects of a person and the peculiar note he emits, his mind or soul , when the 'breath of life' passes through him are inseparable and interdependent: Any modification of his form leads to a corresponding change in his mind or soul.[71] Ludovici believed that in our vital functions we are neither more nor less than animals.[72] Men, like animals, adapt to their environment. The Jews are a 'desert people' who have evolved, physically and mentally, to different ambient conditions to those of Englishmen.[73] Before a good initial endowment can be the possession of all, men must recover the monistic beliefs which existed in pre-Socratic times.[74] Owing to the quite indiscriminate emphasis that, for almost two millenniums, had been laid upon the 'soul' of human beings, there had been a corresponding tendency, increasing with the strides of Christian civilisation, to neglect "the purely animal sides of our natures, the mechanisms of bodily movement and their control, and, above all, the optimal relation of bodily organs required for smooth, uneventful and

successful functioning."[75]

Ludovici acknowledged that racism had been established in Nazi Germany to encourage the policies of selective breeding there. He reckoned urbanization, industrialization, and domestic luxurism which began to prevail with the spread of Protestantism, had led to the neglect of the body and favoured the multiplication of biologically inferior human beings. City and town did not breed the healthiest, strongest and most active members of the community they could not, therefore, cultivate a fastidious taste in standards of human desirability. Apart from the degenerative conditions and environments open to the town-dweller, by withdrawing the human being from the every day lessons to be learnt by watching cultivated plants and animals grow, and observing the conditions essential to their prosperity town life fosters a fantastic or unrealistic attitude to life which of itself constitutes mental unsoundness.[76] Industrialization intensifies the worst influences of urbanization. The factory can be served by 'types' which would not have the endurance or stamina for heavy farm work.[77] Industrialization creates a mass of physically deteriorated individuals, already removed from the instinctive realities of life by their urban habits, and a type of character that is passive and servile. Socratic tuition which had made urbanism and industrialization possible, had conditioned modern man to undervalue and neglect bodily standards.[78] Ludovici thought that one of Adolf Hitler's most significant acts was the expurgation of Socratic humanism in Nazi Germany.[79] Indeed, his assault on urbanism and industrialization would have been abortive had he failed to attack the values based on Socratic teaching which enabled both to flourish.[80] The sound in health and mind were the honoured of the German nation by such Nazi laws as that of July 14, 1933, to Prevent

the Transmission of Hereditary Diseases. By means of this law it became possible through sterilisation, to prevent men and women suffering from certain hereditary diseases by preventing them from having progeny.[61] A further measure, known as the law to Protect the Hereditary Health of the German People, of October 18, 1935, provided for the refusal of marriage certificates to all applicants who failed to reach certain standards of health.[62] The tenth paragraph of the law for the Reduction of Unemployment of June 1, 1933, provided that all young couples who desired to marry and who had not the means to do so, could obtain from the Government help to set up a home. However, loans were only granted under particular conditions:

> The parties to the marriage contract are required to be of German blood, hereditarily sound, and free from any disease, infection or otherwise, which would make their marriage incompatible with the public interest.[63]

From the Health Record Books of the Hitler Jugend to the biological selection of the S.S., Ludovici thought the Nazi Government had inaugurated Socratic humanism and favoured the sound in mind and body.[64]

It is significant that Ludovici was attracted to the Socratic beliefs that Nazi Germany propounded, by his advocacy of Nietzscheism. He believed that Nietzscheism was identical with much that was advocated and executed by the German National Socialist. He thought a good deal of the common ground between them was indicated by the mumblings of discontent which were discernible in the two leading Churches of the Third Reich.[65] Alfred Rosenberg's Der Mythos des 20 ten Jahrhunderts, of 1930, should be understood as no more than a reasoned advocacy of Nietzsche's leading eugenic and pro-Socratic values.[66] Socrates had effected a complete breach with the past. Homer was to a great extent moribund thenceforward. But, Aristotle made a very serious

and determined effort to revive it by combating the extreme consequences of Socratic dualism. Aristotle was essentially the thinker of the developed Church and of the scholastic system, whilst Socrates and St. Paul were the thinkers of primitive Christianity.[87] Protestantism was a reversion to Socratic Christianity. To Luther, Aristotle was "diabolically opposed to divine grace and consequently to God."[87] Protestantism was a return to primitive Christianity and Socrates. Thus, Nietzscheism which in one of its aspects is an attempt to restore pre-Socratic values, is sympathetic to Aristotle. And, if contemporary Catholicism seems to sponsor a Socratic teaching; this was not because such a teaching was traditional in the Church, but because in its conflicts with Protestantism "it has inevitably been influenced by its opponents' tenets, just as English Conservatism has through the decades of party politics become infected with liberalism."[89] Ludovici thought that although we were entitled to infer from the protests of the Evangelical Church in Germany, and even from the Holy Catholic Church there, that the influence on National Socialism of both Lagarde and Nietzsche was far reaching and profound, it did not follow that the National Socialists were on that account alone anti-Christian.[90] Ludovici reckoned that all the protests of Evangelicism and Catholicism meant was that National Socialism approved a Christianity purged of Socratic humanism and liberated from the pronounced influence of the Jews' early history:

> ...I submit, the frequent coupling of the names of Lagarde and Nietzsche by those leading members of the National Socialist Party who are responsible for the outlook and sentiment of modern Germany, and hence, too, the consistency of Nietzschean and Lagardian influence on National Socialism with an attitude still friendly to Christianity, although perhaps, it would be extravagant to hope that the Evangelical Church of Germany should be able to see the matter precisely in this light.[91]

According to Nietzsche, the history of mankind falls into two halves - the period preceding Socrates, during which the public estimate of a man always valued a man according to his biological worth, and the period following Socrates, during which the public estimate of a man always tended to neglect or ignore his biological worth. Nietzsche, and the National Socialists advocated a return to pre-Socratic values, which, by being concentrated on biological worth, would combat and eliminate degeneracy:

> ...it seems fairly obvious that there must be a strong Nietzschean influence in National Socialism, if only because of the powerful breath of pre-Socratic Hellenism which has prevailed in Germany ever since the N.S.D.A.P. seized the reigns of government.[92]

Indeed, Ludovici believed certain passages from Nietzsche could well have served as the outline of the National-Socialist programme.[93] He thought the best 'proof' that Nietzsche's inspiration was operating in the Third Reich was the husbandmans conception of pity, an emotion felt when the sound and valuable plant is in danger of being sacrificed to the unsound and worthless plant, replacing the urbanite's sentimental and unreasoning pity which is felt only for morbid or abnormal existences and is prepared to succour the latter irrespective of the cost to the sound, which the Third Reich had transvalued:

> "A medical certificate is a condition of any marriage", said Nietzsche, "endorsed by the medical authorities, in which a series of questions addressed to the parties and the medical officers must be answered (family histories)." and he made the demand for the marriages of the future
>
> This has already been realised legislatively, ... in modern Germany.[94]

In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Fascists, Ludovici discusses his proposals for creating an elite through selective

breeding. He says the reproductive powers would inevitably tend to decline through inbreeding, when the will is driven up to its maximum of organising power, and whenevery degree of energy the body possesses can be given a purpose within the individual himself and not outside himself in the form of an offshoot of himself.[95] Ludovici then proceeds to examine the ways in which this sterility may be avoided through judicious mixture. Although cross breeding to rejuvenate stock destroys character, this may only be temporary if the conflict is not too great.[96] Thus, an occasional cross, only ifconsummated with a people whose will and virtues have a direction not too extremely hostile to their own, may prove the salvation of a too highly inbred race.[97] In all the nations of antiquity, whether originally pure or mixed, after passing through a period of inbreeding sufficiently prolonged to have arrived at a harmonious working adjustment of their instincts there obtained an instinctive prejudice against the foreigner - "a conclusion that Gobineau draws in his book, L'Inegalite des Races Humaines, which I have sufficiently quoted."[98] Once endogamy and the development of a distinct culture create a sharp distinction between a race and its neighbours, further distinctions within a race are bound to occur, owing to the long practice of particular virtues on the part of the different strata of a race which were originally created by a bodily differentiation.[99] Ludovici advocated incest. The leader, conscious of his possessions in instinct, will, virtue, and beauty, is "intuitively disinclined" to marry someone who is not his like: "If he can, he will, as far as possible, marry within his family."[100]

Through Conservative propaganda and patronage selective breeding should be rendered popular.[101] Once the signs of human desirability were more commonly understood, through the expression of 'sound taste' a great and remarkable change could be effected.[102] In his A Defence

of Conservatism, Ludovici says conservatism is desirable because it is only in a stable environment that the slow work of heredity can build up family qualities, group virtues, national character, and racial characteristics.[103] It was on islands like Crete, Japan, and Britain, in peninsulas like Greece and Italy, and in naturally or artificially enclosed areas like Mesopotamia, China and Peru, that great peoples and great cultures have tended to arise, partly because of the greatest stability of environment that can be secured in such territories.[104] The formation of an ethnic whole out of a confusion or mixture of races requires just such an environment as these countries were able to provide for many centuries:

> ...Constant change, and interference from strangers, are prevented by natural or artificial barriers, while the habituation to similar circumstances, which is usually accompanied by an absence of mixed breeding with foreigners, secures precisely the requisite conditions for the formation of an original and powerful national outlook and temperament.

Above all, these conditions create a strong tendency towards conservatism in the people who suffer their influence.[105] Ludovici believed the English were the most conservative people in Europe because they had been least debauched by miscegenation.[106] It was impossible to conserve the identity of the English nation if Jews were allowed to modify its institutions and blood:

> ...True Conservatives, therefore, should always show themselves firmly hostile to (a) the principle of Jewish emancipation, which enables the Jew ultimately to influence our national politics and our culture; and (b) to any encouragement of a mingling of the two peoples, Jews and English, through marriage.[107]

England's character, culture and institutions, could not be conserved except by conserving its ethnic type. Medieval England was truly conservative in its attitude to the Jews by never encouraging them to settle, and in 1290, altogether expelling them.[108] By excluding the foreigner conservatives would be acting in accord with the true

and original dictates of their creed. It was the Tories who took the lead in the anti-alien demonstration that occurred in the reign of William IV, and on the question of miscegenation, showed themselves the national party in the early days of their history.[109] The necessity of facing and dealing with the problem of degeneration falls naturally within the province of conservatism, because conservatives are primarily concerned with the preservation of the nation's identity.[110] As the multiplication of thoroughly undesirable human material cramps the life of the sound and desirable, conservatives are concerned with its effects on the future of the English race and ultimately of the Empire. Public attention should be solicited and drawn to the possibility and urgent necessity of approaching the English population 'problem' from the qualitative standpoint. Conservative measures should aim at reducing and eliminating degenerate and undesirable stocks, and should protect existing sound and normal stocks from the chance of pollution and deterioration through misalliances and contact with decadent or polluted elements in the population:

> At first those cases might be dealt with which, while they are not acute enough to find their way into asylums and homes, nevertheless constitute a threat to the race if allowed to multiply; and it might even be necessary to increase for one or two generations the expenditure on public assistants, in order to isolate and segregate large numbers of people certified to be half-witted or tainted with some kind of hereditary ailment, either of the eyes, ears, or general constitution which would make the propagation of their kind undesirable.[111]

Mudovici regretted that the inter-war Conservatives contradicted and denegrated everything the Third Reich affirmed. With a view to conserving the identity of the German people, the inter marriage of men and women of German stock with people of Oriental, African and Negroid blood, was not only firmly discouraged by the National

Socialists, but the parties to such pacts also incurred various social drawbacks and forfeited many privileges. But, Conservatives in England discovered such measures:

> Unfortunately for England, this aspect of Nazi legislation had to be just as vehemently discredited and condemned as the rest, especially as a large and most influential section of the population in those islands, regarded it with particular horror.[112]

Ludovici shared his ideal of selective breeding with Nietzsche whom, he thought, with Gobineau, believed in those principles which are strictly maintained by breeders of animals throughout the world.[113] He thought one of the worst consequences of social disorder was the disturbance of a tendency, natural among men, to conserve and intensify certain aptitudes, certain native talents in a family line by means of the steady pursuit through generations of 'blood occupations'.[114] Indiscriminate crossing between the castes, each of which had its particular occupation, was loathsome to the ancient Hindus, Peruvians, Egyptians, and others: "The Guilds of the Middle Ages, too, I have no doubt, fostered alike reverence for blood occupations."[115] However, breeding between classes should not be completely prohibited, according to Ludovici. In Ludovici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, Gerald Swynnerton recounts to Knowles that James Gordon, Egyptologist, married the vital tea-girl, Catherine Doyle, to conserve his mind in a more robust body.[116]

The vital Cleopatra Dolomyne, in Too Old for Dolls, built up her vision of her ideal mate, not with the help of the feverish and morbid fancy of the romantic idealist, but guided only by the hints of an exceptionally healthy body. It was to her a dire need that her mate should have 'fire' and vitality.[117] Mr. Aubrey St. Maur, a friend of

the hero, Lord Henry Highborn, did have that vitality and warmth of blood, without which "the highest breeding is the extirpation of the animal at the expense of the man".[118] Ludovici tells us that Lord Dirle, the hero of What Women Wishes, like Disraeli, denied people's right to the title of aristocrat, whatever their ancestors might have been, if they themselves were no longer exemplars of the superiority of the "animal man".[119] His son, Lord Chiddingly, had married in 1917 and begotten one child. However, Lord and Lady Chiddingly had not married through 'love', as they know of the disastrous consequences of marriagesconsummated by 'love'.[120]

Ludovici's novel of 1922, The Goddess that Grew Up, is an elaboration of his ideal of incestuous mating. Circumstances had choked in Peter Oliver, the full and natural expression of marital devotion. The ill-health of his wife, Maud, had blighted his married life. As he was a law-abiding man, the emotions which else would have found their vent in the experiences of adult passion had turned with preternatural force in the inevitable direction of his daughter, Basilia.[121] Even as a maturing schoolgirl, though Basilia Oliver was not a shining light of learning and industry, as a personality, as the example of a "desirable kind of life", and for comeliness and grace, she assumed a natural lead.[122] She was attracted to the vital Roger Lambie, whose young eyes were already lambent with 'fire'. He promised life, but Peter Oliver terminated the relationship.[123] Peter Oliver observed the unmistakable signs of oncoming womanhood in his daughter. They filled him with fear and announced to him a term to his life.[124] Later in the novel, Basilia is powerfully attracted to the vigorous and elemental Mr. Cyril Bashfield Streeter:

> ...True, he was not the type that she had seen when on the motor tour with her father in France; he had not the inner fire, the red hot internal warmth. But it was precisely this deficiency

> that constituted his chief fascination, for he inflamed without heat, he breathed coldly, and combustion followed.[125]

Peter Oliver denies Mr. Cyril Penfield Streeter permission to marry his daughter. His deep objection to Mr. Streeter was accounted for by his own jealous love of his daughter; and by his instinctive feeling that once married to Mr. Streeter, Emilia, after having found in her husband a man quite the equal of her father in intellect and character, would be as much lost to him as if he were dead. Her marriage to a man of Streeter's gifts would finally destroy his leading part in her life. Consequently, he contrives to drive his daughter into a union with Brian Booth-Martin, which would nevertheless leave her father in the supreme position he had always held and which was now "more to him than his life". Hence his predilection for the inarticulate, ill-constituted, and unprepossessing son of the Booth-Martins.[126] Peter Oliver gives Mr. Streeter an unsafe mount in a riding exercise which leads to his death. He hoped his daughter would never be attracted to another suitor, as Mr. Streeter would provide her with a standard that would always be to the disadvantage of future lovers. But, this did not impress Mr. Truck: "'Life is more powerful than money and standards, and the very profundity of Emilia's grief over the last affair was sufficient proof of the vigour of her passion.'"[127] Mr. Truck's prognosis is correct. Emilia becomes attracted to an officer at a local P.O.W. camp. The officer had a tall and lithe martial figure; his eyes shone with 'fire' from under the peak of his field cap; whilst the fluid mobility of his muscles seemed "not only a proof but a promise of life."[128] Despite his cultivation his movements were still primitive; and the dominant way he treated other men, particularly inferiors, uplifted Emilia.[129] The mysterious officer is subsequently identified as Emilia's childhood suitor, Roger Lambe. For affection

for Emily Coothe-Martin, in whom Mr. Oliver had recognized for Cecilia the would have left him the bulk of her attachment and devotion unimpaired, forever.[130] In attempting to restrain Cecilia Oliver from Roger Marble, Peter Oliver stifles his daughter and figures the one living thing he had made it his principle to cherish, the one living thing that gave his life a meaning. Nothing could live in him after annealing out the efforts of a lifetime. He dies from a heart attack on striking his daughter. Cecilia Oliver and Roger Marble are married a year later in the tragic joy of life's embrace:

> The tragic passions that had enveloped them from the beginning, being part of their own blood and life, there was a fulness and depth in their joy which, like the flames splendours of a tropical sun, know little of smiling radiance.[131]

In Ludovici's novel of 1923, French Peace, Denise Biggadyke's private secretary, Cathy Urquhart, is engaged to the former's brother, Ernest. Cathy Urquhart was the inferior of Ernest Biggadyke in vigour and general health. Denise condemned the social aspects of the match and anything that prevented Cathy Urquhart from marrying Ernest Biggadyke must be right and something to applaud rather than deplore.[132] By the same principle Sir Thomas Braintree attempts to persuade Andre de Loudon, the hero, to renounce his engagement to Mildred Right and marry Denise Biggadyke, to promote life.[133] To Andre de Loudon, Sir Thomas Braintree had been a providential discovery in the wilderness of romance that composed modern England.[134] Eventually, Andre does renounce Mildred Right and becomes engaged to the vital Denise Biggadyke. Andre was 'electrified' by Denise's intense conversion to the creed of Life.[135] Dr. Hale, in The Taming of Don Juan, reminds his protege, Gilbert Milburn, that as a general rule in life, it is less important to be 'moral' than to choose one's mate with discretion.[136]

According to Ludovici, in his choice of the positive woman the Englishman should be instructed in the values of positive life.[137] The future is to the race which is most severely inbred.[138] Incestuous inbreeding is one of the most potent means of racial purity:

> It is certainly true that if the conventions and laws against inbreeding and incest were relaxed tomorrow, hundreds of thousands would be wiped out in two or three generations (through the defective 'inbreeding' unearthing the various taints), but those that survived would be magnificent creatures from which we might hope to rear a regenerated people; and degeneration, insofar as it is the product of miscegenation, would have been largely eliminated.[139]

The rewards of inbreeding would soon make themselves felt, and a regenerate manhood would be led by those stocks which had successfully survived a long discipline in inbreeding.[140] All degenerates would, in due course, be deprived of their liberty to reproduce.[141] Ludovici thought "aggressive measures" to enforce family limitations on degenerate parents would be a laudable accomplishment.[142] He advocated legislative powers for segregating, or otherwise enforcing infertility on those he deemed undesirable.[143] If the law did not sanction the violent elimination of all cases of degeneracy, crippledom, and abnormality, then a few brave and 'tasteful' fathers should lead the way, for the law to follow.[144] The science of human points must be brought up to the level at which animal connoisseurs have brought the points of horses, cattle, dogs, and other animals:

> ...Ultimately this science must far surpass the degree of perfection at which it is now found in animal connoisseurship. And all those who know so little about the interdependence of physical and psychical qualities as to retort with the familiar tag that 'human beings cannot be dealt with on the lines of a stud farm' should be invited to study the subject a little more closely, and above all to study the records of the world's greatest men with less party prejudice than hitherto.[145]

Malthus thought the use of contraceptives should only be authorized by a doctor's prescription, and that it should be made a criminal offence to prescribe them.[146]

To attribute the achievements of the English to their interbreeding, the original inhabitants of England, 'Dunkerians', were first invaded by Aryan Celts, who were a fair-skinned, yellow-haired and blue-eyed people. It was this compound race of pure Celts, mixed Celt-Dunkerians and pure Dunkerians, that are usually designated as 'Celtic' when compared to the Teutonic Celts, who came to England several centuries later. The Roman occupation, which was little more than a military garrisoning of the country, left little impression on this compound of two races. Besides most of the legionnaires in Britain were Gauls, Spaniards, Germans or Low Dutch, that is, themselves a mixture of Dunkerian and Celtic elements.[147] Neither did the series of invasions after that of the Romans alter England's ethnological composition. The Saxons, Scandinavians, Jutes, Danes, and Normans were all Aryan Celts. Thus, rather than being the outcome of numerous race mixtures, the English were at most a blend of Dunkerian and Celt. Throughout the Middle Ages and up to Cromwell's time they inbred and became a homogeneous type.[148] Inbreeding enables and isolates health and desirable qualities, just as it isolates and enables ill-health and undesirable qualities. Cross breeding conceals and spreads ill-health and undesirable qualities, and thus contaminates desirable stocks. Endogamy is the root of racial achievement:

> ...Cleopatra, whose wit, beauty and intelligence are proverbial, was the daughter of a brother and sister, great granddaughter of another brother and sister, and great-great-granddaughter of Epicrates who was both cousin and sister to her husband. Egypt declined only when her endogamic forces broke down.[149]

Rudolf's most detailed programme for collective human breeding is found in his The Choice of a Mate, of 1935, in which he idealises the machinery in antiquity and the Middle Ages for erasing race and class prejudices in the whole population, which prevented young people from reacting positively to a member of a foreign people or race.[150] Man should imitate nature's harsh principles:

> ...just as in Nature, natural selection eliminates individuals which are the outcome of two polluted streams breeding confluent in consanguineous unions, so the wise breeder, who imitates Nature's way, carefully weeds out unhappy specimens and carries on his inbreeding with constant selection.[151]

Man, like the other animals, has an instinct impelling him to canalise acquired qualities, and the natural law is not to have crosses, as Darwin believed, but to avoid them.[152] Rudolf referred to the convictions of Gobineau, amongst other racialists, to support his belief that incest is preventive of degeneracy.[153] Everything that can be said on the score of discord, conflict, and on inharmonious psycho-physical adaptations against the marriage of dissimilars, applies with even greater force to the mixing of races as the higher race is sacrificed.[154] Due to the independent inheritance of bodily parts the offspring of disparate parents may display all kinds of disharmony - too small or too large a liver for the size of the other abdominal viscera, and the like.[155] If the degenerate cannot be compelled not to breed, they should at least be encouraged or compelled to marry their like, as with everybody:

> It should be everybody's aim, therefore, especially if he or she is moved, to marry as close a relative as possible. As, however, for the moment, the love and prejudice prevent the choice of anyone nearer than a first cousin, it should be a sacred rule in healthy stocks (until the love are altered) to marry a cousin (preferably a first cousin), or failing that, to seek out a mate who individually, and in his or her stock is as like oneself as possible (his italics).[156]

Ludovici advocated the application of the policy of inconsumo breeding to every vocation.[157] A man and woman should know their mate's stock before committing themselves; people should be compelled by law to reveal as much as they can of their family history; and to medically examined before marriage.[158] Ludovici thought that Conway had demonstrated what was possible in the impossible of sanitary mating. His ideal was to prepare England to acquiesce in measures which would make medical certification and 'advice' a compulsory preliminary step to matrimony.[159] The introduction of compulsory medical certification before marriage would precede the establishment of consanguineous mating as a routine practice, and the condoning of infanticide as acceptable in the case of biological inferiority. Provided the English were compelled to adhere to these principles through discipline, their stocks would be completely purged of morbid factors in a few generations.[160] So bizarre was Ludovici's advocacy of selective breeding that he thought the more male and female clothes were assimilated, the better it would be for the nation. An efficient uniform for men and women would train the human eye to discern critically the different characters of the heterosexual male and female, and lead to their preservation.[161] The ideal uniform for both men and women would be the blouse and skirt:

> The ideal lower garment for men, therefore, there can be little doubt, would seem to be the kilt, or some other convenient modification of the flowing robe, open at the knee or calves, which the males of ancient civilisation were wise enough to wear. Since however, in our neighbours and friends, the Scots, we have a people who have wisely adopted a same lower garment for men, why on earth we should not emulate them, it is difficult to see. Nevertheless, if it is to necessary to have differentiated garments for the sexes and women choose to go into trousers, seems reasonably wise to prevent them; for this garment, ugly though it is, is certainly much more chaste than ours; it cannot injure them, and it is admirably calculated not to disarrange their pelvic developments.[162]

Ludovici advocated the enforcement of selective breeding by the Government.[163] Close consanguineous matings, those formed upon by modern society until law would, if tolerated in conjunction with infanticide, act as a clearance to the human stocks previously there.[164]

It was in his The Quest of Human Quality. How to save Europe, of 1932, that Ludovici most vehemently stated the case for selective breeding after World War II. His task was to determine how examples of 'flourishing life', an elite able to order their own and their followers lives in accordance with the conditions for a flourishing community, may come to be.[165] His thesis rests on the claim that a ruling elite is only possible where selective breeding has long prevailed.[166] In a natural state, where no artificial aids to subnormal functioning are available, optimal functioning was the prerequisite of viability. Since disharmonious organisms, those presenting a mosaic of independently inherited parts from disparate parents would not function with the efficiency of the more harmoniously proportioned, they tended to be ultimately eliminated owing to their inferior viability. Under the stress of rigorous conditions, allowing of no subnormal aberrations from the standard, we should expect, according to Ludovici, among primitive communities, a standardised type to be produced by generations of assimilation to the best adapted constitution, through the influence of segregation and inbreeding. It is the foregoing conditions which provided mankind with the requisite conditions for creating an elite.[167] Ludovici thought the active principle implied by the word 'race' turned, not on purity of descent from one of the primary divisions of mankind but on the avoidance of inheriting bodily parts from disparate parents, which can be reached only when morphological uniformity has been achieved by a stock.[168] The two fundamental rules for the action that is

to produce an elite race, firstly, that by means of segregation, inbreeding, ruthless selection, and the gradual psycho-physical subordination to which they lead, the undesirable effects of the independent inheritance of bodily parts from disparate parents must be rendered impossible; secondly, the regressions and reversions which result from random breeding between disparate types, stocks and strains, and the degeneracy which such reversions involve, must be prevented only by breeding from uniform stocks.[169] Ludovici criticised previous racialists like Count Gobineau, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Ludwig Woltmann, and others, for their loose treatment of the question of race and their exaggerated claims about the race each happened to champion. He thought that to advance any reasons for postulating in modern or recent Europe the superiority of the 'blond dolichocephalic Aryan', or 'Nordic' or 'Teuton' was scientifically "If isolation and inbreeding can endure long enough, even a heterogeneous people like those of present day Britain, could become a race."[170] However, Ludovici believed that to claim that there was no qualitative distinction between the races of men was even more absurd than to select the Aryans, the Nordics, or the Teutons as the leading race.[171] These races, or mixtures of races, which had been responsible for the highest civilisation, must have had exceptional endowments from the start.[172] Every race has its 'culture potential' beyond which it cannot go, unless it becomes mingled with a race of higher cultural potentiality than its own, a position of Ludovici's that he admitted was implied by Gobineau.[173] Thus, if selective breeding is to lead to an elite capable of founding, developing, and leading a high cultural existence, it must be observed by a race, or a mixture of races, already highly endowed before the period of segregation and inbreeding begins. But, whose cultures of outstanding merit have been created the following three conditions, according to

Ludovici had always been accidentally or 'unconsciously' observed by a people or combination of peoples highly endowed

> ...(a) the prevention of the inheritance of independent bodily parts from disparate parents, (b) the prevention of abnormality due to degeneracy, and (c) the acquisition by adequate selection and inbreeding of genetic homogeneity.[174]

'Race' did not have significance qua purity of descent from ancestors originally united, but qua descent from ancestors, mixed or united, who were originally highly endowed.[175] By insisting that miscegenation account for the decline of ancient civilizations 'scientists' like Gobineau, Madison Grant, Lothrop Stoddard, Huntington, Osborn, Keith, Volkerna, and the like, laid themselves open to attack because they implied that the principal harm of miscegenation lies in the destruction of the 'pure race' alleged to have been responsible for a particular civilization. Whereas, according to Ludovici, the principle harm caused by miscegenation, even with races highly endowed, was that it destroyed quality by introducing the factor of disparate parents and therefore of psycho-physical disharmony and conflict in the generations following the mixture, until segregation and inbreeding have once more had time to restore uniformity.[176] Ludovici claimed to be making an original advance from previous socialists by insisting that the active principle in the creation of human quality is not descent in an unbroken line from a highly endowed race, but biological uniformity and stability, secured by long periods of isolation and inbreeding subsequent to an original mixture of highly endowed races.[177]

Only when a people had subjected itself to selective and eugenic mating, and eliminated all hereditary taints from their family lines, could it entrench an elite. Irrespective of how mixed their ethnic origins may have been, they must protect their strictly endogenic

cultural development than the disturbing influence of the stranger. Those geographical conditions had favoured endogamy peoples of high quality have written

> ...wherever in Europe and the Near and Near East seats of culture have been performed and the very foundations of civilization have been laid, we encounter islands, peninsulas, or else naturally or artificially enclosed or insulated areas, such as the Nile delta, the land bounded by the rivers, lagoons, circumvallated cities and isolated Venice.[178]

Having discussed Ludovici's advocacy of selective breeding I shall proceed to discuss the other ideals that accompany the programme of regeneration that he proposes:-

1. The Role of Man and Woman

In his A Defence of Conservatism, Ludovici says that the mechanisms of heredity do not guarantee that every child will be the exact replica of its parents or the best combination of its parents' qualities. However, if the family is sufficiently large, heredity ensures that a favourable combination of the parents' qualities in one child, or in several children, occurs.[179] Similarly, in his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, Ludovici says that in order to carry on a great tradition and conserve the identity of the nation, a large family, which is the happiest and healthiest, is a necessity and duty.[180]

Ludovici was generally decried for his depiction of women as naturally subservient to men and fulfilling her role vital function, reproduction, by marrying young and having large families. Indeed, Ralph de Feneral

wrote a whole book as a refutation of Ludovici's anti-feminism.[101] He called Ludovici's views on the subservience of women "unmitigated nonsense"[102], and contrary to the development by women of their own freedom.[103]

Ludovici thought prostitution was more conducive to women's health and happiness than their employment in capitalistic industry which sapped "the very life out of the mothers of life".[104] And if prostitution was not to be tolerated then an adequate substitute should be found for it.[105] Ludovici's notion that women is subservient to men and life is consistent with his mentor, Nietzsche, who wrote that women can only be faithful to life[106], naturally antagonistic to men[107], but naturally subservient[108], and whose first and last function is that of bearing robust children.[109] Ludovici also admired Schopenhauer's anti-feminism[110] besides that of Nietzsche, who had raised his voice against feminism "who would have woman become ever more woman and man become ever more man."[111] In Ludovici's novel of 1918, Monsel Fellowes, the Nietzschean Dr. Rolfnde tells his protege, Richard Latimer, that Monsel Fellowes is a healthy and vital female who instinctively desires to serve the purposes of life and its multiplication.[112] He admired the Hindu custom of suttee in which "any woman could feel the death of her husband as the death of a lover without who life was no longer possible."[113]

Gerald Haymonton, in Gathering Days: the romance of a thrice-married lady, says to Fowler, his confidant, that no man thinks life is worth living unless he can exercise power over a woman.[114] The man of business, which he is, thirsting for immortality, turns instinctively to procreation.[115] Ludovici's novel of 1920, Too Old for Folly is

interwood with a poem called the "English Woman", which expresses the "natural" feeling of the nature woman to multiply life:

> Dear nature's anvil hot the hello,
> Who forge still glowing in her cheek.
> Intrued to you, like child provide
> Within her breast and fain would speak.
>
> ooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooooo
>
> Who seen her clad in muslin white,
> With eyes demurest and manner pale,
> May well be minded by the sight
> Of angels pure or cherubim.
>
> Yet, oh, the secret lusts of life!
> The thrills and throbs but half divined;
> The future and the great word "life",
> Which Ottilies occupy her mind.
>
> The wicked thoughts that come and go,
> The dreams that leave her soul aghast,
> And make her long to hold and know
> The entertaining truth at last!
>
> But still the life upon the plain,
> And in the arbour where she lolls,
> With horny gesture say again
> Too young for babes, too old for dolls.[196]

Mrs. Edith Dolmayne, the widow of a wealthy lawyer, made it clear to her daughters, Fenwicke and Gloucester, that they could only partake of some of her wealth if they married.[197] It was understood that if she died and her daughters remained spinsters they would inherit none of her wealth. She loathed the common sight in England of affluent spinsters growing pointlessly rotund on rich food in cosy hotels for parasitic nonentities.[198] Lord Henry Mayburn, the hero, proclaims to Mrs. Dolmayne that "physical and spiritual health is difficult without a normal sexual life."[199] It is a man's and a woman's object in life to multiply life. In Endovier's novel of 1928, The Seldom that Grow Up, the vital Mr. Oliver regarded the teasing breed of the "ladies" that paid court to his only child, Phillis, with feelings of mingled scorn and revolt. His natural philoprogenitiveness caused him to reflect on how inadequately his life had been filled. He shared

under the growing conviction that his choice of wife was unfortunate.[200] He attempts to oppose his desire for Nell by telling on his daughter and almost incestuously forbidding her to marry. But, Estella is called to by Life and is induced to measure the fullness of her life with that of other lives about her. Her old schoolfriend, Miss Taylor, had married Stephen Jermyn and been his a child. This bedrudely awakened Estella to the injurious nature of her own natural blessings. Much time she visited the contented Mrs it was impressed upon her that her life, "with all its comfort and luxury, was more of an empty parade, a vain pretense of life, than life itself."[201]

Sir Thomas Brainbroo, in Brook Farm, says to Denis Biggadyke's father that a proper relationship to a woman means a relationship in which the man inspires the woman with feelings of voluntary submission.[202] Andre de Loudon, the hero, fulfills this masculine role. He felt able to possess the woman he loved absolutely.[203] He nurtures and subdues Denis Biggadyke with his ardent masculinity.[204] The whole of nature seemed to quiver with life and growth when Andre spoke to Denise: "her ears rang with the words, but they had no effect on her brain except to fire it."[205] Andre de Loudon had effected a momentous transformation within Denis Biggadyke, restored her to life:

> ...It was as if her whole body had suddenly been converted into a vessel of living, dancing stars and shooting meteors; as if her blood had in an instant become a torrent of flashing crystals charged with explosive vitality. She possessed -- through her veins to her very fingertips, causing a feeling of formlessness even in the roots of her hair, and then, returning to gather strength as it were, at the waist which he [Andre] had clasped, seemed their flow, settling fire as they sped and projecting titillating shafts of exquisite warmth and comfort to the whole surface of her skin.

She had to exert all her strength to refrain from acting to the cadence

of the unselling vitality within her. Never had she felt so vital by submitting to the male.[206] She relinquished all self-direction to Jake.[207] Mike called her to abandon the Woman's Independence League and the "hectic Bohemianism of Ben."[208] In his novel of 1924, The Sorrows of Man Jaya, Ludovici expresses his contempt for the wealthy Underhill spinsters who had dismissed Gilbert Millburn for causing the illegitimate pregnancy of Miss Dale.[209] Dr. Hale explains to Frances Vandegrave that the indiscriminate charity of wealthy spinsters was applicable as their vain attempt to prove themselves useful to life.[210]

In his Man's Descent from the Gods or, the complete case against prohibition, of 1928, Ludovici asserts that in the myth of Prometheus, Pandora's part in the severe punishment Zeus is said to have administered to mankind for their complicity in Prometheus's theft of fire, is indicative of woman's intolerableness. As with the alternative Semitic account of the origin of evil it is Eve who brings Cain's wrath upon mankind.[211] Both myths seem to imply intimately connected with the events which led to the close of a 'Golden Age', and to the advent of an era of degeneracy.[212] Women see in the best man no change of exercising petty power. Indeed, they have no senses capable of appreciating the best that Nature has had to, or no taste whatever."[213] The mothers' instinctive lust for petty power turns with greater affection and attachment to the cripple than to the well-constituted child. Thus, the females wisely left it to the fathers to decide which infants were to be sacrificed, as they knew of women's intolerableness.[214] Women's fundamental lack of taste is not dangerous provided they remain under masculine control. But, it becomes a social menace when women's influence can be felt outside the home.[215] The worst consequence of women's lack of taste

is that she will always tend to comport with the most undesirable kind of man, because of her lack of taste and lust of petty power, and this reduces the value of human stock.[216] Eve & Pandora were the first lethal instances of woman's tantalisations. Eve becomes an easy prey to the Devil; Pandora goes over to the Titans. The Devil is the archetype of the 'Promethean man'; whilst Epimethous and Prometheus, with both of whom Pandora became associated, belonged to the worst results of the cross between the Cro-Magnons and the remote ancestors of the ancient Greeks, the Aryans. Adam, too, was of the 'Promethean type', and allowed himself to be influenced by a woman, for which the Cro-Magnon or God punished him:

> ...And see how deeply the Cro-Magnon, the Dionysian - that is to say the man whom I believe to have been the original of the god of the Jews and Christians despised him for it.[217]

As woman's lack of taste constituted a steady pull towards degeneration she must be controlled by man.[218] Ludovici advocated the exclusion of women from public life. He feared spinsters would interfere with the social liberty of men to gratify their inclination for exercising power. Hence the contempory prohibition of alcohol in America.[219]

Ludovici's ideal for the role of man and woman is most eloquently portrayed in his Woman. A vindication, of 1923. His thesis is that whether we contemplate woman in the role of adultress or the staunchest of lovers, both her strengths and weaknesses are the outcome of her best and most vital qualities.[220] Woman's destiny is stamped indelibly on her body, to achieve two primary adaptations - that to the child and that to the man:

> Immersed as Woman obviously is, up to her shoulders in the business of life and its multiplication, let it be said plainly and unequivocally: all those who teach her that any other business is her business, all those who, in face of the dilemma of modern problems,

> confuse her with tales about a true womanhood
> away from life and its multiplications; all those,
> in short, who beguile her with promises of
> happiness, contentedness, or even comfort,
> without her primary adaptation to man and the
> child, are liars both unscrupulous and criminal.[221]

She is much more in touch with the forces of life than man.[222] But, women cannot live lives or enjoy life independent of men.[223] We should recognize in woman a creature richly equipped for life, and with the whole of her trunk and nervous system intricately organized for it, so that woman cannot evade the correlation of her bodily parts without entertaining thoughts of suicide.[224] Woman is wed to life when she is born.[225] Woman's strengths and weaknesses all serve a vital purpose: "If she has virtues they will be offshoots from the reproductive instinct; her vices will be the same. For immorality, if she is capable of it, will be life's immorality, vital immorality, positive immorality."[226] Woman, being an unordered and unarranged form of Life, yields to man's social instinct which is the unremitting and endless harmony of his existence.[227] The body approves any manifestation of order, particularly the sexual union, "this approval, this never to be forgotten chorus of praise that our body sings, in spite of ourselves, is the sign that our [man's] social instinct feels gratified (his italics)."[228] It is man's social instinct that guides him in the way he should gratify his longing for the stream of Life, woman, and the way he should meet the responsibilities having gratified it.[229] Ludovici says the approval of a man by a positive, vital, well-built girl is a certificate of potency, and healthy life acquiescing in one of its essential means to multiplication.[230] He advocated polygamy.[231] The wife should be understood as a keeper of the home, as a mother, and as a guardian of the home comforts.[232] The husband should have a concubine to ensure that he does not weary of his relationship to his wife.[233] Even if a woman commits adultery she is still faithful to Life and

serving the fundamental purpose of the race.[234] If the female that is positive to life cannot tolerate long absences on the part of the male without endeavouring to seek fertilization elsewhere who cannot be blamed.[235] Ludovici reckoned the presence of a body of unemployed females, or spinsters, in any nation must exercise a morbid influence upon the life of that nation.[236] The spinster does not directly flow with the main stream of life, she is merely a spectator:

> Nor will it necessarily console her, or reconcile her to her relatively unimportant fate as a spectator, to point to the pain, the passion, the disappointments, the hardships, the disease and the poverty that lash the main stream of life like a flail. If she is honest, she will tell you what everybody else feels - that she would risk all those things to be in it.[237]

As the life of the individual female is prolonged, and the tone of the reproductive organs depreciate through the deleterious influence of idle waiting, there occurs an abatement of the 'unconscious influences' impelling the positive spinster to seek a fuller life.[238] Ludovici advocated recognising prostitution as an indispensable public service.[239] By contrast, he thought the spinster only impeded and retarded the machinery that counts life.[240] When women enter commerce, industry, the civil service and the professions, they are betraying their role in life.[241] The wealthy spinster is the extremist aspect of feminism. She is a blind alley of the stream of life, where the forces that have produced her come to a dead stop. Her household expenditure, her retinue, and her disbursements for humanitarian and religious objects, exact a toll on the community, which retards the fluency or security of the stream of life:

> ...About them in smaller and conspicuously poorer houses are the inhabitants of the village - small families with parents struggling to make both ends meet, with children frequently underfed and under-clothed, but all of them belong to the main stream of life, and constitute the only justification there is for the existence of the town and the village itself,

> the Church, and all the machinery of social life. The spinster ladies from their wealthy fastness, with its carriage drive, its troops of servants, its rich solid furniture, and its overfed animals, look down upon the busy scene about them. They are not part of it, but merely spectators drawing their profit, their life's blood from it... their presence, in the best house for miles around, is really only a means of impeding the machinery facilitating the flow of the stream, a means of causing friction in its movements.[242]

Ludovici says that from every political point of view, all of which he embraces, whether "monarchic, aristocratic, oligarchic, democratic or socialistic", it is impossible to justify the lives of wealthy spinsters. They should be regarded as a dangerous and intolerable burden on the life of the community.[243] It should be emphasised to parents that marriage is what they must seek for their daughters and what they must train them for.[244] Ludovici advocated that the Government ensure that all work outside the home should be exclusively reserved for men, poor married women, or middle-age widows. He hoped the latter would facilitate early marriages.[245] Spinsters should be segregated in isolated institutions and their activities, their opinions, and their wealth, controlled by a policy beneficent to the nation as a whole.[246] Whilst woman's lack of taste on the one hand, and her love of petty power on the other, exercised a deleterious and dangerous influence on modern society, Ludovici suggests that they are too vital to be tampered with without jeopardising the survival of the species.[247] The 'solution' to the problem of feminism lay in the control of women by men:

> The only admirable solution lies in the direction, not of changing woman - that would be suicidal to the species - but in limiting her power, in controlling her influence... Woman must be redefined. Her sphere must be once again delimited and circumscribed, if her vital and precious instincts are not, in their effort to extend 'out of bounds', to drag us steadily down into the abyss.[248]

Both in her strengths and weaknesses woman is entirely the creature of vital impulses that are indispensable to the species.[249] As Woman's

most vital principles cannot be eradicated without destroying her utility, so the deteriorating influence of her vital principle cannot be tolerated. In chapter 4, "The Virtues and Vices of Women"[250], Ludovici says in women are to be found the principal virtues that make for a continuation of the human species on earth: Unreflecting constancy to the demands of Life; untiring interest in the processes of life and its multiplications; a capacity for bravery in defending or succouring human life; a capacity for single minded devotion to her offspring; a capacity for chastity until her affections are captured.[251] Woman does not pause to deliberate when performing vital actions. If she reflected it would presuppose inaction. Only her emotional capacity is capable of directing the unreflecting forms of action that the demands of Life impose upon her: "A mistress of feeling, therefore, we cannot expect her to be so perfect at reflection."[252] However, woman's tastelessness, like nature, indiscriminately pursues life and its multiplication at all costs.[253] If the female's lack of taste is not overridden her influence leads to the survival of a vast number of undesirable human beings. Although her lack of taste is part of the scheme of life, it tends to degeneration.[254] Thus, woman must be restored to the charge of man.[255]

Ludovici reckoned women should not be enfranchised because as the custodians of Life, with all the strengths and weaknesses that involves, women cannot be at the same time entrusted with the ordering of Life.[256] Woman's nature possesses strengths and weaknesses which, though of incalculable value to the purposes of life, renders it a dangerous element in the direction of public affairs.[257]

In the fourth chapter of his Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman, "Future Woman"[258], Ludovici says that hitherto the

conception of masculinity has been too limited.[259] In addition to courage and proficiency in sport, man must expect of the manly man the following attributes:

> ...will-power, leadership, mastery over the mysteries of life, and not humiliated fear in their presence, intelligence sufficient to overwhelm any female brain that is placed alongside of his...and clarity and decision regarding every problem that it concerns him to understand - in fact, a man whose presence alone makes the claim of sexual equality a manifest and transparent absurdity.[260]

He desired a "Masculine Renaissance", indispensable for the salvation of modern humanity.[261] He advocated the legalisation of concubinage[262] and the withdrawal of women old enough for matrimony from industrial, commercial, and public life, and the revival of domestic industries.[263]

Ludovici conceded to being abused rather than answered in his dealings with feminists.[264] Indeed, he was, for attempting to "convince us that woman is an animal completely devoid of any intellectual apparatus and merely endowed with the instincts requisite for the attainment of bodily necessities."[265]

Ludovici believed the achievement of civilisation had taken place more readily in societies organised on patriarchal principles.[266] In the course of evolution each sex had evolved instincts, emotions and mental powers related to the kind of life that it would have to lead.[267] In his role of initiator, man develops leadership, dominance, originality, independence. In her role of passive imitator, woman develops unconsciousness, irresponsibility, imitativeness, dependency.[268] According to Ludovici, if a male is adequately equipped he will proceed to initiate and to lead in everything.[269]

In his The Right-Honourable, or, the case against birth-control and an alternative, of 1928, Ludovici says that birth-control by leading

to the indiscriminate limitation of families in dysgenic.[270] Nature's way has always been to select post-natally:

> ...If natural selection has contributed at all towards the evolution of man, it has done so post-natally, for it is only when an individual is formed that his characteristics and potentialities are determined, and his fate in the life struggle can be left to depend upon them.[271]

He reckoned that if the average healthy woman's reproductive life is over twenty years, and the optimum interval between births in healthy conditions is two and a half years, then a family of at least eight or ten children should be the norm.[272] And, it is of the utmost importance from the standpoint of the welfare of any race or nation that heredity should be given as many chances as possible to achieve the best combination of stock qualities.[273] The artificial limitation of the family by birth-control sacrificed innumerable hordes of the best in every generation.[274] Ludovici even attributed the loss of discipline in modern society and the prevalence of individualism to the small family system.[275] Ludovici thought Puritanism, which sees nothing desirable in life or more life, was the characteristic attitude of all birth-controllers and feminists[276]:

> ...in both we find the same strong vein of sophistry to support a position that does not bear a moment's examination, the same denial of the healthy woman's right to normal functioning in sex, ... the same note of incurable pessimism, which, being only the expression of an innate hopelessness and lack of joie de vivre in the individual birth-controller or feminist, makes him wish to bring all humanity into step with his funereal march and into harmony with his obsequial dirge.[277]

Ludovici recommended prolonged lactation until the child is two years old as he thought it would prevent conception, and enable the three year optimum interval between births to be attained, without any contraceptive precaution.[278] He believed the consequence to women who waited the average twelve or more years between first menstruation and first pregnancy was the loss of the tone, strength, and efficiency of

their reproductive structures.[279] He thought that when the stimulative changes which occur in the organs and breasts of a woman at every menstrual period, are not followed by their normal sequelae, gestation, parturition and lactation, cancer of the breasts, ovarian, and womb are of frequent occurrence.[280] Thus, a woman who marries when she is twenty-five and a half, the average age in England, and has her first child at twenty-six or twenty-seven is relatively senile.[281] The parturient female should be regarded as the emblem of the joy of life; birth-controllers reviled as Puritans; and doctors who advise anaesthetics for child-birth stigmatised as ascetic kill-joys.[282] Ludovici thought that women should become more reconciled to extra-marital pregnancies, and appreciate that pregnancy is the fulfillment of their being and a more merciful termination of a relationship than sterility.[283] He reviled the law forbidding marriage before thirteen as absurd.[284] Abortion, with its lethal risks, should only be granted to the woman who is mentally defective, as both herself and potential child are "human rubbish".[285] Life and its multiplication involves sacrifice of something. But, it should not be of healthy mothers.[286] Ludovici advocated rendering abortion illegal.[287] Adolescent girls should marry men of their father's age, or at least over twenty-five.[288] Ludovici thought womens' taste for domestic and maternal duties was immeasurably more important to them than academic knowledge, "so much trash".[289] He admired the extraordinary and sudden rise in the birth-rates in both Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany, where difficulties had been placed in the procuring of contraceptives, and large families encouraged.[290] We should regard higher education for women, and the practice of securing careers for women, as a means of disposing merely of those girls who belong to an inferior biological class - the congenital feminist.[291] Ludovici regarded feminism as just another liberal trick and slogan

which amounted to an emancipation from self and the love of life, indeed, a freedom to go wrong and destroy the very meaning of life for everybody.[292]

Ludovici believed that Nazi Germany by demonstrating upon an ideal of woman as wife, mother and domestic mate, and its conviction that only then can women secure happiness and health, was in harmony with Nietzsche's and his own ideals.[293] Nietzsche understood by tenderness and chivalry towards women, precisely what Hitler understood, that is, providing her with the norms whereby she may function normally as a mother and a wife. Ludovici claimed that Hitler believed, as Nietzsche did, that the women of a country are what their menfolk make them:

> "It is men who corrupt women", declared Nietzsche, "and everything that women lack should be atoned for and improved in men - for man creates for himself the ideal of woman, and woman moulds herself to the ideal... We must educate men better."[294]

Ludovici reckoned that one of the principal causes of the persistently high rate of maternal morbidity and mortality, as also of the general prevalence of difficulty and pain in child-birth, was the relative senility of the average mother at her first child-birth.[295] He regretted that the status of the race-mating woman was low because of "Syphilo-phobia and Puritanism."[296] He advocated making work outside the home illegal for married women.[297] In his pseudonymous novel of 1939, Lords Thurlestone, Ludovici idealised Mary Parker, the domestic servant in Mr. Melton-Smith's employ. She was thoroughly content in her position and "could look with her tongue the girls who flaunted their freedom and finery before her."[298] Good mothers and housewives should be publically honoured and rewarded[299], and domestic service should be the only occupation for a woman.[300]

Just as Ludovici based his ideal for the role of men and women on biological or life differences, he did the same in regard to the role of authority vis-a-vis youth. He suggested that the the principle service that age could render to youth, the benefits of its life experience, was discredited of respect and deference in an age of indiscriminate change acclaimed as 'progress'[301].

> ...even those children, who today have the advantage of a wise parent whose experience would be a valuable addition to their life-equipment, forfeit this advantage owing to the need that is the very air they breathe. To respect parents is no longer the thing. It is not done.[302]

Ludovici's fervent exaltation of natural authority, discipline and authority, and the natural hierarchy, conflicts with his contradictory fervent exaltation of youth.[303] Disregarding this inconsistency, Ludovici reckoned that in an aristocratic society ruled by values which recognise a 'natural hierarchy' among human beings, child adulation should be deprecated and the child's claims on adult attention circumscribed.[304] A he adult should displace the child's 'pleasure principle' with the 'reality principle'.[305] Small families were anathema to Ludovici because they were particularly averse to discipline.[306] Ludovici demanded a tightening up of discipline in instruction and tuition. The formal prescription of rules to oppose the discipline of the 'reality principle' to the impulses proceeding from the child's 'pleasure principle', to help the child to acquire 'anatomy of life in the real world's self-discipline; chastisement and bodily punishment of children in every department of life, particularly in the home.[307] The child must be schooled and disciplined to adjust his life to the demands of society.[308] Ludovici asserted that the romantic notions of child instruction derived from Rousseau's Emile had led to indiscipline, and should be 'rejected':

> ...One is a freer and better educator if one not only dismisses every notion of the child's alleged

> higher moral worth, but also if one always remembers that he who is about to put on his manor should not be ranked above him who, if not about to take it off, has at least worn it in life's fray much longer than the child.[309]

Education should be an education in life. Conservatives should reduce the educational system's curriculum. The minimum requirements of a sound life should be given a much more important place in the school programme. The children of England ought to be taught their native tongue especially, because it is of value from day to day in life.[310] The chief object of education should be mastery in life.[311] Ludovici shared this conviction with Nietzsche, who wrote that the ancient Greeks "subdued their inhumanly insatiable thirst for knowledge by their regard for life, by an ideal need of Life - since they wished to live immediately that which they learnt."[312]

In Ludovici's novel of 1921, What Women Wished, Lord Chiddingly, the hero, proposed a grand scheme of educational reform, according to which English was to become the leading subject in all elementary schools, at the cost of subjects which he thought most working class children forgot as soon as they started work, and there was to be substituted a new gentle training "in the sound principles of life".[313] In Chapter VI of his The False Assumptions of "Democracy", "Education"[314], Ludovici says happiness and harmony are more easily achieved by a people holding sound views concerning life than a people versed in knowledge.[315] Only those elements of a scholastic curriculum are turned to practical use, or remembered, which came into daily use throughoutlife A working class boy remembers his tuition in reading, because he practices it daily in life.[316] Whilst the children of the poor were sufficiently in touch with life's realities to know its fundamental truths, the children of the wealthy, removed from life's realities,

more particularly susceptible to fantastic doctrines.[317] Indeed thought children should be taught the 'correct' meaning of words, to impart to them a stock of realistic ideas about life and humanity:

> ...without feeling shy of the natural repulsion that healthy boys would instinctively feel towards a moral or philosophical lecture, they would nevertheless be able to choose a philosophy of life, the lack of which in education today is one of its principal blemishes.[318]

The moral education of a life led in a large family is more valuable to the individual and the race than the absorption of information.[319] Rudolphi believed that one has only to live a short while among the learned and scholarly to be convinced that education is no promoter or guarantee of virtue.[320] Discipline should be the fundamental object of education.[321] Rudolphi admired ancient Sparta, where boys at the age of seven left the company and tutelage of women entirely, in order to come wholly under the supervision of men, to give them fitting models for imitation, and to learn masculine arts and skills.[322] He was intolerant of co-education.[323] He believed an essential branch of education was not merely familiarising the young with literature, the arts, and giving them standards of quality in manners and speech, but above all, cultivating taste in life:

> ...the training of their eye in the aesthetics of the human form, so as to enable them to judge with approximate accuracy the Health, Carriage, Bodily Proportions, probable Character, and Stamina, of their fellows. Then, they may be helped to discriminate wholesomely and prudently when the time comes for them to decide on the choice of a bride and even in the choice of their Associates.[324]

So though Schopenhauer had anticipated a later mood by emphasising the importance in education of accustoming the young mind to the facts, deeds and laws of reality, and condemning the reading of fiction and fantastic romances, specifically the works of Scott and Walter Scott's "Above all things", he said, "we must strive to lead them [the

children] to a clear grasp of reality."[325] Because a man may not be able to parse a simple sentence, or add, divide and multiply fractions, it does not mean that he is ignorant. The fully trained farmhand who can plough, rear animals, repair houses, understand dairy farming and the breeding of dairy cattle, drill a field of corn and build and thatch a stack, is not ignorant.[326] Ludovici believed that there are many aspects of human existence concerning which only a long "life-schooling" can yield valuable lessons.[327]

2. The Nietzschean Ethic

In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, Ludovici says of the first three chapters that they may appear to the superficial Nietzschean to be contrary to the first principle of a healthy morality by laying all stress upon the duties of the governing classes to the working classes. But, he says, at a time when the leisured classes do not fulfill their arduous and profound duties they cease from being the greater portion of a people. They are the victims who should be sacrificed:

> ...In the eyes of a philosopher, the sacrifice of inferiors, when the ostensible superiors are simply parasites, or very nearly so, is an intolerable evil. It is only when the superiors are leading a grand march, the benefits of which must inevitably conduce to a greater degree of healthy, flourishing and beautiful life - it is only then that the sacrifice of inferiors can for an instant be tolerated or condoned. It is only then that the work and those devoid of power, if the necessity should arise, may with the gloom conscience of the community, be left to perish by the wayside, or be exploited for the profit of life, the intensity and excellence of life.[328]

All preparation for salvation in a decadent society consists in tightening the strings of the hearts of the people. What is needed is

a Nietzschean 'transvaluation of values', for the recognition of superior life when it appears.[329]

Arnold believed Conservatives should make a vigorous attempt to disseminate among the people a moral tone which would educate public opinion to regard all prosecution of the unsound and tainted as despicable and revolting.[330] In his *A Reform of Conservatism*, Arnold realises that if the measures to the nation who are unhappy and prefer change of any kind before a continuation of their suffering, there is a crucial distinction between those who suffer because of unwise conditions imposed upon them by inconsiderate rulers, and those who suffer from themselves because of their degeneracy.[331] If conservatives meet the demands of the latter they will penalise the whole nation and reduce its vigour and its standards.[332] He extolled that up to the time of the Grand Rebellion, when the monarch was still the protector of the people, the health of the nation and its welfare had been matters of government concern. The Prince in the Middle Ages extirpated leprosy in Europe by measures which sacrificed the less to the greater. Conservatives, as realists, should consider the sound and healthy first and not be considerate in regard to those people who are a danger to the life of the rest of the community.[333] The vast proportion of these people who existed in hospitals, homes, workhouse institutions, and private families who were not self-supporting should not be regarded as desirable.[334] Pity should only go to the limited section of the nation that was still whole and desirable.[335]

Arnold was admired, by few, as prophetically demanding the selected sacrifice of the world's internal elements of society.[336] He heralded "a gathered sacrifice of degeneration in what is timidly imagined to

to a Russian revolution."[337] His notions of sacrifice was certainly consistent with that of his mentor, Nietzsche. The latter believed that poverty, violence, slavery, and 'evil' of every kind served as a will for the elevation of man.[338] Nietzsche adopted the position of the moral relativists, there are no absolute values 'good' and 'evil'.[339] Concepts of good and evil are mere means to an end, expedients for anything goes.[340]

> Nietzsche teaches that nothing is stable - not even values - not even the concepts good and evil. He likens life unto a stream. And that being and nothing are alike the stream, and they seem to stand still. Many will be reminded of good and evil when they look upon those teachings for them there are values above over the stream of life, and life flows on beneath them and forever this standing.[341]

Nietzsche protested against reading a moral order of things in life's "Life is essentially immoral!".[342] For Nietzsche, and Rudovici, all that increases power is good whilst all that springs from weakness is bad. The first principle of their ethics is that the weak and ill-constituted should perish.[343] The superfluity of energy in the strong is the motive force which explains their will to overpower, to create, and "to sing, shout, spring, play, romp, kill, oppress, and seek danger." Their natural functions of the strong are regarded as 'good' by those who possess them.[344] Rudovici thought Nietzsche had been mistakenly interpreted as an [a]moralists

> ...the dog-breeder drowns the sickly individuals among a litter of puppies. If the mother be excessive for the bitch, and he can find no foster-mother, he unscrupulous even promising young dogs for the sake of the ideal dog-family, which he has in mind. Life - a double life - demands sacrifice, and not sacrifice for a metaphysical point, but, more often, for a physical one.[345]

Some must be sacrificed if an ideal race is to be attained.[346] Rudovici believed moral altruism, not egoism, was the bonsai of Nietzsche's 'philosophy'.[347] Throughout human history there had been an eternal struggle between the strong and the weak, the healthy and the sick.

the concept of 'good' of the powerful is the 'master morality'; the 'good' of the weak is the 'slave morality'.[348] Nietzsche was the first to realize that the 'master morality' makes life more attractive, more justifiable, and more acceptable on earth.[349] 'Bad' in the 'master morality' is applied to all that springs from weakness.[350] Nietzsche divided life into an ascending and descending line;[351] and maintained that wherever the 'master' morality prevailed it favoured an ascending line of life and therefore favoured the multiplication of a desirable type of man; and he was equally convinced that wherever the 'slave morality' was supreme, life tended to follow the descending line.[352] The Christian or 'slave morality' dubbed all manly and vital virtues wicked, and preferred to set the life of the whole world at stake, rather than relinquish that deficient vitality was the greatest sin of all[353] :

> In Christian values Nietzsche read nihilism, decadence, degeneration, and death. They were calculated to favour the multiplication of the least desirable on earth; and, as such, dermite his antecedents and with his one desire, 'the elevation of the type man', always before him, he condemned Christian morality from top to bottom. This magnificent attempt on the part of the low, the base and the worthless, to establish themselves as the most powerful on earth, must be checked at all costs, and with terrible earnestness he exhorts us to alter our values.[354]

The leader, to whom Nietzsche appealed, was obliged to sacrifice the pity of the 'slave morality' and learn to be 'harder' in his sympathies.[355] In Ludwici's novel of 1918, Manuel Fellowes, the Nietzschean Dr. Helbedoinotzsetz his protege, Richard Latimer, that in his choice between his fiancee Gladys Morrison, and the vital Manuel Fellowes, it is his duty to promote the best, the strongest, and the most beautiful on earth. It is life's design.[356] The 'type' of woman who we wish to see preserved and multiplied is a question of taste that links to the very roots of life, the the source of human tissue. It is a vital, life or death, question.[357] Dr. Helbedo contends that desirable

life is produced only by a morality that aims at creating the flourishing human being. Any morality that can apply the epithet 'good' to any act or living form which is not compatible with the flourishing human being is bad because it militates against the co-operation of human life by encouraging the opponents to multiply.[358] The Thomas Malthus, in *Thoughts Upon*, opines to the hope. Adds to Godwin, that a man's and a woman's real value is solely the extent to which they guarantee human survival in a desirable form. Those who offer this guarantee have a prior claim to regard, and superior rights over all those who are less desirable: "right due the needs to the blind, the crippled, and the physical wrecks, who have no claims whatsoever, and then only charitablity has and the bad taste to encourage to multiply."[359] The Thomas Malthus dedicates his life to opposing the morality which, assuming equality between human beings, gives the fool of breath the same chances of survival as the 'savoury' and fragrant.[360]

Godwin believed that man could not begin to ascend until the value which makes it virtuous to sacrifice the greater for the less is transvalued into the ethical value that it is virtuous to sacrifice "the rubbish for the precious (his italics)."[361] Abnormal, crippled, defective, incurable, and undesirable people should be perceived as a burden and an oppressor andshould not be allowed to live.[362] The energy, space wealth, and space time of the community would then be directed to the desirable.[363] Godwin praised the Middle Ages, when English people were chiefly agricultural, and therefore knew the laws of moral and desirable life. It was recognised that in times of famine and epidemics, the moral were first. If sacrifice were imperative the unsound were the victims chosen:

> ...the populace in periods of distress, resulting from epidemics would, for instance, clamour for

> the slaughter of the leprous, the cretins, and the idiots of the community. It is true that they often did this from the wrong motive, that is to say, they ascribed the distress itself to the presence of the physiologically botched in their midst; but, as a proof that there was method in their madness, and that they were not quite as blindly unscientific as men would make out, to most scientists, their, that one of the ostensible perpetrators of the slaughter of a generation or other feast, was the satisfaction of hunger; a leper who had misbehaved himself at the receipt of alms and, secondly, that when meat was condemned by the market inspector it was usually given to the hospitals.[364]

Our pity should go out to the soldier of life who drops, or who is wounded, in the fray, and not to the degenerate who threatens or limits the lives of those useful elements most valuable to the nation.[365]

Ludovici reckoned the criteria of degeneration in infants that we possess, which enabled us to determine those who can be expected to guarantee in their psycho-physical make-up the survival of humanity in a desirable form, and stigmata of degeneration that develop in the insane and mentally deficient, afforded an adequate basis on which rigorous selection and elimination could readily proceed.[366] He advocated infanticide for all infants that did not promise to meet psycho-physical standards consistent with the survival of the race in a desirable form:

> ...a relaxation of the rigid regard for the sanctity of infant life would lift, as it were, an iron cowl from the heads of adult humanity all over the civilized world, and restore an enormous amount of lost joie de vivre and innocence to the life of millions of people.[367]

Pity for the undesirable meant cruelty to their betters. The elimination of feminine and manly sentimentality would accompany the purge of society's human foulness.[368] The noblest pity was to succour the dwindling elite and to save them from contamination and extermination by the hordes of the unsound.[369] Only that life would have sanctity which offered some guarantee of future worthiness to the nation:

> The murderer does less harm to society than the incurable invalid or other sufferer, because while the murderer kills only one fellow man, the incurable sufferer, by the continuous burden he imposes on all, prevents the life of hundreds of his fellow-creatures. Out of pity for the sufferer, therefore, we ought to be able to put painlessly away all incurable sufferers, just as we do incurable criminals many, indeed. Surely it would be the greatest mercy both to the sufferers and to their sound contemporaries: the huge mansions and palaces, strewn all over England for the upkeep of human feelings, and maintained at the cost of scores of millions of pounds each year, should become homes for the recreation of the sound, and for the better enjoyment of life by the sound. There might even be exhibitions there by, whom the sound might flock on particular anniversaries, and whose, if necessary, they could pay homage to those who had conferred the only benefit that the betrayed can confer on the sound - their own departure from the world.[370]

The thought and emotion of saving the dwindling sound stocks on which the future of the nation depended, Jadovici thought, would neutralise the initial feelings of repulsion at the violent elimination of degenerates.[371]

The beauty of life and nature is that all the most vital actions are 'selfish' actions.[372] Cynically, Jadovici said that immorality was not a proof of degeneracy. The British sterilisation of criminals would mean the elimination of England's better stocks.[373] The national should always reserve his efforts and the fruits of his labour for the succour of those of his own race. It was an embodiment of the conservative commitment to conserve the identity of the nation's institutions and traditions. Such a commitment was not that of the crowd of 'unnecessary' anti-Semites, according to Jadovici. England's first concern was her own people who were in need, not Jewish or any other alien refugees.[374]

Jadovici's Religion for Infidels, of 1961, is devoted to his elaboration of a Nietzschean religion. Hints of which are to be found in his

Man: an indictment, of 1927, in which he defines religion as oneness with life:

> The profound and cultivated man of wanton spirits, whose sense of self is the outcome of healthy impulses springing from the abundant energy and serenity of his being, not only affirms his own self and the universe with every breath he takes, but by the intimate knowledge he acquires of life through the intensity of his own vitality, he feels deeply at one with everything else that lives.[375]

Degenerate people do not have the vitality requisite for religious experience. They misunderstand religion as Christian ethical observance.[376] What was needed, according to Ludovici, was a novel religion based upon a perception of the power behind phenomena, freed from all notions of Christian ethics.[377] In his Religion for Infidels, Ludovici says his intention is to outline a religion for those who cannot believe in Christianity and yet do not wish to remain destitute of transcendental questions.[378] He defines religion as man's relationship and attitude to the power he believes to be the author of life and the universe. Therefore, the tendency to regard religion merely as a matter of morals was tantamount to admitting an inadequate grasp of it[379]; "the mind capable of holding this false [moral] view must be unable to imagine the awfulness of the invisible influences at work in the wings, as it were."[380] The life forces that Ludovici desires we live in accord with, are devoid of Christian morality. Nature gives us the mandate for those cynical actions that are performed selfishly. Flourishing life should be unshackled.[381] The moral duty of man in society is to promote and defend all the influences which favour superior and flourishing life, and to resist and condemn all those influences which favour decadent and degenerate human life. Everything else denotes a misunderstanding of the function of compassion - to strengthen the nation.[382] This religion for infidels turns to its own account the formative and impregnatory powers of the life forces, and might be called a 'natural religion'.[383]

Its ethic is consistent with a lethal chamber for "human rubbish" and entails, at the very least, the violent elimination of selected lower grade mental defectives.[304] It is a eugenerative measure that will strengthen the nation, as there is:

> ...no evidence to show that the sympathy and the bonds holding society together were destroyed by the ancient Spartan custom of hurling ill-fated infants into the place called Apothetae, a deep cavern near Mount Taygetus, or by the ancient Roman custom of hurling similarly ill-favoured infants over the side of the Tarpeian Rock.[305]

Ludovici made no attempt to conceal the fact that he adopted this ethic from Nietzsche.[306] The only obstacle to Nietzsche's 'transvaluation of values' was Christianity and its morbid legions of the sickly, the pustulent and the gangrenous who would fight to preserve their parasitical dominion over society, according to Ludovici.[307]

3. Machiavellian Realism

In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Toryism, Ludovici laments that since the publication of Machiavelli's Prince opinion in Europe on the relation of political to private morality has been hopelessly divided.[308] England's achievements had been due to her acting and triumphing entirely on Machiavellian lines. Machiavellian realism means:

> ...in relation to internal politics, that the morals for the child cannot constrain or trammel the parent; and in reference to external politics, that the morals which rule the conduct of each individual member of the herd to his neighbour, cannot constrain or trammel the leader of the herd in his position of defender or assailant facing a hostile or strange herd.[309]

Political deals and promises and contracts cannot and must not be judged from the standpoint of private morality. An orderly state is one in which the 'intra-herd' morality is observed by all citizens.

the simple citizen trust the practice of his morality will ultimately be repaid and must not be shaken lest the foundation of the nation's virtue be undermined.[390] Only the elite can practice the cynical craft of politics in which guile, deception, and dissimulation are cultured.[391] Political and private morality are incompatible.[392]

In his A Defense of Conservatism, Ludovici says that the role of the Conservative politician is one of realism.[393] The conservative knows enough about the characteristics and potentialities of the people, and about the eternal characteristics of healthy mankind in general, to be able to judge whether political innovations are realistic or fantastic:

> ...whether they are in keeping with the eternal nature of man, or the particular character of his nation, or whether they apply only to angels, goblins, fairys, or other romantic fictions, who alone seem to suit the onigenetics of hundreds of modern half-brained reformers.[394]

The Conservative politician should only be concerned with securing the extension of his own nation's power as the nation is a living thing, and itslife and identity can only be conserved by expansion. He should be prepared to act firmly and swiftly to deal with the vis major which threatens to enforce change on the nation from outside. Because the vis major can only come as the result of an extension of power on the part of another nation.[395] The conservative must steadfastly refuse to betray his position of realism and entertain romantic ideals like fraternity and universal love. Realism alone is found to work, it alone can be trusted to maintain and preserve the identity of the nation: "It is not a matter of fancy, it is a matter of eternal laws."[396] The realist knows that there are some men whose nature inclines them to rule and others whose nature inclines them to serve.[397] As a political realist the conservative sounds cold and gloomy

compared with the romantic. Far from believing in the natural or inherent right of every individual to political liberty, the conservative believed, like Viscount Bolingbroke:

> ..."that all men are directed, by the general constitution of human nature, to submit to government, and that some men are in a particular manner designed to take care of that government on which the common happiness depends."[398]

Realism constituted the conservative faith in politics because it is the only belief that works, if the object is to preserve the nation.[399] But, in order to be realistic, a certain healthiness and normality of outlook and necessary.[400] The Tories and Conservatives, had always been the denizens of rural districts and the Whigs and Liberals of the towns.[401] London retaining the more healthy elements in the population, the constant and attentive contact with eternal and natural laws which agriculture enjoins upon those engaged in it, tends to rear in the rural population a more realistic attitude to life than that which can be cultivated in towns. Therefore, when at the time of the Grand Rebellion the first great national division occurred on a great political issue the "Tory-Rural-Agricultural Party" found itself arrayed in the protection and defence of the Crown, against the "Whig-Urban-Commercial-Trading party."[402] After acclaiming Machiavelli as the greatest political thinker Europe had known[403] in chapter VII, "Why one should be a Conservative"[404], Lodovici indicates national expansion as a necessity of conservative realism. There is no moral wrong, he says, "in the expansion of a healthy, flourishing and cultivated people at the cost of inferior savages."[405] The British Empire as a means of national expansion, allowing for the preservation of national identity, is essentially the creation of a conscious or 'unconscious' conservatism.[406] To be a conservative is to face cold realities with courage and resolution, and to oppose overweening romanticism:

> ...Utopian, pregnant only with disillusionment and deception, have taken the place of rational and realistic expectation in the minds of millions of the population. Abstract words, having only fantastic connotation, unrelated in every sense to facts, now rule majorities as once only tyrants could. Intangible utterly without foundation now drew the modern man into the street to fight and to clamour, as if he actually bore some evident relation to life. And social degeneration which makes men prone to harbour feverish fancies and whims and will-o'-the-wisps, complicate the situation and increase its gravity.[407]

Conservatism represents the only realistic and classical resistance there is to liberalism, socialism, and other fanatic persuasions. Ludovici thought it would be impossible to conserve the identity of England if the dehumanizing of romantic ideas were allowed to continue.[408]

Ludovici's defense of realism is brilliantly displayed in The False Assumptions of "Democracy", of 1921. His task is to redefine contemporary political vocabulary according to realism.[409] In chapter IV, "Justice"[410], Ludovici says that nature is utterly moral, life is hopelessly unjust.[411] Life is not concerned with justice:

> ...The rain falls on both the just and the unjust. The hurricane kills the just and unjust alike. The lightening burns the house of the just and unjust indifferently. Microbes feed on the pure and undefiled virgin just as ravenously as upon the polluted jade. Tuberculosis does not pick and choose; it kills where it can.[412]

The word 'justice' is meaningless when applied to life.[413] Society endeavours to mitigate nature's harsh rule by means of preventing or assuaging unnecessary sufferings; but society cannot divorce itself completely from life.[414] Society is bound to act with nature and allow nature's laws to operate with comparative freedom in her midst. Particularly in regard to the act of procreation. Is justice rooted in the very act of procreation, which is essentially a natural act otherwise society would die. The child can have no choice over whether or not it is born, on its parents, or which sex it should be.

Justice is inapplicable at the very root of life itself - procreation. Like all manifestations of life it is unjust. It is part of the bargain which is life[415], a necessary survival of vital a morality within a moral society.[416] Where nature peeps out even in civilized societies, as it does in procreation, there cannot fail to appear injustice. Since in order to survive man is bound to allow nature a certain medium of free play in his societies, a certain medium of injustice cannot be removed from even the most ideal community.[417] Essentially, the ideal of justice amounts to an attitude of hostility to life, because it is tantamount to a refusal to accept life's 'yield'.[418] Man should accept reality:

> All life's light and shade, all her excitement, all her incitement to man to compete with energy and spirit in her game, depends for more than half of its charm precisely on the fact that she is amoral - that is to say, that she produces inequalities, contrasts and divergent types, indifferently, lavishly, without taking thought, without mercy. Her call is to the brave, to the stout of heart, and to the adventurous and spirited. Those who in the midst of this great adventure cry out 'Injustice!' either misunderstand, or wilfully misrepresent the whole scheme.[419]

The application of rationalistic lifeless notions, such as equality, are inapplicable to the world of activity and reality.[420] According to Ludovici, the term 'equality' means nothing more than a mathematical abstraction because it is unreal.[421] Life cannot be reckoned, and a life-handicap cannot be calculated.[422]

Ludovici's notion of realism is imaginatively expressed in his novel of 1923, French Leave , when the hero, André de Loudon, walks on the South Downs of Sussex to induce a mood of realism to assist him in deciding whether to renounce his fiancée, the non-vital Mildred Hight. Ludovici describes the effects of the Downs on André de Loudon. Unlike anything else in the English scenery, the Downs promote in the beholder a clear and realistic attitude to life. They left nothing to individual fancy, and promoted realism:

> ...their naked contours, free from all the hidden mystery and romantic secrets suggested by woodland darkness, and seeming as it were, the stuff even of ugliness, impelled the wanderer to clarity and unambiguous logic. They were clamoured in the sense that, as their meaning did not lurk partly in the beholder and partly in the mind of the spectator, it did not depend upon the latter's mood or standpoint for its explanation.[423]

their arbitrary tone, which affords securities, consisted in meaning one thing and no other.[424] They unashamedly exhibit their forms "they thrust out their muscles and sinews beneath the thinnest covering of turf; often they moved their very bones." It suggests a clear meaning. No opportunity is left to the morbid excesses of imagination. Man feels bound to give his own being a meaning amid such loneliness, and he turns inwards. He himself must become as plain to his own mind as the Downs are plain to him: "their extreme loneliness invites a realistic summing up of meanings all round." Andre de Loudon felt the realistic influence of the Downs.[425] He knew his own meaning and what he meant. He realistically pondered that if Mildred might dislike his masterfulness, his wilfulness, then it was questionable that she accepted him as a whole. Perhaps she proposed to tinker with him all his life, until, in the end, he became a Mildred with a man's unatomised peculiarities. The position was a fantastic one, and the more he contemplated the Downs, the more perfectly he realised this. It was romantic and unrealistic to suppose that people could be altered in that way. Such was the realism induced by the Downs that this fierce conclusion was turned upon Andre:

> ...why had he selected Mildred? Was he not also trying to wield the chisel at the eleventh hour? ...He wished to make her better able to act up to his ideal, more devoted, sufficiently passionate to be more zealous about her own dignity or 'rights', or whatever the word was for the thing she forbade him to trespass on...this was the romantic nonsense he had just condemned...In fact he was about to do the same thing for which a moment ago he had condemned Mildred![426]

this was the conviction to which the realism of the Roman had led him. His real-life situation had been presented to his mind vividly. Every outline of this real picture was sharp and clear. For sharp outlines are real or "hard" outlines. In order to live and abide by these realities a man must possess double "manliness". Pedro de Lemdon was abundantly endowed with "the hardness that is requisite for realism."[427]

The time had come, according to Ludovici, to recognise realistically the inevitability of violence and sacrifice, and realistically to select the section or elements in the world or the nation that should be eliminated.[428] It was illusory to suppose that violence and sacrifice ceased when war ceased. There are two alternatives sacrifices that may be executed as the corollary of the violence generated by the reproductive function of a community. Either the reproductive function might be restricted in the male, or the violence may be unloaded on other peoples. Ludovici preferred the latter as the most realistic:

> This is a perfectly practicable and laudable method of neutralising violence within a community, and all great people have tried it and succeeded in practising it. There is no reason why while inferior races remain it should ever cease to be a measure of relief.[429]

Hitherto, the operation of measures to allot the incidence or neutralise the effect of violence generated by man's reproductive function had been haphazard or accidental, except in war time.[430] Ludovici advocated the deliberate selection of the incidence of the violence, the abandonment of all suicidal "solutions" like homosexuality, birth control, emasculation, and the distribution of the burden of sacrifice over inferior races abroad, and inferior human products in all classes in the nation.[431] But, the first and most important step was to secure the inculcation of realism among the populace,

that violence, and therefore anarchies, cannot be removed from political life in any way that was desirable, and that all somatic reforms which produce unity and harmony among men, without the need of forcible displacement or coercion, were fruitless.[432]

Individual lamented that "due to the hasty and incredible corruption of Anglo-Saxon politics", English politicians, both Labour and Conservative, were still separated by a chasm from Machiavellian government and dealings with foreign powers.[433] He thought it required a degree of Machiavellian obtuseness bordering on moral defect to regard the average civilized man as corrupt relative to nature. Nature is black with duplicity, falsehood, deception, and the cynical contempt of justice and fair-play:

> ...From the largest carnivora to the cat, the cormorant and the otter; from the camouflage of how creatures that approximate an inanimate object, or whose coats make them invisible to their prey, down to the amphibians and insects who pass themselves off as twigs, leaves, brambles, fellow-insects, or else cobras, there is not a diabolical device with which Nature has not anticipated the cunning and callousness of our burglars, thugs, bandits, and murderers.[434]

It is otiose to seek the roots of any moral value in nature as the life forces are indifferent to what men understand as good and evil, ideas which have no meaning outside human groups. Morality is as peculiar to man as honey is to the life of the honey bee.[435] Therefore, if one is called upon to govern, "it is wiser and safer to side with Machiavelli... than with Locke and Bentham."[436]

4. Elitism

In his introduction to his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for

Keyserling indicated his intention to provide the guide lines for the creation of a new elite or, to cope all political struggles and all the fluctuations of fortune which have attended the history of civilizations, have not consisted of a struggle between the principle of aristocracy and a more desirable principle, but of a struggle between the principle of aristocracy and its representatives, or of aristocracy versus the aristocrats.[437] Aristocracy is the principle of life[438], as in all vital matters there is but a right and a wrong opinion. The peoples and nations who act on aristocratic principles will have a full lease of life.[439] Every nation produces an elite that is superior to the "top and bottom dogs".[440] Here entirely and more men thanks to a fortuitous and rare concatenation of happy circumstances are born the exemplars of flourishing life - life in its maximum of beauty, health, vigour, will and capacity within the species; whilst others are born the exemplars of mediocre or impoverished life.[441] The masses, "like children", are simply able to feel and to respond to those who understand and judge them correctly - the elite.[442] The achievements of the race are solely those of the elites

> Whether we turn to the decadent aristocracy of Egypt, the Incas of Peru, the Brahmins of India, the Jews of the desert, the Spartiate of Attic Greece, the Nationalism of Rome, or the German nobility of the Middle Ages, we are concerned with the best that a particular people were able to achieve in the matter of flourishing specimens."

The history of these peoples' high culture is the story of the aristocratic influence they underwent.[443] And, if the principle of aristocracy, which is the principle of life, had suffered a momentary defeat, it was not because of the struggle with a superior 'solution' of the problem of government but because of the supersession of the moribund elite by a young and vital one: "Aristocracy versus the Aristocrats."[444]

Conservatives should entrust the nation's future to an elite.[445] In his A Defence of Conservatism, Indoviel says conservatism has a popular or exoteric, and an exclusive or esoteric meaning. It is the esoteric meaning of conservatism that Indoviel claims to be its fundamental.[446] To say the validity of the claim for change turns on the question of quality. A truism overlooked by such conservatives as Burke, Disraeli, and Lord Hugh Cecil.[447] There are two forces in national life which constantly conflict with humanity's natural and deeply rooted predilection in favour of a stable environment. They are the renewal of the nation's personnel with each fresh generation, and the shifting of certain sections of the nation under uncongenial circumstances. But, each of these life forces are represented by two distinct classes of men. The newcomers may be either supernormal or subnormal. Only the elite have the right to clamour for change as progress, as they have come into the world with qualities which make them superior to the standards expected by the stable environment.[448] Conservatives must be guided by this distinction, which is the esoteric connotation of conservatism, and rather than being merely an attitude of caution and obstruction in the way of all change, which in the popular and exoteric connotation of conservatism, esoteric conservatism is an attitude of protection against those changes which are merely similar seeking.[449]

> That aspect of Conservatism which will always cause it to be loved by the ignorant, though healthy and contented elements in the nation, is precisely its tendency to obstruct novelty and change, but that aspect of it which will cause it to prevail and to shine gloriously in the nation's history, is its tendency to prevent not from attempting and from spreading throughout the institution of the country.[450]

He presented esoteric conservatism as the preservation of the nation's identity throughout the processes of change, by a steady concern about quality in the whole of the nation's life.[451] The principle of

Individual's conservation is that no living, growing, and surviving whole can be conserved if due regard is not paid to its quality, therefore, conservatives must be guided by qualitative distinctions if the nation is to continue to live.[453]

> ...for one thing, egotistic conservatism and aristocracy necessarily meet, because to ignore qualitative distinctions in the management of material things is dangerous enough; but to ignore them in the management of thought, religion, and principles amounts to national suicide.[454]

He thought the framing of a conservative policy to meet the needs of the age and to avert the degeneracy that threatens depended upon the immediate formation of an elite.[455]

Individual's elitism is certainly consistent with the ideas of his mentor, Nietzsche.[456] Without absolute hierarchy and discipline man would never have the means of continually self-surmounting himself.[457] Nietzsche thought a vital aristocracy should look upon itself as its own justification, and should accept with a good conscience the sacrifice of the masses who should be reduced to slaves and instruments.[458] To Individual, Nietzsche had described no limits to man's explorations through an aristocratic order of society.[459] Nietzsche refused to believe that men are equal, and advocated the practice of deliberate and progressive selection knowing which would, he believed, establish what he regarded as a necessary scale of gradation and rank and a sharp division of classes, with the elite at the head.[460] He believed his mission was to stand for a neglected minority, "for the gold in the mass of the quartz."[461] The Divine Manu, Jesus, Confucius, Mohammed, Jesus Christ, who converted men through their sublime arrogance into a mirror in which they saw themselves and their doctrines reflected, were the type of leaders to whom Nietzsche referred when he spoke of "higher men". Ruling, like all other functions, requires the great for its sole justification:

> ...the really great ruler soothes his zenith in directing an epoch, a party, a nation or the world, to the best advantage of each of these; it does not follow that the motive power propelling him should necessarily be the conscious pursuit of the best advantage of those he rules - that is merely a fortuitous circumstance closely associated with greatness in ruling - generally speaking however, his only conscious motivation is the gratification of his inordinate will to power.[461]

The only egoism which is justifiable, according to Sudovici and Nietzsche, is that of the elite.[462] In Sudovici's novel of 1910, Manoff Follower, the Nietzschean Mr. Rolando proclaims that disorder is a disease that kills life. Life can only be secured by order imposed by an elite that knows how to choose and reject correctly in all vital matters - as to choose the wrong thing in life means death.[463]

James Gordon, in Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, on his deathbed, instructs Gerald Brymerton that his only child by Catherine Doyle must lead a life of discipline and hardship.[464] He must search for difficulties, and learn to distinguish between beliefs which merely make a man feel happy and at ease, and beliefs which are disconcerting, though true. If he is a leader he must learn to sacrifice his follows to his purpose.[465] Society is but a huge organization for exploiting greatness.[466] In his novel of 1920, Too Old for Folly, Sudovici says that in most men there is a sense of quality, a power of discrimination which intuitively values other men: "a feeling of certainty usually accompanies it, which is as mysterious as the evidence upon which it is based is intangible and elusive."[467] When Lord Henry Highbarn, the hero, confronts Sir Joseph Bullion, it is intuitively intimated to the latter, a financial magnate, that Lord Henry Highbarn is of rare and vital quality.[468] The eleventh Marquis of Mirle, in That Woman Winhop, is described, despite his fifty-five years of age, as a remarkably vigorous and

young-looking men. He gave the impression of immense vitality and strength.[469] He believed that unless the best in the land have also the best bodies their claim to leadership could never be established.[470]

Hadrian thought that even the lowest form of prosperousness, the wolf pack and the herd of antelopes, benefit from hierarchy by the function it enables their leaders to perform. For a society implies cohesion, it implies unity of purpose and desire; it also implies a more or less uniform outlook on life. But how are these things possible without higher men?"[471] He believed the history of all radical reforms and innovations demonstrated that far-reaching changes are always the work of a leading, active, gifted, and small elite, striving with zeal and determination to realize an ideal: "the wilful minority establishes the environment, or mould, and the inert, ductile masses pour into it and receive their shape."[472] The leaders of the 'Hannibalic Renaissance' he desired would remodel the national life without having recourse to the discredited vote, and constitution.[473] Hadrian cited as examples in history of an elite imposing its will on a reluctant or even hostile mass the Protestant Reformation, the Grand Rebellion, and even the Bolshevik Revolution.[474] Socialism could offer no hope for the future as every elevation of mankind had been achieved by heroes and elites, never by the masses.[475]

Hadrian believed his ideal of leadership had materialized in Nazi Germany. He believed Adolf Hitler had instilled something akin to a new religious zeal in the German people: "It is as if he had been raised not only from the dust, but also given a star or ball of fire which will lead them to the fulfilment of their destiny."[476]

Hitler had set an example of impersonal effort for the common good by his profligate career.[477] Ludovici compared the fervour that Hitler had inspired to that which he thought must have been prevalent in Europe when the great Gothic cathedrals were being built. He thought there was nothing reactionary in the enthusiasm with which the German people proclaimed Hitler, the man displayed the passionate affection of children in his presence. Collectivism had triumphed over individualism in Nazi Germany by the unlimited allegiance to the notion that Adolf Hitler had implied by his heroic, impersonal effort, that had galvanized the masses into action:

> The religious appeal..., by giving man a higher impersonal purpose, into brutality of the strife above the market place, above considerations of merely individual gain, with all that this means in intermecine and suicidal struggle.[478] had to have given his nation such a purpose, to have persuaded them that such a purpose is worthwhile, is the secret of the Fuhrer's magic.[479]

The economic conditions so suddenly transformed in Germany under the Third Reich, which led to an immediate spectacular rise in the marriage rate were due, according to Ludovici, to a new will established in the people by their leaders.[479]

Elite recognition is natural and intuitive. Man possess intuitive mechanisms for registering signs of superiority in others which, according to Ludovici, act with great precision. Reject of rank and anything a tailor can supply cannot prevail upon them to register what they do not automatically accord[480]: "This was my conclusion during the last war - ... contrary to the implications of Biblical teaching, respect should always be regarded by all as a spontaneous and involuntary reaction."[481]

Addressing the English Army in 1939, Ludovici reckoned that although

they represented a militant minority in the eleventh hour of their national degeneration they should take heart.[402] It is not numbers or voices that ultimately determine success, as Liberals and democrats believe, but only the firmness of purpose and energy of the individual members of a militant body, however small:

> ...if, moreover, we take heart from the spectacle of what other once contemptible minorities have done - bodies such as the National Socialists of Germany, the Fascists of Italy, and even the Russian Bolsheviks themselves, not to mention the handful of Jews whose conversion to the country Gwynedd granted in 1657, - we shall find less cause for either deep misery or self contempt, and rather confidence and strength from reflecting that only that fight is lost which is abandoned, and that if any cause is upheld with passion and single mindedness, it must ultimately prevail, even when committed English Liberals and international manipulators, Jew or Gentile, constitute the organised enemy.[403]

No thought vitality, or wholeness of body, would be the mark of the aristocracy of the future, which would gradually make its bid above the morbid functioning of the population of the civilised world. The man who wished to belong to that aristocracy of the future would need to cultivate a new pride of body, independence of spirit, and mastery of life which would constitute its principal essentials.[404] Even after World War II Ludovici believed the revival of an aristocracy was essential, "even under the threat of the new silly charge of 'fascism'."[405]

He desired a revolutionary elite or an aristocratic society, in which the degree of power exercised by the dominant class is commensurate with the quality of its members, had never existed in England.[406] Uniform valuations must prevail throughout the whole society for the elite to arise, and for their power to be maintained:

> ...a people of quality, owing to the uniformity the condition implies, and consequently to a corresponding uniformity in the standards of value, will tend to assess superiority as all, including the elite, do. There will be little if any disputing. The merits of a superior individual or group will be unanimously recognised, because the same distinct

standard of values into all judgments.[487]

In a highly integrated society the formation of a distinguishable bodies, to which all look with feelings of depends ey, confidence, security and pride, would be wholly untenable.[488] Indeed, the consideration of an elite is closely associated with the theory of selective breeding. He thought whereby breeding produces a high degree of standardization and, therefore of beauty, there would prevail a keen appreciation of the features and bodily proportions which best epitomized the psycho-physical ideal of the people. The elite that displayed this optimal epitome would take a positively persuasive appeal to the masses.[489] After two millennia of "erratic wandering in the wilderness of Socratic fallacies" he thought mankind should proceed to do what Plato over two millennia ago suggested should be done - deliberately rear and conserve an elite that may be entrusted with the leadership of modern peoples[490] "only by breeding and careful selection can the human material be formed for an elite which can benefit by elite education and training."[491] However, Plato was mistaken in thinking that sages or philosophers should constitute the authority in a government. The essential quality requisite in enlisting popular support for an elite is real evidence of their achievements in the cause of the nation.[492] During the second, third, and fourth decades of the nineteenth century, three men - Pitt the Younger, Nelson and Wellington - shed glory on their generation through national achievement. In consequence all the feebles and the statesmen of this season who were overlooked by the common people.[493] An elite is of vital, life or death, importance to the nation:

> The nation must salvage a minority which, in the hour of direst need, may be in a position to stand up and defend the "establishment" and defeat ensuing Authority. Only the most reckless and most unreasonable rationalist can believe that a complex society like ours can remain sound and flourishing without such an elite.[494]

5. Populism

Just as fascists draw from all areas of the political spectrum for the analysis of culture that constitute their ideology, so does Ludovici. The elite should be a popular one. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A Text Book for Fascists, Ludovici says the only justification of aristocracy is its duty of protecting and guiding the laborious and productive masses. An aristocracy that denies this principle is rightly doomed.[495] Conservatives should be cautious in the policy of the elimination of the unfit that Ludovici proposed, because it applied to all classes of the nation.[496]

In his A Defence of Conservatism, Ludovici says the conservative must be deeply concerned about the welfare and happiness of the people of his nation, because unhappiness and dejection are the most frequent causes of a demand for changes which are destructive.[497] In as much as the preservation of the identity of the nation must involve a tender consideration for the health, welfare and happiness of the masses the Conservative Party should be popular. Consequently: "to the extent to which they become anti-popular they cease to be truly aristocratic or Conservative."[498] But, in practice, the heavy responsibility of distinguishing between progressive and regressive demands for change, may give the sound Conservative the appearance of an anti-popular obstructionist.[499] As both aristocratic and conservative doctrine overlap in their exaltation of stability and authority, and in their common principle regarding the need of qualitative values, they find their adherence in any sphere of society where the worth of a thing and a person is measured according to their quality, and the power of time in the production of anything precious is appreciated.

> The violence that has been done to truth by attempting to fit social classes so neatly into political parties, is probably the primary cause of the confusion now existing in the public mind regarding domestic politics in this country. And that is why it cannot be reported too often that the Conservative and Unionist Party - I do not mean the administrative machine - is an example of a very distinct type of mind and body, which comes in all classes, and is by no means more common in the present House of Lords than in a coal pit.[500]

Constitutional democracy is a sham. The cause of the party in power is drawn from popular influence. As fast as the voting power of the people had been extended, the more disillusioned had the people become.[501] Democracy is susceptible to alien influence and control through 'money power'. The 'money power' of the Jews is supreme over political parties, especially the Liberal Party.[502] The proletariat is circumscribed in a constitutional democracy as the legislature is controlled by 'alien interests'.[503] The Conservative Party should devise a policy that would enlist popular faith. The masses should be educated on the subject of foods the preparation of bread and the supply of milk and drinks should be severely controlled, especially proprietary and tinned foods, to ensure popular welfare. To facilitate this government should be purged of 'vested interests' and the popular interest elevated to a position of absolute paramount limited by no constraints, legal or otherwise, despite the immense difficulty of the struggle:

> ...We must remember that it is not so long ago that the proprietor of one of our largest proprietary foods, who was a Member of Parliament, happened to be killed in a accident at Hyde Park Corner; but it would be fantastic that the House of Commons could be cleared of all such people in this providential manner.[504]

In Radvici's novel of 1919, Catherine Doyle: the re-union of a thrice married lady, Donald Guynnerton recounts to Knowlon that his late friend, the de-vitalised Egyptologist James Gordon, was infatuated with a tea-girl at the British Museum, Catherine Doyle.[505] The elite of the future are to be drawn from the working classes as James Gordon wished

to supplement his wants by marrying the wild but brave Catherine Doyle.[506] Later they married in London. Catherine Doyle's father "could have crumpled Gordon up between his thumb and first finger"[507] whilst she humbled the six others with intense vitality.[508] She moved with the vitality of a lioness and had the radiant healthy beauty that Frankau believed was now only found in the working classes.[509] Gerald Haymarton thought the beautiful girls of his own 'high' social class were brittle as opposed to Catherine Doyle.[510] Though Gerald Haymarton had done Oxford/Cambridge and many clubs in his time he was no match for Catherine Doyle's second husband, a working class man called T.E. Byron, who had a magnificent build and the flesh of a wrestler.[511] According to Gerald Haymarton, Catherine Doyle possessed sexual promise:

> '...In her features I saw high breeding. Gordon's eye had been true. There are some girls in shops in the West End of London who also have race in their way. But they are not really discovered. Occasionally one of them gets through entrance to the stage, and then a Duke or an earl snatches at her.'[512]

Cleopatra Blakeney, in The Old Flame, was primitively female enough to demand and expect a savour of vitality in him who wooed her. But, she was more accustomed to perceive the outward signs of this coveted quality in waiters, hunters, coal-heavers and butcher-boys, than in the men of her 'upper-class' circle.[513] Janet Perkins or 'Jinjer', the working class heroine of Frankau's novel of 1921, Mad Hanna Fisher, had the signs of being an ardent lover of life.[514] For uncle, Solomon Perkins, though a Labour supporter, saw the human difficulty of finding freedom in his own world.[515] However, his socialist arguments availed nothing with Janet Perkins who saw in the aristocratic hero, Viscount Chiddingly, a man to whom she would entrust the welfare not only of herself, but of her people and country.[516] Mr. Solomon Perkins does concede, however, to Janet's mother, that

Viscount Chiddingly as a Conservative MP had indeed been friendly to the proletariat. And, his latest move, as a leader of the Friends of Order movement, for pure liquor and pure bread would be in favour of working people:

> 'Not bad that idea of Peter Pantaloon', continued Uncle Lolo, 'about which I don't suppose you know anything. It may be utopian and all that, almost be called Freedom, but it's a bloody good idea for all that.'[517]

Lord Chiddingly was committed to fighting the 'vested interests' that had corrupted constitutional democracy.[518] Lord Sidney Herbert, a Liberal candidate gets several daily newspapers to dump Lord Chiddingly with endorsing one of London's oldest and most distinguished Labour leaders, Mr. Solomon Perkins, in order to induce the socialist element in East St. Patricks, the constituency being fought for, to abandon their own candidate in Lord Chiddingly's favour.[519] On the eve of the poll Mr. Solomon Perkins, a veteran Labour Leader, justifies himself before his association and his claim for identifying himself with a Coalition candidate of pronounced Tory views and traditions, instead of supporting the Labour candidate and the Labour cause. It excited much public attention for it was the first instance of an established and much respected Labour leader's abandonment of the principles of his party for the express purpose of going over to the Tory side. It was heralded as the harbinger of a mass defection of socialists to the Tory Party.[520] Reciprocally, conservatism was to become a popular creed and the political extremes were to meet, a leitmotiv of fascism:

> One of the most striking features of the meeting was that, despite their determined endeavour to obtain admittance, no member of the Coalit ion, however remotely connected with the main branch, was allowed a ticket. Lord Hirle had given the word, and it had been obeyed. Mr and Captain Hill, while both agreed that on this great occasion, when the most important parties in the State, the Labouring classes and the Nation, were, in the persons of Mr. Solomon

> ...Lord Randolph Churchill, to effect a public, and it was to be hoped, permanent reconciliation, it was not fair that there should be present any office direct of the House which had done its utmost to ruin the Tory Party.[521]

Mr. Robert Cecil also publically expressed his disillusionment with the Labour Party. He announced that he felt himself more close and close to a sort of Disraelian Toryism, and to an organisation of England as Tory times under an old fashioned and chivalrous aristocracy, from the years of World War I.[522] He proceeded to give his audience an historical outline of the policy of Toryism and that of Liberalism throughout the nineteenth century, and should only repeated interruptions in the form of cheers that, despite all the assertions of Liberals to the contrary, it had been the Tories who throughout that period had shown themselves to be the true champions of labour's independence. Among the proofs he advanced to prove here the point was the case of the Ten Hour, the seventh Earl of Shaftesbury and Mr. Michael Thomas Sadler, who had fought for a whole generation to protect the men, women and children of the proletariat against exploitation by Liberal manufacturers during the middle of the last century.

> ...Leaving his conclusion he emphasised his conviction that as he saw things now, the best policy was for Labour to join hands with the Tory Party, except for its leaders and protectors men of first class ability and intelligence, like Lord Randolph Churchill, Lord Shiddingly, and the Duke of Stumminster, and to change its present wholly aggressive and hopelessly unpatriotic policy.[523]

He then outlined the number of measures, all protective of the working men and his children, with which Lord Shiddingly and his father, the Marquis of Hale, had been connected.[524] He was convinced that Lord Shiddingly's vast and comprehensive scheme of social reform bore a deep and honest concern for the working classes.[525] His long speech vitalised the mass audiences

> ...ation stood on their chairs, waving their hats and cheering, women fainted, hundreds were hit over the head, bones, and other objects flew and attendants - in order to reach the platform to fight their way through the vehement human barrier, and on each successive wave of fresh cries it was only forward and was knocked by it once in fact who wished to get out, an exciting movement partially cut by the sheer fit of the men to prevent that hundreds were swept along by it as if they had been only fifty deep.[526]

In the midst of mounted cadets, a titanic strife, Lord Chiddingly was the by-election at Mid St. Patrick, and seemed to have it in his power to effect a reconciliation between conservatism and socialism.[527] Janet Perkins, Lothian Perkins's niece, showed a natural attraction to Lord Chiddingly. He could not find the vigour which she possessed in virtue of his own class.[528] Janet Perkins had convinced him of the reality of his physical appeal by the completeness of his capture of a strong and vigorous and fiercely natured girl whose working class 'taste' in men must compel her to seek out the essentially manly type.[529] There was the savour of pit drive health and vigour in Janet Perkins's love.[530] Never before had life offered Lord Chiddingly such a deep and luxurious drink. At his passing from her, he lost interest in his comparatively tamed Buckinghamshire activities. His fascination was like the calm interception of a flash of lightning, when all the retreating clouds and the whole earth are waiting for the stroke to continue its unswerving course.[531] Later in the novel, Lord Wade points to a picture of Charles I in his mansion and hints at the similarities between the latter, who founded his family line, and his distraught son who is infatuated with Janet Perkins. He tells Janet that Lord Chiddingly and Charles I have similarities in being popular martyrs:

> '...the tops of great buildings get rent of the rain, the wind, and the cold loneliness of the night. They receive the first lick of the lightning. They are not sufficiently near the unswept ground to feel the warm comfort and the pleasure.'[532]

he told her how, as a rising young official at the Foreign Office, he had met a beautiful working class girl and found in her an intense constancy and vitality unlike that found in women of his own class. But, he had had to renounce her for his career although she had become his life and he had lived for nothing else.[533] Accordingly, when Janet Larkins forsakes Lord Maldingly, she also forsakes life and commits suicide.

In Tadevich's novel of 1924, The Mystery of Hon Sung, he says that the protege of Mr. Vale, Gilbert Milburn, had yet to learn that it is women who are the principal custodians of class prejudice.[534] Mr. Vale proclaims to Frances Vandgrove that the mass is, unfortunately, impotent in a constitutional democracy whose parties are controlled by the 'money power'. He says politics:

> '...is all a question of money and vested interests. If I knew of a way by which the British Empire could be saved, do you suppose that I should stand the smallest chance of getting my ideas adopted on its merits? Not the slightest! It would all depend on the number of vested interests involved, and the amount of money I could put up.'[535]

Gilbert Milburn tells Mr. Vale to work the people, and oppose the whole sham of constitutional democracy. Mr. Vale replies that it would be difficult to fulfill for the newspapers and public media are controlled by the same 'vested interests' which control political parties. Besides, few would be prepared to listen or to sacrifice their lives as "when it came to action they'd be off to their golf or their shooting."[536] Subsequently, Mr. Vale gets Gilbert Milburn installed as the unofficial Conservative candidate for the northern division of Kenmere to effect a regeneration in the dietary habits of the English. Sir Jonathan Vandgrove, a wealthy proprietary food manufacturer, warns Mr. Vale that if he dares to diminish the power of the 'vested interests' represented by the proprietary and preserved

feeds of England, he will provoke a Leviathan that will ultimately silence he and his supporters.[537] Indeed, Gilbert Wilburn is defeated at the General Election by a Liberal candidate, an agent of the 'money power'.[538]

Endovier thought it was the first duty of the ruler to watch vigilantly that violence and injustice is not of man's making, for that can be remedied. The second duty of rulers is to assuage as far as possible the opposition resulting from the violence that is of life's making. He thought Charles I was an ideal monarch in this respect as he sheltered those when natural disasters had overtaken.[539] Endovier lists as the multifarious deeds of violence of man's making that have been allowed to break loose on the community, and which lend a colourable warrant to the otherwise absurd proposals of socialists, the following: Sweating; the act of inviting the proletariat to engage in unhealthy occupations; profiteering; speculation on the first necessaries of life; wasteful disposal of property after death; class cleavage and snobbery; urbanization; the purveying of inferior food to the masses, and of food that is not strictly life-supporting; lack of protection afforded to the masses against usurious moneylenders; the failure to impart to the masses by means of education any branch of knowledge that would add dignity to their characters and lend support to their self-esteem.[540] Endovier thought the campaign for the prohibition of alcohol had been initiated by the heads of industry and commerce to deliberately weaken the proletariat's resistance to their depredations.[541] People who are bright, vigourous, and bold, through wholesome, fermented liquor, are difficult to dragoon or to enslave:

> ...such people do not tolerate for long the jading and besotting high speed of an efficient modern factory; they too strongly resemble the old peasantry of England, who were the terror of the

> continent - the men who stood and conquered when they were but one to fifteen at Poitiers and one to five at Agincourt. Such men must be bad, they will not be driven.[542]

Under the values and standards that prevail in the commercial and industrial society, "governed by moneyed interests", it could not be demonstrated that the ill-adapted were theundesirable.[543] Ludovici thought it would be eugenic that the working classes had even larger families relative to the putative upper and middle classes.[544] Ludovici believed "the mean, narrow and pusillanimous spirit of every dyspeptic sybarite of Mayfair or Kennington"[545], forgets that man is a gregarious animal, and that happiness is not necessarily achieved by spacious houses, luxurious apartments, and the constant opportunity and temptation of seeking isolation.[546] In order to enlist the cooperation and sympathy of the poor in preparing legislation for limiting the freedom of degenerates, such laws must be made as rigorous for the defective among the rich and well-to-do as for the defective among the indigent.[547] Highly temperamental and adventurous individuals were intolerably placed in the criminal classes by middle-class people:

> ...among smug and 'safety first' people, the term 'degenerate' instead of being applied to the type commerce and industry are breeding, is constantly applied to people who are either too virile and robust to endure the air that is breathed in offices and warehouses, or else too passionate to survive daily contact with the opposite sex without expressing themselves sexually.[548]

Ludovici called the wealthy unemployed classes parasites.[549] Those from whom we derive our corrupt notions of leisure who were above work, enjoyed position of complete independence, and were more free of public obligations than any wealthy class there had ever been, only contained a few who had won their independence by creating anything.[550] The majority of them did not turn to creation but recreations:

> ...such activities are, for instance, playing or watching games; pursuing or watching the pursuit of various sports; attending certain exhibitions, commercial entertainments or race meetings; travelling or climbing; reading for distraction; dancing, promiscuous fornication, etc. [551]

The privileged class consisted to a great extent of people recruited from generations of middle men who had stood with stoic but resourceful natural zeal between producer and consumer. Indeed, Ludovici denied that the status of normal human beings because of the frequently futile and neurotic nature of their pastimes; the common occurrence of neurosis, or signs of neurasthenia among them; their inevitable restlessness; their generally low physical condition; the tendency among the best of them to return to creation of some sort, like the clock making of Louis XVI.[552] The whole distinction between respectability and criminality was, according to Ludovici, an implication of bourgeois snobbery and Puritanism:

> ...thus, crime does not reveal biological inferiority; and, seeing that it may and often is pursued out of sheer delight in risks which respectable employment in modern civilisation cannot provide, it may actually denote a plus of courage, spirit, independence, and masculinity.[553]

Ludovici ascribed the ignorance and indifference in England to the achievements of Hitler and his advisers, in the first three years of their government, to rigorous and benighted press censorship.[554] He thought valuable by products of the Nazi labour camps were the breaking down of class barriers by the mixing of the various social strata in the camps, and the benefits to all concerned derived from the closer acquaintance made by the children of middle and upper class families with manual labour, its hardships, its advantages, and its immense importance in the economy of the nation.[555] Again, he indicated that his attraction to the Nazi regime was inspired by his advocacy of Metanoeism. Ludovici believed that the Nazi promotion of the cult of manly brown to the want of blood spilt in the national cause,

was reminiscent of Nietzsche, who wrote:

> "Women should begin to regard their duties as soldiers do. They receive excitement, honour, but they get no wages; there is no relationship between work done and money received; the individual should, according to his kind, be so placed as to perform the highest that is compatible with his powers."[558]

Work had to be transvalued. Amid the chaos of modern capitalistic exploitation, with its impersonal, almost abstract masters, Ludovici thought Hitler had fulfilled a Nietzschean ideal by creating a bond between the labourer and his work which was reminiscent of the feelings that bound the workers of former times to his employer.[557] The ideas associated with the manual work required to be drawn aloft onto the plain of duty, and heroism and sacrifice on the field of battle.[559]

Ludovici's populism is most apparent in his pseudonymous book of 1939, Jews, and the Jews in England. In the latter, he says the Jews because of their values and natural equipment were impervious to the contempt which those about them might feel for the occupation associated with the middle man's position.[559] The Jew led every international movement, as against fascist nationalism, because of his primitive desert ancestry which knows of no territorial nationality.[560] He is indifferent to the interests of the nation in which he find himself, indeed, an enemy of the popular interest.[561] Ludovici reckoned that since the readmission of the Jews to England in the seventeenth century, the productive and business life of England had been progressively Judaised.[562] Consequently, the enfranchisement of the Jews did no more than set the coping-stone to a social edifice which had been in process of construction under their alien influence for over a century and a half. As a descendent of a race inured in the desert to an existence which, though precarious, was not laborious, and, ever since his abandonment of the nomad's life, attracted to

and progressively more occupied in trade, the Jews were bound to promote bourgeois culture, in which class and duty path to wealth are preformed to manual labour:

> ...by his congenital proclivity to traffic with the product of other men's labour rather than to be a producer himself, the Jew was bound to favour all those activities which we now know as speculation, forward buying, forestalling, regration, and the promotion of every variety of agency and middle man function until, in the whole of the labour and product of the nation he influenced, there was nothing that remained immune from the 'take-off' of the exchanger with the capital to anticipate a demand.[563]

Contempory culture was that of the Jew, according to Ludovici. Both in the ideology of laisser-faire and the practical exponents of it, there was nothing foreign to the method of the Jewish businessman, or to the spirit which the increasing influence of Jewish finance and trading 'morality' had spread in England.[564] Ludovici thought Jewish influence could not be excluded from the drastic reforms which secured the establishment of free and irresponsible ownership, and which ultimately culminated in modern capitalism. But, once private property had abandoned its only justification, duty, it necessarily followed that communism became the inevitable reaction to this divorce of duty from ownership.[565] The whole of the nation's property owners, although unaware of the extent to which they had been subjected to Jewish influence, were threatened with the total confiscation of their property. Jewish influence had cleared the way for the transition of modern capitalism to communism:

> ...And if today we see the Jew everywhere advocating and even anticipating the next logical move in the line of development which he can understand - the merging of Capitalism and Communism - it is probably due merely to the fact that, with his proverbially quick wits (especially in regard to human conduct), he has inevitably perceived the hopelessness of the wreck his methods have made of the Western institution of property, and now wishes to pilot the dilapidated hulk into a dock where he can hope to continue and survive, if only in the guise of a despotic bureaucrat.[566]

Tadpole accused the Conservative Party of being a fraud for failing to appreciate that the enfranchisement of the Jews must mean the abandonment of all hope of conserving the nation's identity.[567] The Jews inevitably supported an influence and money all the tendencies in England which were striving at destroying unpurchasable forms of power like aristocratic lineage, privilege, hereditary honours and Sanctions, to complete their enslavement of the English populace.[568] Disraeli was ingeniously misleading when he wrote:

> "All the tendencies of the Jewish race are conservative. Their bias is to religion, property, and aristocracy; and it should be the interest of education that the bias of a great race should be encouraged and their energies and creative powers enlisted in the cause of existing society."[569]

The Jews became associated with a Liberal and 'money party', standing opposed to all those conservative elements in the land struggling to maintain tradition, lineage, and untarnished titles and honours. The Jews' alien 'money power' transformed old aristocratic societies into plutocracies in which their control may be strengthened.[570] They came to dominate important strategic positions from which opinion, and political and financial interests, can be controlled.[571] The Jews denigrate all the rigorous policies and measures tending to conserve the national character and identity.[572] And, when the Jews advocate communism it is merely a device for moving on to a fresh oasis or pasture, "whose docile flocks of sheep will continue to maintain their bureaucratic masters in idleness"[573]; but, when faced with the problem of establishing themselves among a conservative people, or a people organised on aristocratic lines, the Jews became militantly Liberal out of expediency.[574] They strive everywhere for the strategic positions from which the mass may be directed or controlled.[575] Tadpole desired that the English masses militantly attack Jews, their influence, and the Judaised elements in their life and law.[576]

Ludovici believed "the often secret, powerful and anonymous influence of high finance", rendered the popular will impotent in a constitutional democracy.[577] He submitted that the working class are really England's native element, and their middle class shopkeepers and petty-traders composed the element that in either foreign, or having been native, had become alienated. The working class are England's native element who had been unable to accomodate themselves to "the alien culture and civilization foisted on the land in the last three centuries." They were the only body in the land who had not been infected with money, and who understood earning a living solely as working for a living. Heroically, the working class stake everything on their psycho-physical ability to work.[578] The Rousseauan notion that men are born free and have everywhere become enchained through the villainy of governments was peculiar to the middle class. The working class notion of freedom had nothing in common with the largely morbid middle class desiderata. Ludovici thought it consisted in the natural desire of all normal men to express their higher impulses in their work and thereby to acquire credit socially. Their longing to find an outlet for higher impulses, to find emancipation from anonymous and dishearteningtoil, to find a definite and secure social station, to obtain social regard, to nourish in one's work the healthy appetite for social regard, and no longer to be the sport of blind and inhuman trade oscillations, had little in common with the "morbid, neurasthenic and wholly fatuous conception of Liberty" of the middle classes.[579] Furthermore, the working class were not so neurotic as to demand equality inthesense of complete inter-changeability between human beings. Nor, according to Ludovici, do they demand it before the law, or in relation to opportunity. The working class cry of equality had three roots: the ability to discern quality in men; the sense of personal worth; and the refusal to acknowledge that an acceptance of the doctrine of human inequality necessarily involves

the acceptance of class cleavage. They only concede real inequalities:

> The feelings arising from these three roots amount to loyalty and, rising above wealth, rank and economic standards, and functioning only in the domain of psycho-physical attributes - flesh, blood, character, will-power, intellect, voice, etc. - they clearly foreordain of artificial class distinctions.[500]

Only where the 'money power' tries, by class cleavage, to create for itself a rank not justified by any psycho-physical qualities, the three roots of working class egalitarianism revolting against an artificial hierarchy and affronted by a cleavage only justified in claims of race generates a vague striving for equality. With the mass of spurious distinctions created by money, and with a middle class often acting as employers devoid of any other distinction, constant affronts to the sense of personal worth among subordinates were unavoidable. Ludovici submitted that the cause of what he regarded as the vague striving after equality of the working class was really an inarticulate demand for genuine superiority in those whose circumstances placed above them.[501] Despite the marked deterioration of the working class by the influence of their economic supposed imposition of industrialization, urbanization, indiscriminate immigration, and Socratic humanism, they were still the most vigorous element in England. Their foremost feature that Ludovici admired was what he regarded as their positiveness to life, and their fellows. They were gregarious and passionate unlike the middle class. The street, whether in village or city, was their gregarious unit.[502] They were not liberal like the middle class[503] as their normal bias was in favour of prejudices and narrow sympathies. Only their vitality could regenerate the nations

> ...for only by the accumulation of millions of such narrow rivulets, emulating and not deploring all our strength to God and acquire its irresistible momentum.[504]

The danger to this came from the wealthy classes' economic capacities who opened the imbalance of their typical habitually of judging men and things by money standard.[505] The 'money power' of the Jews had already succeeded in swindling the House of Lords and hereditary power:

> ...For if privileges and titles, inaccessible to mere plutocrats, still survived, it meant that the power of money was not absolute, and that certain key positions would remain denied to men wielding financial weapons alone.[506]

6. Totalitarianism

Ludovici's fascist selectivism, drawing from all aspects of the political spectrum, is complemented by his advocacy of totalitarianism. A monolithic political system in which the government permits no rival parties or loyalties, demanding total subservience of the individual to the state. There being no constitution or limits to the sphere of political actions; no division between the elite and the mass; no division between the government and the society. The elite initiates the mass and reciprocally the mass initiates the elite, but not through constitutional channels. Totalitarianism is the concomitant of the fascist synthesis of political extremes and the keystone of the political system Ludovici envisaged. In his A Defence of Aristocracy. A Text Book for Tories, Ludovici intends to discuss the 'problem' of democracy on a plane above that of "mere political party"[507], and he says that often he will seem "as hostile to aristocracies as the most confirmed radical".[508] He reckons the Independent Church had robbed rulers of the active exercise of the 'autonomy' of governing, the potent medium for binding a people and their elite together. The

Church should lose its autonomy to facilitate the fusion of the elite and the mass.[589] Political and social values should be rendered uniform and absolute.[590] All subsistence:

> ...by regard itself as hopelessly insecure and ephemeral, where the people over which it rules are not led, guided and sustained by one general idea which animates all their hopes and aims, colours all their deeds and enjoyments and kindles all their passions and desires where they are not governed by the one inviolable value.[591]

In his A Defence of Conservation, Ludovici advocates totalitarian government and frowns upon all political extremes, the leitmotiv of fascism. He says that in all national life, as in the life of nature, there are two forces which constantly conflict with the inclination of all creatures to prefer stability before instability in their environment. These two life forces are, first, the removal of the whole of the nation's personnel with each fresh generation; second, the shaping of certain sections of the nation under circumstances which make adaptation impossible.[592] However, their desire for change is only a temporary striving for change, pending more successful adaptation. Their anti-conservation must swing back to conservation when once the object of their clamour is achieved:

> ...even Communists who have successfully established the conditions they desire, necessarily return to conservation and begin again to resist change. ... They, in the violent measures adopted by the Communists of Russia against counter-revolutionary propaganda and movements, we see the natural conservation of men recognizing after the forces which have made for change have achieved their new adaptation.[593]

Ludovici charged Edmund Burke with never having perceived the difference between the temporary and unthinking desire for change, which is common, and the excessive zeal for advance, which is rare and valuable.[594] He calls politics a 'science' of conducting national affairs by directing

and framing national policies. As the nation is a vital and living thing conservatives must be committed to totalitarianism. Since conserving the identity of the nation is a matter of conserving a living, growing and therefore changing phenomenon, politics cannot be merely an abstention from interference, as if an immovable and uncorrodable rock had to be preserved, but "a science of enlightened interference after the style of forestry."[595] The whole of the politics of a living nation, therefore, resolves itself into a 'science' of expansion with conservation on the enlightened interfering lines of successful forestry. All political parties which claim to be national and not international, must consequently be conservative. They only differ regarding norms. Even a patriotic revolutionary must be a conservative, according to Ludovici's criterion. If he desires his revolution for the good of his nation, he must desire the results of his revolution to endure. And at that point he becomes a conservative. "This explains the curious phenomenon, recurring throughout history, of the revolutionary who ultimately becomes a 'reactionary'."[596] Thus, the term Liberal or Labour, as a title of party, ought to be opposed to Conservative only as a sign of disagreement regarding norms. He calls esoteric conservatism the position of those who, far from being merely opposed to change, wish only to conserve the national identity throughout the changes introduced by growth and expansion.[597] The conservative must be committed to preserving the nation's vitality, because ill-health leads to the decay of national strength, capacity and character: "To be a good forester a man must know how to give trees their proper health conditions, and he must also know how and when to chop and prune them."[598] Ludovici proceeds to advocate a modern feudal and guild system, or corporate state. He extolled the mediæval guild system in which craft was hereditary, sons and daughters were married

within the trade, and capacity and innate predisposition for a particular calling were cultivated.[599] He confirmed the idea of a limited constitutional sovereign as it removed the one great barrier to the exploitation of the people.[600] A "powerful Crown" Indovici claimed as an ideal and reality.[601] The Great Rebellion severed politics from economics. Hendilton had not regarded the health of the individual subject as beyond the sphere of government:

> ...The statesmen of the Middle Ages, and above all the kings at their head, were perfectly well aware that the health and happiness of the individual subjects were questions which it was incumbent upon the State to study and understand.[602]

Indovici thought it necessary and urgent to organise industries so as to prevent functionless ownership and division between owners and workers, and a difference of interest between them. The Middle Ages set an example in this as industries formed corporate wholes, in which masters and workers functioned as units answerable to the State, and guaranteed public service both qualitatively and quantitatively in return for certain privileges.[603] Especially in those industries on which the life of the nation chiefly depends masters and workers should constitute a corporate whole; and functional ownership should be secured. Indovici believed the vices of modern capitalism, although not inherent in capitalism per se, were due to the fact that it had never been properly controlled.[604] The Conservative Party's role as the popular party, as a party chiefly of landed interests, and as a profession of realism, constituted it the appointed their to organise modern life as the feudal kings and Church of the Middle Ages had organised medieval life. The Conservative Party should have given industry its proper relation to the State and the public:

> ...It should have made the workers in industry an essential organ of the whole body, at once helping to support its life and vitally interested in its prosperity and preservation, vitally giving and drawing energy, with an intimate relation to

> every branch, from the ruling house to the financial foundation.[608]

The difference between master and worker should have been merely functional. And the whole of each industry should have been vitally connected to the State.[609] Indeed though the Church should also become subject to the State and be deprived of its autonomy.[610] Until the 'problem' of the autonomy of the Church, with its extra-national allegiance, was solved, Monro and Conservatives, in opposition of the Church of England throughout their history, and of the new the defenders of authority, subordination and order, would continue in an uncertain position.[611] And, it was idle for Conservatives to respect the Constitution for it no longer resembled the original pattern of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, except in the retention of a few names and ceremonies.[612] A figurehead with social influence was all the power of the monarchy then, may be, and usually is, a good deal of nothing in a public speech supporting the Constitution.[613] No desire to conserve a sham Constitution could be indeed incomprehensible.[614] The Conservative's duty to 'conserve' the Constitution involved the further duty of conserving the Church and the only means of achieving that was to restore its freedom and responsibilities. Indeed questioned the existence of the 'Constitution', with its composite character of monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, since the Parliament Act of 1911.[615] Agreed, with the monarch a mere figurehead, and the House of Lords a mere form, the Constitution as Montesquieu wrote about it, and as Disraeli praised it, ceased to exist in 1911. Is therefore fully proper to preserve or uphold it? What does the average Conservative mean when he is speaking about the present Constitution?[616] If every institution in the realm which had not constantly maintained a standard of the highest efficiency and wisdom was to be destroyed, then the House of Lords and the Constitution, whose existence Indeed questioned, should be no

exception.[614] If fundamentary institutions were to be saved they should be reformed on patriarchal and conservative lines, and make independent of political passion.[615] Malvolio thought that Conservatives could not conserve the liberty of the nation if the responsibilities and functions of the Crown were not increased; the force of local administration on the basis of the status quo previous to 1911[616], and industry was organised competitively.[617] Conservatives must consciously oppose the fields of commerce, industry, and finance, for every possible means of deliverance from labour-strife. It must be superseded by "morally direction, by the consciousness of a destiny all."[618]

In Malvolio's novel of 1921, The Rose Upon Wheel, Arthur Marshallay Lordsway, addressing the 1920 Club, says true conservatism does not necessarily consist in loyalty to the Constitution:

> "For, my Lords and Gentlemen," he concluded, "the true object of being a successful Tory or Conservative, does not lie in an established of blind conservation to all things it does not consist in being forever the devoted and loyal upon of the status quo, but in the art of flourishing, what to conserve and what to suppress, on the green roll by, and to find adequate substitution, true to the traditional character of one's race, for those elements in the social edifice which from time to time one's better judgment compels one to discard."[619]

In Chapter IV of his The False Assumptions of Theocracy, "Freedom"[620], Malvolio denies that any living thing can be free from birth. A person's potentialities and actualities are rigidly determined at birth.[621] And in reality, no man who wishes to continue living is free. He is bound to procure food and clothing for his self.[622] Even strong natures have no choice or freedom. They are driven to their great deeds by a store of accumulated energy which must discharge itself over a large area.[623] The character of all strength

is that it gives those who possess it no freedom in the domain of action.[624] Only weakness is apparently free, or is conscious of desiring freedom.[625] Ludovici interpreted the working class demand for freedom as really a demand for a bondage in which their stronger impulse would have more scope. For, Ludovici believed, freedom in the sense of non-relation, non-dependency, absence of duties, absence of work, and absence of responsibilities or conventions, utterly fantastic[626]:

> There is only one kind of freedom that bears any relation to reality, only one kind of freedom therefore that can be striven after, that can be realised; and that is the freedom to exchange a bondage compatible with our strongest impulses for a bondage that harmonises with them.[627]

Each individual is so totally bound to the State that they have no rights or liberties. Ludovici thought the State the sole custodian of rights, entitled to impose limits upon the multiplication of what it regarded as degenerates.[628] In his proposals to relax the laws against infanticide it was not to be left to the ignorant, the tasteless and the careless, to decide who should and should not live, but to the State.[629] All acute cases of malformation, degenerative stigmata, crippledom and abnormality, should be destroyed and, with an anarchic twist, if necessary illegally: "And if the law does not move, it only requires a few brave, tasteful and merciful fathers to lead the way in this direction, for the law to follow."[630] In his Violence, Sacrifice and War, Ludovici suggested that hitherto the incidence of violence and sacrifice, generated by reproduction, had been left to chance among the population. He advocated an era of selective sacrifice, in which the State would decide who was permitted to live:

> ...Just as in war, the elements selected for sacrifice, at least at home, would be the object of much honour and public praise and recognition, and just as the human sacrifices of the past are supposed to have gone to their death, gorgeously arrayed and crowned as kings, so the sacrificial victims of the future might if necessary go to their doom amid public celebration

> and demonstrations of national beings that would cause the historical record breakers of today, whether aviation or speed-boat floods, turn green with envy.[631]

Ludovici's The Function of Private Property, of 1932, is a significant contribution to his feudal or corporatist ideal of totalitarianism. In the latter he proposes a solution of the 'problem' of proprietory rights, based neither on the capitalist nor the communist standpoint.[632] He says that nowhere in existing primitive races, or among past primitive races, has communal possession been found to exist unblended with private ownership or vice versa.[633] But, he rejects the latter as a basis from which to argue as he thinks the practices of primitive society inapplicable to modern society. Similarly, he rejects the tradition of European thought or 'philosophy', because it was the thought of men born and bred in city states.[634] It was natural for communism to develop the idea of property as entailing no duties, because it was the kind of property with which they were chiefly concerned.[635] Besides, Ludovici reckoned that no Western European 'philosopher' or lawyer had ever succeeded in establishing private property on a fundamental law or principle of life. Nor, does he attempt to establish private property on a first principle of life or upon a natural law.[636] According to the ends one wishes to achieve with man and society, according to the degree of potential for conservatism which one wishes to secure, one may determine the kind of proprietory rights it is expedient to grant to private individuals.[637] After rejecting the anthropological and 'philosophical' justifications of private property, Ludovici turns to history to support his case that only by coupling private property with duty may it be coupled with an operation identical to life itself.[638] He suggests history reveals a picture not of private ownership, nor of communism, but of a blend of the two, marked by a hardening of the right of individual ownership

on each society approaches its dominance. Whether we turn to Judaea, to China, to Egypt, to Greece, Rome or mediaval Europe:

> the early legislation seems always to have been eager to combine communal or conditional, with private and absolute ownership, and at last as the latter form encroached on the former in each nation, the manner the civilization approached disintegration.

In ancient Egypt, where the system was feudal, the Pharaohs had periodically to intervene to buy back from rapacious landlords lands that had become private property. This demonstrated that the tendency of the blend of private and communal ownership to degenerate into purely private ownership was regarded as an evil and had to be checked by redistribution. In ancient Greece the same dangerous developments and the same remedies occurred.[639] Similarly, in ancient Rome, although absolute ownership became universal, comparatively early, vestiges of a system of conditional ownership survived.[640] Ludovici found his ideal in the feudal system of mediaval Europe which gathered up and organised all that was best in the institutions of the ancient world relating to property, and evolved an intricate and decentralised form of administration, consisting of graduated privileges and obligations extending from the serf to the presiding monarch.[641] The principle of mutual obligation and loyalty, protection and service, bound together all ranks of society; whilst nothing in the form of irresponsible ownership existed, at least in the means of production, the right of private property was sufficiently conceded to lend "adequate freedom" and dignity to the individual, and to provide for the adequate development of character.[642] Ludovici's desiderata was to reinstate the system of responsible proprietory rights, of graduated loyalties and obligations, of graduated service and privilege, which, in feudalism made the position of the least in the land as secure and as essential as that of his immediate and remotest superior.[643] Property should be 'functionalised', and rank and

privilege coupled with a corresponding function.[644] From his study of history Hadevisi concludes that whenever and wherever absolute private ownership has been extended to every possible form of property, and led to the creation of a class wholly dispossessed and dependent in a non-functional way, disintegration has always threatened. At such moments of crisis,

> ...the efforts of ancient legislators - Nehemiah, Solon, Pericles, Lycurgus, Agis, Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, to mention only a few - have always been to avert disaster by trying to give to the majority those very benefits, which are the sole basis for the persistence of individual ownership as an institution.

Feudalism was a reaction to the long spell of absolute ownership which spread throughout the Roman Empire as the result of Roman law.[645] If civilisation is to be conserved communism, the ultimate reaction to abuses of private property, must be avoided.[646] The wise man should turn to experience, as Aristotle insisted, and recognise the truth that he knows of no single instance of communal ownership having either created a great cultured people, or endured in a great culture or people.[647] Nevertheless, the following objections to private property remain: private property makes cupidity and greed possible; it does not accumulate where virtue or human desirability is most conspicuous; it is frequently viciously administered; it may be used to vulgarise and desecrate leisure; people tend to forget the contribution made by all to their individual property; in capitalist societies it may be acquired in vast quantities in ways that have no connection with diligence, good taste, great intellectual gifts, good health, patriotism or even honesty ("transactions [which] can be carried on quite successfully by a purblind, bedridden cripple at the end of a telephone"); in capitalist societies it becomes a right without a function or duty; in capitalist societies it leads to the exercise of an anonymous inhuman power over one's fellows ("spectacle

of a degenerate, crooked cripple being carried about in a litter all day, year in, year out, by six stalwart, able-bodied, and wholesome men who sacrifice their all to him").[648] The solution to the vices of private property lies in reconciling it with duty in a new feudalism. The fundamental difference between the rich and the poor should be that, whereas the poor are not equipped to hold property, the rich are so equipped. Only those should be poor from whom property can be removed without either loss to the property itself or to the community.[649] Ludovici decided that it is as difficult and onerous to be rich as it was difficult and onerous to be a lordor in feudality. He was in no doubt as to the Constitution of the tribunal which would adjudicate the transfer of property:

> ...from our knowledge of all corporations and bodies of men, who have a certain reputation, a certain standard of service, and certain common interests to maintain and protect, it is clear that these must ready jealously to guard the prestige and standards of an order are usually the men who belong to it.

He thought the above was true of the merchant and trade guilds of the Middle Ages, and especially of the Council of Ten in Venice.[650] Thus, noblesse oblige would be restored, as it already was in such corporations as the Church, the professions, and such services as the army and navy.[651] However, if the middle class declined from forming themselves into a corporation of the State then their fate would be that of the House of Lords - demise. Alternatively, if they succeeded in 'functionalising' wealth they would have the institution of private property, and have the populace to support them.[652] The possession of wealth and prestige must be 'transvalued' into one of qualitative distinction and difficulty and responsibility: "from being a weapon of eccentricity and unsolotedness, it should become an instrument of order, morality and solotedness."[653] Ludovici did not think that such an enterprise would fail through lack of youth and ability, for

he knew of a contemporaneous political movement, fascism, which had already successfully committed itself to such a 'transvaluation of values' elsewhere.[654]

Ludovici, predictably enough, found his ideal in the contemporaneous Nazi movement, which he believed had indissolubly united Germany as no country had been united since the Renaissance. It had obliterated political parties and factions, which Ludovici thought should exist in no nation. He thought England was just as 'conditioned' as totalitarian Germany, except that in the latter the conditioning powers were ready to answer for the effect they produce, whilst in England they were wholly irresponsible and did not answer for what their unfettered use of publicity enabled them to effect in the moulding of public opinion.[655] He particularly admired the portion of laws which came into force in September 1933 and were known as the Reichserbhofrecht (the law relating to the Inheritance of Landed Property) which provided for the hardworking and capable peasant a security in his holding, which no usurious creditor could defeat. The test of credit default was not whether the creditor had made a loss but whether the peasant debtor was capable, knowledgeable, diligent, and had shown that he could keep his land in a proper state. Ludovici admired it for land was not treated as a movable property, to be bought and sold in the open market.[656]

Ludovici thought only that society could be conserved which is organised on the principle of mutuality and the recognition of the truth that no property can be wholly private, that all possessions belong in part to all because all have contributed to their creation. He thought the above principle was largely realised in England during the Middle Ages, in feudalism.[657] Government should act with authority

to abolish abuses, increase national efficiency, and tighten social discipline. Totalitarianism is the only remedy when the nation has been brought to the brink of chaos by the multiplicity of its conflicting groups. Totalitarianism is:

> ...a defensive mechanism by which the virtue and strength of an integrated nation's will and purpose are emulated and stimulated for the sake of urgent constructional salvage schemes.

Ludovici defined his totalitarian ideal as 'organic' rather than 'inorganic' totalitarianism. He believed his advocacy of the former was bound to resemble the 'inorganic' totalitarianism of contemporaneous fascist nations as all of Europe was suffering from the same degeneracy.[658] He thought he was advocating a prophylactic for 'inorganic' totalitarianism:

> ...it is only when chaos will have outpaced our efforts to integrate the nation and to give it a single will to set itself in order that [inorganic] Totalitarianism will have become an ineluctable necessity.[659]

Ludovici's notion of 'organic' totalitarianism takes the form of a modern feudalism. He extolled feudalism which, up to the time of the Tudors and Stuarts, integrated the English and made them form a nation against their asocial inclinations.[660] Every victory of prerogativeness was achieved by a painful and gradual metamorphosis of the 'particularist' Saxon into a social being.[661] When once the King and his Barons became one with the people, and had begun to socialise them, the disrupting and asocial elements composed of the Jews came to be felt as something increasingly alien and intolerable, and in 1290 they were expelled, not to return for 365 years. During these 365 years Ludovici claimed the English reached total ethnic unification, and their culture and civilisation came to life.[662] Under the 'guidance' of monarchs like Henry I, Henry II, Edward I and Edward III, and, Elizabeth and the early Stuarts, the English became totally integrated.

The monarchs were "the protector of persons", suppressed exploitation of the masses, enforced honesty in trade, and all practices calculated to bring gain to the individual at the expense of the community, such as forestalling, engrossing, and regrating, were prohibited. Usury was even more suppressed.[663] The guilds, whether merchant or craft, were induced to be concerned quite as much about protecting the general public as their own members. Practices leading to the exploitation of the public were suppressed.[664] In extolling feudalism and the guild system then, Ludovici claimed he was attempting to show:

> ...how a particularist people were gradually moulded by their leaders into a nation which represented all the many features of a bellum contra omnes, and how they learnt to make their watchword National before Private Interest.[665]

He regretted that Elizabeth I's and James I's re-enactment of Edward VI's Act for the encouragement of the fishing industry and the increase of fishermen, the training school of the Navy, by making it compulsory for all English people to eat fish all through Lent and prescribed days of every week, would be stigmatised by liberals as fascist.[666] Feudalism fought anarchy and promoted an organic integration of the community by giving every man, from the lowest to the highest, his place and function in society, and therefore a certain dignity arising from the sense of possessing a private right and of being an essential link in the hierarchical chain.[667] Ludovici believed the 'Constitution' meant the reigning Sovereign, the Lords and the Commons, acting together in governing the country. But, in the absence of a strictly defined Constitution, the Commons had usurped the power of the Sovereign and the Second Chamber.[668] He sought to reverse the contemporaneous situation:

> Above all, owing to his [the monarch's] exalted rank and conspicuous position in the land, he is essentially able to be an example to his

people. It is in the service of all because no class can be given the population their life-training and work for and the life about him do and choose, will become the country's standard of taste and judgment.[669]

Mafford only pronounced the pretence of the Constitution, because it included royal prerogative in their conception and the contradiction that could be made by an elite.[670] Ludovici thought there was a need for a Second Chamber, independent of political party, to act as a brake on the House of Commons.[671] All opposition, especially the official Opposition, should be emphasized and the Government allowed to act unhindered.[672] Ludovici thought strength can have no place in parliament, committees, or any other deliberative assemblies.[673] A new feudalism, possessed of the public spirit which animated the nobility in the Middle Ages, should be created.[674]

7. The Order of Nature Restored: Naturalism, Primitivism, and Prophylaxis.

In providing a vision of the order of nature restored with the accompanying imagery of naturalism, primitivism, and prophylaxis, Ludovici is a typical fascist. Lord Milo, in *What Woman Wishes*, says to Lord Chiddingly, his son, that if he watched daily life in a rural community he would realise that there is a life to fight for. The natural life in which a man had the privilege to direct the oldest, healthiest and most useful industry on earth, agriculture, the industry which satisfies man's most natural needs, and also keeps him sound in mind and body.[675] Ludovici advocated the adoption of rural occupations and homes among the proletariat.[676] They should become agriculturalists and craftsmen again, because it is the only way by which they could recover their dignity, their lost freedom, and vanished health.[677] Large

hypertrophied cities and town should disappear.[678] The vast expansion of industry and services in England and Wales had not only contributed to physical degeneracy, for many occupations of the modern factory system had a benumbing and unedifying effect upon the mind of the worker.[679]

Medvied criticized the labour service organization of West Germany for it had created new agricultural areas, new farmsteads, and a peasant population. He was impressed by the condition of men, of all classes, in rural agricultural labour camps. "They all looked healthy enough to thrive under Spartan conditions."[680] Promoting and consolidating their return to the land were laws which made it difficult for young rural people to migrate to the towns, which also met with Medvied's approval.[681]

Medvied believed the peasant was far more realistic than the townsman, because illusions are deadly in his vital occupation.[682] There prevailed a keen sense of the biological values necessary for the conservation of the people's health in the Middle Ages. Towns and townsmen were objects of contempt because the physically unsound and inferior tended to migrate to towns.[683] A revival of rural life and agriculture, and a repopulation of the countryside, would facilitate a system of healthy soil cultivation in England.[684] The indirect effect of town life was to divert attention from the basic animal needs of man.[685] Urbanism particularly affected women's sexual functions, to their detriment: children tend to lose their sexual desires; the difficulty of housing large families in towns; the passion for conspicuous spending rules all town-dwellers, results in an accumulation of possessions which, because they are expensive, curtail families; the loss of a realistic view of life through

artificial, replacing natural conditions, lost to the most elementary facts of biology, health, food production and normal function, being forgotten or lost sight of.[686] Endovier hoped that modern man would recognise the extent to which he had enslaved himself to an unnecessarily complicated and sophisticated way of life: He had forfeited his pristine health, freedom and stamina by pursuing courses which had deviated too drastically from his original and more simple existence of pre-industrial days. England, the leader and innovator in the Industrial Revolution, should inaugurate a new era of simple living and more modest needs.[687]

The belief in the superiority of what is primitive is prominent in Endovier's writings. Gerald Wynnerton, in Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, laments to Knowles that, before he met Catherine Doyle, he thought marriage peculiar to the time when men used to absent themselves for months at a time from their mate, either as warriors, adventurers, or hunters, when life was more exciting.[688] Later, when he goes on a world cruise to dispel his anxieties at the marriage of Catherine Doyle to the objectionable Mr. Symes, he passes through Milan. He noticed how curiously alive the Milanese were. Servant-maids played the game of their lives, in the intervals of which they did their work, and any man seemed to serve their purpose, provided he were under Seventy:

> 'I drew my curtain aside and began to wash and dress, and it struck me, as I pursued those operations, that Adam were much less civilised than most of us believe. Although we no longer drag our spouse by the hair from her father's tent, or bring her down with a blow on the head, she still follows the man who really wants her badly, and is not overscrupulous concerning the methods he employs to get her.'[689]

In Endovier's novel of 1920, Too Old for Folly, Cleopatra Holroyde insists that it is preferable to be natural in life. For mother

nobleness how by anything that 'natural' means nothing to people who swallow the whole complicated artificiality of modern life, when one "ought to be living in a cave, dressed in a bearskin and growling at the roots of trees".[690] Later in the novel, Lawrence contrasts Mr. Aubrey Tit. Bear with Doctor Melchior. He described the former as one whose figure and features gave the impression of metallic virility. His 'hard' features and heavy jaw were balanced by their fine mould and his thoughtful eyes.[691] Doctor Melchior had nothing of the exuberance and vitality of Mr. Tit. Bear, and which made the latter so contemptuously his superior:

> ...Doctor had nothing to communicate to him for his tame, cerebral, London-tainted blood. Mr. Bear, on the other hand, had that fire and warmth of blood, without which even the highest breeding is little more than the extinction of the animal at the expense of the man.[692]

Sir Thomas Brassbound, in Shaw's Play, says the moment the healthy native takes to wearing clothes he develops skin disease and his health declines.[693] 'Decency' means "clothes and ill-health."[694] Later, when Andre de Touchon, the boxer, gives an overwhelming display of energy and grief when his fiancee Mildred Wight, abandons him, Sir Thomas was vaguely humiliated by a sense of having witnessed something more elemental and primitive than he either knew of or was capable of himself.[695] After accepting his abandonment Andre pursues Pauline Pigeadyke whose "primitive side" he succeeded in stimulating.[696]

In his Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition, Indovini 'accounts' for the hostility to Prometheus in the myth whose he brings fire to men, with all the 'progress' it entailed, as the reaction to the irremovable ills he believed must have attended those who originally attempted to adapt their lives to the use of fire. Illness and disease arose from the abandonment of the nomadic in

favour of the stationary mode of existence. A stationary rather than a nomadic people have to live in the midst of their befoulment. The pastoral life leads to a 'softening' and debilitation of the body, as compared with a life of hunting. Such a change could not be effected without serious penalties:

> ...mysterious ailments, particularly of the alimentary canal, must have begun to appear; women must have found that the stationary life modified the former ease and regularity of their functions (child birth in particular) and violent death and probably famine and sickness may have been the result.[697]

Civilisation, with its less severe standards for survival, made a lower degree of vitality eligible; whilst, clothing, by concealing the defects of the worst co-ordinated individuals, led to dysgenic mating.[698]

Prophylaxis, and therapeutics, comprise a significant element of Ludovici's writings. He believed Conservatives must concern themselves with the health of the people because no people can enjoy a sane outlook that does not possess bodily serenity. Health, "is primarily a question of sane living, of healthy food properly prepared from the dawn of life to the end."[699] The commercialisation and industrial preparation of England's staple foodstuffs sowed the seeds of ill-health and debility in every fresh generation of Englishmen that grew to maturity. A good deal of the insanity, despondency, nervousness, dental trouble, and general constitutional feebleness of modern times were due, according to Ludovici, to the many severe and obscure disorders of the digestive system which, he believed, are caused by unwise feeding. Consequently, the Conservative Party:

> ...With the view of protecting and preserving the soundest elements of the nation, [should institute] a thorough examination... of the conditions prevailing, especially in the market of artificial, proprietary, and all industrially

> produced foods, of which the rumen particularly possesses specific qualities. The question should be boldly put, in the teeth of vested interests, whether health is possible when essentially produced foodstuffs are being absorbed on a large scale. And this applies above all to every kind of alleged substitute for [illegible] milk.[700]

In Swinnerton's novel of 1919, Priscilla Taylor the nurse of a [illegible] Dr. Donald Saymerton recalls to Hermia a conversation which he had with Dr. Donald, in which the latter proclaimed that he was ashamed of his profession because it is built upon the sick and the unsound. The medical profession almost suppresses the power of the priesthood in the Middle Ages which built its power upon the slaves and the poor, and appeared the aristocracy with the people's support. Similarly, the medical profession, with all the sick and polluted to support it, crowns the moral and the male[701]:

> "Mark my words, Saymerton," he pursued, "a medical Luther will one day arise, and also a medical Erasmus, Bacon, Harley, Paddleigh and Spencer - not to speak of a medical Nietzsche - and then the fate of the medical hierarchy will be sealed. I see the day coming with inevitable certainty, for even the faith of our supporters - the physiologically botched, - is now tottering to its fall."[702]

Lord Henry Pigdean, in The Old Ark Hills, is invited to go to central China by the Executive Council of the Society for Anthropological Research, in order to investigate the reasons for China's practical immunity from lunacy and nervous diseases. Mrs. Pilgrim picked up the newspaper that divulged this information and proceeded to send that his proposed departure from the country would be a severe blow to the irreparable nervous invalids who annually benefited from his skill.[703] The loathed old age, "the bitter small of corpses", and wasted youth.[704] Lord Pigdean, in that Henry Pigdean, was acutely aware and aught to

have worn glasses to read; but rather than descend to any such scientific auxiliary to defective health, he preferred never to read.[705] His son, Lord Chiddingly, pointed to ill-health as one of the principal causes of disorder and unrest. He maintained that debilitated people cannot take anything but a jaundiced view of the best conditioned State, and that the first step, therefore, was to secure the proletariat's health which would once again feel the joie de vivre. The simplest means of doing this was to reform the food conditions of the country.[706]

Mr. Truck, in The Goddess that Grew Up, astounded the pariahs, a debating society, by proclaiming that before smallpox vaccination although thousands died those who remained were able to live with their constitutions unimpaired and uncontaminated. Only a few working men, at the back of the village hall, applauded him, whilst Canon Torrance, who Mr. Truck opposed, thought he had all the 'best people' with him. Mr. Truck proceeded, with apoplectic fury, that vaccination was undermining the primitive and natural health of our bodies:

> '...Who knows to what extent modern debility, the general lack of robust health - I do not speak of actual disease and illness - but the general absence of bouyant, wanton health and vigour, may not be due partly to the repeated poisoning in small doses of every generation of babies as they arrive?'[707]

He quoted a passage from Herbert Spencer to the effect that the propogation of subdued forms of constitutional disease through vaccination had been dysgenic. The audience was even more shocked when he frankly stated that the reduction of mortalities from smallpox vaccinations would lower the vital resistance of the race to disease.[708] It never occurred to them, especially doctors, that what was needed was a rule of life and a Constitution that could dispense with medicine altogether.[709]

Ludovici spoke of the elaborate and exhausting tiresomeness of illness:

> ...the luxurious and intricate pestilentialness of its effects, like the opulent ramified growth of some tropical fungus, that ultimately drills its intruding tendrils into every nook and cranny, every air space, of a whole domain. It does not require to be virulent to achieve this end; it needs only to be chronic, unabating, fluctuating hopelessly from day to day, without respite, without one interpolated movement of the state approaching good health, or normal well-being.

It blights the lives of those who witness it.[710] But, under the process of steady attrition which day by day wears down all sympathy, all capacity for interest and compassion, there gradually develops the beneficent safeguard of indifference. It is but the natural protective growth that health builds up against the devastating influence of a corrupting environment.[711]

In Ludovici's novel of 1924, The Taming of Don Juan, Frances Yardgrove, the consumptive son of a well-known manufacturer of proprietary food, Sir Jonathan Yardgrove, is informed by Dr. Irving, a vicar of rural Sussex, in a plaintive tone, that the local inhabitants 'live' on tinned food and margarine.[712] Dr. Hale, whose therapy he seeks, proclaims that consumption is caused by either the inability of the alimentary canal to assimilate the foods necessary for the body, or else it has not been given this vital food in sufficient quantity or quality. His explanation for the high incidence of tuberculosis in Sussex is the latter[713]:

> '...Not fresh air ad nauseum; not Davos Platz and an early grave; but the correction of the vice in your alimentary canal, Sir [Frances Yardgrove] ! - the largest and most important organ in your body - followed by plenty of good food, and the ultimate desperate cry of 'pax' from your germs.'[714]

Accordingly, Frances Yardgrove's tuberculosis is cured. Dr. Hale explains to Gilbert Milburn, his protege, that pasteurization diminishes the

vital quality of milk, and the boiling of milk reduces its vital qualities further.[715] Later in the novel, when Gilbert is taken prisoner of war in World War I, Dr. Hale recommends that he eats raw vegetables, dandelion leafs and common grass, to correct his deficient diet.[716] When the war ends Gilbert returns, he and Dr. Hale buy a farm to produce unpasteurised milk for those still sound in body.[717] On the occasion of Gilbert's becoming the unofficial Conservative candidate for the northern division of Weston, he reiterates his master's ideals:

> 'Our cry', Gilbert explained, 'has got to be "Pure Food for the People!" and the suppression of all fraudulent advertisements which lead the ignorant to purchase vast quantities of commercial and industrial foods that are either worthless or actually harmful. And we have to make it quite plain that our objective is the improvement of the national physique - not by the doubtful and expensive method of increasing the number of doctors, or welfare centres, or Health Ministry officials, but by placing health within the reach of all, on the nation's breakfast, dinner and supper table!'[718]

One of Ludovici's most significant books on prophylaxis is Man's Descent from the Gods, or, the complete case against prohibition, of 1921. It arose from a debate held at the Sesame Club in London on November 3, 1919, to which Ludovici was invited in order to oppose the Bishop of Willesden, who was to advocate the prohibition of alcohol in Britain.[719] Ludovici interprets the myth of Prometheus euhemeristically. The myth points to Prometheus's theft of fire as having been a calamity. Not until Dionysius appeared with his dispensing of fermented liquors were the appalling evils resulting from Prometheus's theft of fire production mitigated and neutralised. Prometheus versus Dionysius is the theme of the book.[720] Ludovici thought there were cogent reasons for believing that the right to fetch fire from the 'gods', the superior Cro-Magnon race, must have been subject to various rules laid down by Zeus and his wise counsellors.[721] Prometheus,

a hybrid between the Cro-Magnard and the Aryans, the inferior race, was probably aware of the increase wisdom of the restriction imposed by them regarding the fire-supply, yet preferred popularity by becoming the champion of the Aryans.[722] With the means to produce fire, the pastoral life, agriculture and industry followed as a matter of course, and in their train, commerce.[723] Above all, with the advent of cooking, food lost properties without which life cannot be maintained at a healthy or happy standard, or cannot be maintained at all. Disease quickly set in.[724] The Holy Catholic Church, in its incomparable wisdom respecting the material side of human life, was the first institution to point to the necessity of a partially raw food diet at specified periods in the year.[725] But, with the advent of the Protestant Church, the Catholic Church relaxed the rigour of its controls whilst, in Protestant countries, the reformers divorced themselves from those religious observances and exercises for which their new revolutionary programme offered them no adequate substitution.[726] Indovici recounted two personal experiences to substantiate his thesis regarding the detrimental effect of cooking on food. First, when he rid himself of incipient pyorrhea by treating himself as for a mild scorbutus. He ate plenty of uncooked vegetables and rid himself of his affliction. He believed people could save their teeth from pyorrhea by treating themselves as for a mild scurvy, and removing themselves from a high to a low altitude.[727] Second, when at the battle of the Somme in World War I the food for his battery in the Royal Field Artillery was inevitably stewed, and the men suffered from boils and scabies.[728] The dietary regimen he idealized was that of the pre-Xenophonic Greeks when, he believed, probably ate raw meat, various grasses, seeds, berries, roots, fruits, wild honey, and drank the milk of wild cattle and wild mares.[729] Primitive man must have been totally immune at the physical calamities

which fell upon them after the first indiscriminate application of fire to foods:

> ...those of us who still have a clean breath left, those who are still robust and healthy enough to feel a frank dislike and contempt for the invalid, the 'sufferer' and the half-witted, and who regard the cripple, the cretin, the misshapen and the physiologically bungled and botched with undisguised loathing, will know what I mean.[730]

These ills gradually abated from the moment when Zeus gave his only begotten son by Semele, the god Dionysius, as a Saviour to mankind.[731] Like the Christian God and the Saviour, they are frequently identified one with another.[732] Dionysius was the guardian deity of the productive, invigorating, overflowing and intoxicating power of life - wine.[733] Frantic orgies worshipped him as a deified ancestor who discovered the panacea against most of the ills and woes resulting from the unlimited use of fire.[734] Ludovici assumes Dionysius to be a divinity of the kind resulting from ancestor worship, unlike Zeus, a divinity resulting from the deification of a member of a superior race. Dionysius appeared long after all trace of the original superior and inferior races had disappeared, when the Aryans had absorbed the Cro-Magnons. Semele was probably a simple Greek maiden, just as the Virgin Mary was a simple Jewish maiden.[735] Dionysius discovered for the Greeks an art of life which increased their capacity for life.[736] The great virtue of the cordials introduced by Dionysius was that they made it possible for men to resist deficiency diseases induced by cooked food, and they also enabled him to do this at all times of the year and in any clime.[737] Ludovici believed the great decline in resistance offered to disease in Europe during the preceding three centuries which had made careful sanitation and disinfectants of all kinds an essential part of the life of modern man that without them he could not survive, was due to a proportionate decline in the quality of fermented liquors, and in the amount of fermented liquor consumed

by the mass of the people.[738] The evils of drunkenness in England were the direct result of the poisoning of the once pure old ale that made England what she was at her zenith in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.[739] The old ale of the Plantagenet and Tudor periods kept men extremely healthy and virile. Puritans de-vitalised ale by tolerating an adulterant, hops, from which lupulin, an anaphrodisiac, is extracted.[740] The leading features of Dionysius's "therapeutic doctrine" were : That wine is a good tonic; is a valuable stimulant, both of the mind and body; it is an excellent aid to digestion; it is a natural aphrodisiac; it allows of the benefits derived from fruit being enjoyed at any time and in any clime; because fermentation produces vitamins it compensates for a diet that is deficient through the exposure of food to heat.[741] The Promethean crime, byoccasioningof the cooking of food, was the cause of appalling tribulations for the women of the ancestors of the ancient Greeks, because of the coldness of their mates: "Life was a husk at which their vigorous teethgnawed in vain endeavour to discover the sweet kernel."[742] The mad dishevelled women depicted by Greek art as taking part in the festivals of the Dionysians who carried a wooden phallus in their baskets filled with fruit[743]and even ate raw meat as part of the festival, is explicable as their wild gratitude to Dionysius[744]: "It was Dionysius against Prometheus, Life against Death, the erect obelisk against impotence, sickness and disease. And Dionysius triumphed! No wonder the women were so gratified; no wonder they were so wild."[745] It was the first renaissance of health, beauty, vigour, and joyful life. Dionysius so neutralised the evils of Promethean civilisation as to make life not only possible, but also joyful and vigourous.[746] Ludovici thought there was a vital meaning in the Cro-Magnon's representation of woman with child. They were pre-Promethean who knew of no sickness or ugliness, and to whom "the

promise of life, bigness with a guarantee of the multiplication of life, was the most beautiful thing of all."[747] In the Cro-Magnon figurines and drawings of pregnant women, Ludovici saw a deep love and enthusiasm in regard to life, a fundamental acceptance of all that life, and the multiplication of life, means. They did not question the value of life![748] Ludovici concludes that the attempt to prohibit alcoholic beverages in Britain is a retrograde step to the grey misery of a Promethean civilisation, without the "therapeutic safeguards" of the doctrines of Dionysius who enabled the ancient Greeks to be drunk with life![749]

Ludovici called 'good' all that which makes life desirable. He thought that besides the desirability of lust, motherhood, reproduction and fertility, 'good' must refer to reverence for the body and a preposseession in favour of health and prejudice against sickness:

> We also call good the loathing of ugliness and the desire to suppress it; we therefore approve of deep suspicion towards ugliness and illness, and towards everything and everybody that attempts to give ugliness and illness fine sounding and euphemistic names.

He calls 'bad' the finding of excuses or extenuating circumstances for ugliness, botchedness and sickness![750] False teeth and spectacles should be regarded with repugnance![751] The moment physiological serenity goes and a function ceases to be a pleasure the value of Life ebbs![752] The development of all influences tending to deteriorate the body, especially scientific techniques and substitutes tending to supersede it, like wheelchairs, false limbs, and the like, must be prohibited![753] We should master life and grasp reality;

> ...because, having mastered our bodies and solved once more the secret of their harmonious workings, we shall no longer be in the difficult dilemma of mortals who, with neglected and badly functioning physiques, try to anticipate here on earth the pas times and pursuits of the immortal world.[754]

Ludovici thought the nation, especially working-class mothers, should be thoroughly re-educated concerning food values. The subject of nutrition should form an item in every school curriculum; and a special regimen for the child should be taught by public proclamation.[755] He advocated legislation that would make it impossible for English women to buy inferior foodstuffs of all kinds until a standard was established regarding staple articles of diet; and a severe system of rationing for tinned, preserved, and proprietary foods.[756]

Ludovici derided modern medicine for its belief that a disease can be satisfactorily treated by suppressing its symptoms; its "bacteriological bias"; the belief that the perfection and multiplication of artificial aids is one of the directions in which medical science can improve.[757] The object of medical research should have been to make medicine unnecessary by understanding the nature of disease as wrong functioning, not merely of a part, but of the whole organism.[758] Artificial aids should be condemned, and bodily vices remedied by correcting faulty functioning;

> ...The proper procedure would obviously be to dispense with glasses and artificial aids in general, and to re-educate the faulty organ - whether it was an eye or a kidney or a heart - to function correctly.[759]

The individual should be 'naturally' immunised by an improvement in food conditions, a better understanding of hygiene, the restoration of breast feeding as a universal custom and duty, the return of the masses of the population to healthy out-of-door occupations, and, the raising of the general tone and resistance of the individual by re-educating him in the correct use of his body.[760] Will and self-discipline, rather than drugs, are the only effective cure of illness.[761] Ludovici's Health and Education through Self-Mastery, of 1933, is devoted to the latter. He suggests that mankind is approaching an evolutionary cataclysm[762] as ours is an epoch of extreme maladaptation.[763] The human

organism is analogous to a machine, faulty use engenders faulty functioning.[764] The fact of evolution would incline one to expect that the use of an evolved mechanism with its evolved nervous controls is not fixed for all time and is, therefore, susceptible to ill-usage.[765] Evolutionary processes do not possess either the infallibility or the reliability that Darwin supposed. By far the greater portion of living species are the degenerate survivors of superior ancestors, and civilized man himself, except for a few outstanding and exceptional individuals, is by no means a successfully adapted animal.[766] It cannot be claimed that man's mastery over himself and his environment has kept pace with the complex changes which civilisation had introduced into the modern world. "Nor is it apparent from the results achieved that it is safe to leave those problems created by change to blind evolutionary processes to solve."[767] Civilisation introduced constantly changing conditions, which precluded satisfactory adaptation; and the imposition of less severe standards for survival, not merely as the result of modern surgery, but also as a result of life's no longer demanding a rigid and definite level of efficiency.[768] Only when civilized men master themselves by correct physical functioning can they be rejuvenated both physically and mentally.[769] An enhancement of general tone and vigour is the only remedy for neurosis and psychoses.[770] But, the correct use of self is not a pleasant pas time, like golf, bridge, or chess, rather it is the most exacting, rigourous, and humiliating experience a man can undergo:

> ...For while it holds out vistas of the heights to which a man can attain if only he applies himself and concentrates, it also exposes him to himself as a creature so antagonistically directed hitherto, so essentially the thrall of his unconscious, that it constitutes the severest rebuke that could possibly be administered to his pride. Through it he sees revealed the extremely thin partition that once separated him from the borderline mental case, and as he begins to master it he wonders whether there is anything more than speech alone that

formerly distinguished him from the highest anthropoids or even the beasts of the field.[771]

The same notions occur in Ludovici's The New Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning, of 1945. He suggests that the mere act of yielding to an impulse, whether to move, to eat, or to breathe, does not necessarily suffice to renew life adequately: "We see all about us people who yield without hesitation to those impulses, and who yet fail adequately to build afresh each day the life forces within them."[772] If anywhere in one life has died or is moribund or reduced in tone, because it has not been adequately renewed every day, that part of one will become imperfectly adjusted to the forces of environment and even to the exigencies of the other life forces in one's body, with the result that illness supervenes.[773] Only a good initial endowment, good habits of life, diet, hygiene, and correct use of self, can renew life adequately every day. Doctors must learn that illness is often the outcome of a routine of life that has failed adequately to renew life. Ludovici defines health as:

> ...that state of life in which there is not only a favourable initial endowment for adjusting the forces of the organism to those of the outside world, but in which the vitality in every part of the organism is also being adequately renewed every day for this adjustment.[774]

At the very root of life, in the principle of the survival of the fittest, nature has implanted a dual control of bodily mechanisms which served the purposes of individual self-preservation. The moment disaster occurred consciousness interfered with the instinctive and traditional optimal controls of the species, and saved the situation. The very science of organic evolution presupposes such a dual control of animal organisms.[775] However, it is in this dual control, with the exigent ent possibility of conscious interference that error in the use of self may find its opportunity, as it had with modern men. Other animals had not succumbed to error because of their standardisation:

A stable environment in which only those who evolve optimal controls survive, and reproduce their kind; rigid elimination of all those who, in the process of adaptation, fail to evolve optimal controls.[776] Uncoordination has not applied to infinity for generations. Discoveries such as fire, mechanical contrivances of all kinds, and other changes to the way of life entailed by civilisation, have repeatedly confronted man with fresh problems in the use of self. Not only did the environment cease to be stable, but rigid elimination of failures ceased to operate with unfailing regularity, especially through the provision of artificial aids to the maladapted.[777] However, consciousness which nature leaves in part control of our bodily adjustments and muscular coordination, is a double edged sword. Although it may introduce error, it is man's only means of eliminating error and recovering correct use of self.[778] Correct body use can only be achieved by the daily psycho-physical experience of using oneself under correct discipline, until the new and correct reflexes governing the supporting and locomotory reflexes become conditioned.[779]

Parturition, for example, should be 'normalised', anaesthetics should be withdrawn, and it should lose its present "torture-chamber features."[780] A vital bodily function such as child-birth should be pleasurable[781], as Ludovici believed it was among primitive women.[782] He thought latent septicaemia could be avoided by a dietary regimen which secured wholeness.[783] By faulty bodily coordination, the normal and natural relations of the organs, their condition, and tone, may be adversely modified.[784] Through the wrong use of self an abdominal wall may sag, abdominal viscera may be displaced, and a thorax may expand so inadequately as to restrict the respiratory function, all of which impair the course of pregnancy and parturition.[785] Ludovici claimed, in innumerable cases, to have witnessed the improvement of the respiratory function and the

increase of thoracic capacity, under connection of faulty bodily constitution.[786] It is merely a ruse of orthodox medicine to maintain that bacteria is the cause of illness. By means of it the vanity and indolence of the sick were spared, and the medical profession flourished. Moreover, the sick only breathe, move, stand, and work in an incorrect way, that is the cause of their illness. Only painstaking self-discipline can purge them of their corruption.[787] Ludovici's ideal was that mankind should become as independent of expert medicine and surgery as animals in their natural state.[788] Ludovici believed, from personal experience, that the distress caused by a long history of constipation, with the daily use of irritant aperients, is an important factor in the genesis of nervous. Indeed, all nervous, which psychiatrists describe as of purely psychogenic origin, begin with a long period of psycho-physical distress.[789] Regrettably, the 'germ-mania' of modern medicine relieved the sick and the sound of the need for action[790], and had made no progress in the knowledge of a sound bodily regimen.[791] Here strenuous physical exercise by the mass of the people of modern England would, believed Ludovici, relieve them of their morbid demand for sedatives, aperitifs, and other forms of medication.[792]

Conclusions and Conspectus

There are two unequivocal conclusions to this chapter, and preceding chapters. The first conclusion is that Ludovici's social and political thought is fascist. His programme to regenerate England overlapped the political extremes of the party system which he intended to succeed, the militancy of fascists. In this chapter, I have discussed his advocacy of elitism, a notion which is liberal; his advocacy of revolution and populism, notions which are socialist; his advocacy

of the Nietzschean ethic, a notion which is contiguous to both racism and authoritarianism. Whilst in this chapter, and preceding chapters, I have discussed Ludovici's advocacy of authoritarianism, eugenics, and antipathy to egalitarianism, his ideal of an authoritative direction of cultural racial planning, collective breeding, traditionalist patriarchism, Nobiliary Reaction, totalitarian government. The second conclusion is that in Ludovici's social and political thought conservatism is commensurable with fascism.

Nevertheless, during and after World War II Ludovici did make a few unconvincing attempts to exonerate himself of his identity as a fascist, although, the ideological character of his political writings never changed. In July 1941, he claimed that he had always advocated hereditary rulership because its authority is always accepted and stands beyond jealousy and envy. No thought disregard of this truth was a fundamental flaw of fascism:

> Hence the ...obscurity and stupidity of the English Tory who can so far misunderstand his position as to confuse it with that a fascist or Nazi, or any other political upstart who believes in the sudden emergence of a man, a party, a class, or a group that can save mankind, or even save a particular nation.

Ludovici proclaimed that it was on the question of elite selection that Nietzsche, and himself, would come from sharing any convictions with Nazism. No thought his adherence to Nietzsche's "aristocratic ideal" was sufficient to exonerate him from the appellation of 'fascist'. However, by maintaining that the true Tory position rested on a belief in "blood", whilst attempting to disavow his identity as a fascist, makes his claim to being a mistreated conservative unconvincing, as it always was.[795]

Judovici's most vigorous attempt to disown himself of his identity as a fascist is his article "Transform Society's Values", which he contributed to a symposium on the future of the Jewish people, Gentile and Jew, in 1965. The latter consisted of articles, mostly by prominent Jews, which expressed abhorrence at the barbaric Nazi extermination of Jews in World War II. In his contribution, Judovici says that it is historically unsound to attribute to the Jews that state of affairs and practices which laissez-faire, inspired by the fundamental individualism of the English, ultimately brought into being. However, the fact remained that the Jews who were re-admitted to England from 1655, "found in this state of affairs [laissez-faire] and in those practices environmental conditions which suited both their temperament and character."[794] Judovici maintains that the English throughout their history have been animated by a separatist and isolationist spirit, tending to express itself socially in what he calls 'particularism', a term he adopts from Henri de Tourville's Histoire de la Particularisme. 'Particularism' is a temper of aloofness which looks upon the rest of the community from the narrow angle of the family, and recognises few social obligations. Henri de Tourville claimed that it was a product of the life led by the ancestors of a section of the Saxon people in their ancient home, the Norwegian fjords![795] Judovici endorses Henri de Tourville's racialist thesis. Only the presence of a few patriarchal elements in England, like the Anglos and Normans, accounts for their persistent, though feeble resistance to extreme particularist developments.[796] Racially, the Jews, like the Saxons, had a past which influenced them in a particularist direction. Their ancestors led the life of nomads and acquired the same traits as typified that branch of the Saxon people which colonised a large part of England.[797] Therefore, to quarrel with the efficiency of the Jews in a particularist

culture, when one is a particularist and one's own people were themselves largely responsible for the creation of that culture, "is about as reasonable as for a loser at a game to abuse the winner, when its principles and rules are of his own making."[798] When, in a particularist society, things inevitably go wrong, a minority easily discerned by the mass, who are doing conspicuously well, are not unnaturally singled out as the cause of the general distress:

> Besides, it is in the interest even of non-Jews, or certainly of those who happen to stand high and dry above the more intolerable conditions imposed by particularism, to direct the attention away from themselves onto a body which can be truthfully designated at least a part cause of the trouble. It is obvious that this is only a half-truth.[799]

Ludovici rebuked the extreme English anti-Semite who would reject de Tourville's thesis and claim that particularism became paramount in England owing to miscegenation between the English and Jews, because of the difficulty of selecting anyone for banishment if "Jewish blood" was widely disseminated in England before 1656, which he did not refute.[800] Ludovici still believed mental and physical health depended on racial purity.[801] However, as the grossest random-breeding in the modern world, the mixing of wholly different types and stocks within the same people or nation, was regarded with complete equanimity, Ludovici thought it would be "like straining at a gnat" to make any special point of avoiding mixture with peoples who are not hereditarily true Englishmen, such as the Jews. Besides, as orthodox medicine and genetics did not appreciate the extent to which ideal health "probably depends" on standardisation of type, the 'problem' of the Jews on the biological side, "must remain unsolved and be left to the taste of the individual in either community." Ludovici, at his most tolerant, thought only the social and political solution of the Jewish 'problem' allows of precise

statement, and with this he concluded.[802] He believed capitalism, as the nineteenth century knew it, was irrevocably doomed.[803] Ludovici thought the only hope for the future lay in the transmutation of England's deeply particularistic culture into one essentially mutualistic, accompanied by a wholesale transvaluation of the values that are associated with a particularised culture.[804] If the Jews did not settle elsewhere, which Ludovici preferred, they must collaborate with the non-Jews about them in reinstating, amidst the decadent particularist culture, values that are independent of wealth.[805]:

> They [the Jews] must be fully prepared to take severe measures against those individuals in their own people who, willy-nilly, refuse to abandon those instincts and gifts which have made them so eminently successful in particularist societies - the instinct to make private property a wholly private and unrelated phenomenon, the instinct to drive a hard bargain with the ignorant and needy, the instinct to discover where need is pressing in order to turn it to personal profit, the impulse even to create such a need where none exists and to forestall a needy purchaser, and, above all, the demagogic shrewdness to identify themselves with the non-Jewish clamourers for liberty, when all this liberty may mean is the absence of wise hindrances to the ruthless and automatic action of competition or supply and demand.[806]

The Jews who accepted the above should be prepared to banish those who do not. Only then, Ludovici believed, could the Jewish 'problem' be solved.[807] The latter is the closest Ludovici ever came to repudiating fascism, but it still bears its unmistakable traits. Besides, it was probably prompted by expediency. He lamented, in October 1957, that the anti-democracy of both the fascist nations and the English 'right' sufficed for their complete identity to be assumed by the "moronic minds of the crowds in Parliament (including Ministers of State) and, above all, of the crowds of the general public outside." Ludovici claimed that owing to his lifelong connection with the English 'right' he was subjected not only to suspicion but "many indignities" at the hands of the authorities in World War II. He recollected

bitterly that the Chief Constable of Suffolk, Colonel A.F. Senior, interrogated him for a whole morning, "because he had heard from some other fool the profoundly suspicious fact that I had translated Nietzsche into English."[608]

However, the above examples of Ludovici's attempts to disavow his identity as a fascist are only significant because of their uniqueness and the pressing circumstances that brought them about. They are the only ones that can be culled from his writings. Despite World War II, Ludovici never changed his ideological stance during or after it. His attempt to transform conservatism into fascism never waned.* In his introduction to his The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders, of 1952, he claimed that since he wrote his A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, in 1915, he had not found it necessary to depart a "hairsbreadth" from the position he originally held. Everything that happened and everything he read in the interval had only strengthened his original convictions.[609] Indeed, until his demise, Ludovici continued elaborating the same ideas with which he launched his career as a fascist ideologue over six decades before. One has only to peruse the remarkable number of articles which he contributed to the South African Observer from its inception in May 1955 until his last contribution in May 1970, eleven months before his death at the age of eighty-nine, to appreciate the endurance of his fascist convictions. Even the very impetus that impelled him into a career as a writer and fascist ideologue, his

---

*As is obvious from three articles he contributed to the South African Observer in 1955, when he was seventy-four years of age: "In Defence of Conservatism", South African Observer, Volume I, No.2, June 1955, pp. 5-7; "A British Conservative looks at the Black Invasion of Britain", South African Observer, Volume I, No.3, July 1955, pp.5-6; "Britain's Conservative Statesman", South African Observer, Volume I, No.4, August 1955, pp.5-6.

concern at the decay of art and culture, did not merely persist but intensified in some of the last articles he contributed to the South African Observer in the late 1960s.*

Ludovici lamented the difficulty of converting the post-war generation to fascism: "the servility which the dread of appearing Fascist has inculcated in the present generation."[810] Whilst, in his penultimate book, Religion for Infidels of 1961, which is essentially devoted to Nietzscheism, he expressed anger at the difficulties he had encountered throughout his life in getting Nietzscheism adopted in England: "Continentality, the power of the Churches, the indoctrination of centuries, and the influence of the sickly and defective themselves, were too formidable."[811] He was a failed man. Throughout his lifetime Ludovici was either dismissed as an "earthly ignoramus"[812] or, more kindly, a brilliant writer with an unfortunate tendency to run to exaggeration and absurdity: "All that he needs to give him his proper place in literature is an accession of moderation and common sense."[813] He reflected on his failure to influence the British public and blamed it on the control of mass communications by the Establishment:

> ...For fifty years I have been engaged in trying to enlighten the British Public about the pitfalls to which their lack of psychological insight constantly exposes them, and I may truly claim that I have probably had more articles and letters destroyed or returned by newspaper editors on the score of 'lack of space' than any writer in Christendom. For nothing - absolutely nothing - is ever allowed to reach the eyes of the British Public that the Establishment thinks would not

---

*Four of the more significant are: Anthony Mario Ludovici's "Public Opinion in England (XXIII)", South African Observer, Volume XIII, No.4, January 1968, pp. 13-14; "Public Opinion in England (XXIV)", South African Observer, Volume XIII, No.5, February 1968, pp. 12-13; "Public Opinion in England (XXV)", South African Observer, VolumeXIII, No.6, March 1968, pp. 12-13; "Public Opinion in England (XXVII)", South African Observer, Volume XIII, No.8, June 1968, pp.12-13.

be good for them.[814]

He hoped that he would at least be credited "by a more enlightened and emancipated posterity with having single handed and against every possible interest of my Age"[815] with having done what he thought it his duty to country to do. He never was in his lifetime or, to date, by posterity.

In the next, and final, Chapter, I shall briefly study Ludovici's political affiliation. It will be maintained that they, like Ludovici, were fascists, and shared a common attempt to render conservatism commensurable with fascism.

Notes to Chapter 5: The World Regenerated.

1. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy, A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.viii.

2. ibid., p.87.

3. ibid., pp.95-96.

4. idem., Lysistrate; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.96.

5. ibid., p.97.

6. ibid., p.101.

7. idem., Recovery. The quest of regenerate national values (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1935), p.11.

8. ibid., p.12.

9. ibid., p.13.

10. ibid., p.16.

11. ibid., pp. 17-18.

12. ibid., p.18.

13. ibid., p.20.

14. ibid.

15. ibid., p.21.

16. ibid., p.22.

17. ibid., p.24.

18. ibid., p.25.

19. ibid., p.27.

20. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.430ff.

21. ibid., p.254.

22. ibid., p.266.

23. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.v.

24. ibid., p.vi.

25. ibid., p.6.

26. ibid., p.12.

27. ibid., p.14.

28. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "In Defence of Conservatism," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.2, June 1955, p.5.

29. ibid., p.6.

30. idem., "Translator's Preface," to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Will to Power, Book III and IV, in The Complete Works of Friedich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London): T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume XV: p.xviii.

31. ibid., p.xiv.

32. idem., Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), pp.98-99.

33. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy"(London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.216.

34. ibid., p.199.

35. ibid., pp.201-202.

36. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against probilition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.238.

37. ibid., p.247.

38. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.358.

39. ibid., p.359.

40. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth-control, and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928)., p.256.

41. idem., Recovery. The quest of regenerate national values (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1935), P.4.

42. ibid., p.5.

43. ibid., p.6.

44. ibid., p.8.

45. idem., The Future of Woman (London: Kagan Paul, 1936), p.141.

46. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.207.

47. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.78.

48. idem., "Review of The Fascist Movement in Italian Life,by Pietro Gorgolini (Fisher Unwin, 1923)," English Review, Volume 37, October 1923, p.487.

49. ibid., p.488.

50. ibid., pp.488-489.

51. Benito Mussolini, quoted in Pietro Gorgolini op. cit., quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.489.

52. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Review of The Fascist Movement in Italian Life, by Pietro Gorgolini (Fisher Unwin, 1923)," English Review, Volume 37, October 1923, p.490.

53. ibid., 491.

54. ibid., pp.491-492.

55. ibid., p.492.

56. Benito Mussolini, loc. cit., quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid.

57. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid.

58. idem., Woman, A vindication (London: Constable, 1923), p.328.

59. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), p.14.

60. ibid., pp.48-49.

61. ibid., p.89.

62. idem., Recovery The quest of regenerate national values (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1935), p.7.

63. ibid., p.8.

64. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.328.

65. Friedrich Nietzsche, Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by Maximilian A. Mugge in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume II: p.51.

66. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.16.

67. ibid., pp.243-244.

68. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.36.

69. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.18.

70. ibid., pp.110-111.

71. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), pp.241-242.

72. idem., The Truth about Childbirth, Lay light on maternal morbidity and mortality (London: Kegan Paul, 1937), p.233.

73. Cobbett [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Jews and the Jews in England (London: Boswell, 1938), p.92.

74. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), p.9.

75. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), pp.13-14.

76. idem., "Hitler and the Third Reich (III)," English Review, Volume 63, No.3, September 1936, pp.231-232.

77. ibid., p.232.

78. ibid., p.233.

79. ibid., p.234.

80. ibid., pp.234-235.

81. ibid., p.235.

82. ibid., p.236.

83. ibid., p.237.

84. ibid., p.238.

85. idem., "Hitler and Nietzsche - II," English Review, Volume LXIV, No.2, February 1937, p.197.

86. ibid., p.198.

87. ibid., p.200.

88. Martin Luther, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.201.

89. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid.

90. ibid., pp.201-202.

91. ibid., p.202.

92. idem., "Hitler and Nietzsche - I," English Review, Volume LXIV, No.1, January 1937, p.44.

93. ibid., pp.50-51.

94. Friedrich Nietzsche, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.51.

95. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.321.

96. ibid., p.324.

97. ibid., p.326.

98. ibid., pp.346-347.

99. ibid., p.347.

100. ibid., p.384.

101. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "The Conservative Programme; A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 113, April 1923, p.606.

102. ibid., p.613.

103. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.2.

104. ibid., p.3.

105. ibid..

106. ibid., pp.4-5.

107. ibid., pp.116-117.

108. ibid., p.117.

109. ibid., pp.156-157.

110. ibid., p.230.

111. ibid., p.232.

112. idem., "A British Conservative Look at the Black Invasion of Britain," South African Observer, Volume I, No.3, July 1955, p.5.

113. idem., "Notes" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarathustra, translated by Thomas Common, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume XI: p.435.

114. idem., "Art: The Art of India [Review of The Arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon, by Ananda Coomaraswamy (T.N. Foulis),]" New Age, Volume XIV, No.15, February 12, 1914, p.475.

115. ibid., p.475.

116. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), pp.87-88.

117. idem., Too Old for Dolls. A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.25.

118. ibid., p.39.

119. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.28.

120. ibid., pp.56-57.

121. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.15.

122. ibid., p.103.

123. ibid., p.130.

124. ibid., p.159.

125. ibid., pp.199-200.

126. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.245.

127. ibid., p.262.

128. ibid., pp.274-275.

129. ibid., p.281.

130. ibid., pp.291-292.

131. ibid., p.304.

132. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.53.

133. ibid., pp.191-192.

134. ibid., p.193.

135. ibid., p.194.

136. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p.93.

137. idem., Woman. A vindication (London: Constable, 1923), pp.102-103.

138. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.304.

139. ibid.,

140. ibid., p.344.

141. ibid., p.349.

142. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth-control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), pp.50-51.

143. ibid., p.61.

144. ibid., p.250.

145. ibid., pp.252-253.

146. ibid., pp. 253-254.

147. idem., Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), p.28.

148. ibid., pp.29-30.

149. idem., "Eugenics and Consanguineous Marriages," Eugenics Review, Volume XXV, No. 3, October 1933, p.151.

150. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.10.

151. ibid., p.66.

152. ibid., p.90.

153. ibid., p.103.

154. ibid., p.130.

155. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.10.

156. ibid., p.152.

157. ibid., p.154.

158. ibid., p.203.

159. ibid., pp.212-213.

160. ibid., p.213.

161. ibid., p.379.

162. ibid., p.383.

163. idem., The Four Pillars of Health. A Contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), p.9.

164. idem., "Artificial Insemination," Letter to The Times, July 4, 1945, p.2.

165. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.91.

166. ibid., p.93.

167. ibid., pp.115-116.

168. ibid., p.130.

169. ibid., p.137.

170. ibid., p.140.

171. ibid., p.142.

172. ibid., pp.144-145.

173. ibid., p.145.

174. ibid., pp.146-147.

175. ibid., pp.148-149.

176. ibid., p.149.

177. ibid., p.168.

178. idem., "Personality in Statesmanship (III)" South African Observer, Volume I, No.8, December 1955, p.5.

179. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.62.

180. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), pp.376-377.

181. Ralph de Pomerai, Marriage, Past, Present and Future: An Outline of the History and Development of Human Sexual Relationships (London: Constable, 1930), p.vii.

182. ibid., p.317.

183. ibid., p.315.

184. idem., "The Latest Form of Poisonous Hate," New Age, Volume XII, No.2, November 14, 1912, p.33.

185. idem., "The Latest Form of Puritanical Brutality," Letter to the New Age, Volume XIII, No. 1, May 1, 1913, p.19.

186. Friedrich Nietzsche, Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by Maximilian A. Mugge, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume II: p.23.

187. idem., Beyond Good and Evil. Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed. 2nd Impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), pp.186-187.

188. ibid., p.182.

189. ibid., p. 189.

190. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Notes" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarathustra, translated by Thomas Common, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols., (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume XI: p.414.

191. ibid., p.415.

192. idem., Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.36.

193. ibid., p.222.

194. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), p.142.

195. ibid., p.149.

196. idem., Too Old for Dolls. A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), pp. 5-7.

197. ibid., p.12.

198. ibid., p.13.

199. ibid., p.121.

200. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.27.

201. ibid., p.267.

202. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.16.

203. ibid., p.38.

204. Anthony Mario Ludovici, French Beans, (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.16.

205. ibid., p.130.

206. ibid., pp.130-131.

207. ibid., p.199.

208. ibid., p.236.

209. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p.32.

210. ibid., p.153.

211. idem., Man's Descent From the Gods; or the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.212.

212. ibid., pp.212-213.

213. ibid., p.215.

214. ibid.

215. ibid., p.216.

216. ibid., p.217.

217. ibid., pp.218-219.

218. ibid., p.220.

219. idem., "The Folly of Feminine Franchise," English Review, Volume 37, November 1923, p.578.

220. idem., Woman. A Vindication (London: Constable, 1923), pp.vii-viii.

221. ibid., p.28.

222. ibid., p.29.

223. ibid., pp.30-31.

224. ibid., p.41.

225. ibid., p.42.

226. ibid., p.47.

227. ibid., p.56.

228. ibid., p.60.

229. ibid., p.68.

230. ibid., p.81.

231. ibid., p.166.

232. ibid., p.167.

233. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Woman. A Vindication (London: Constable, 1923), p.172.

234. ibid., p.189.

235. ibid., pp.193-194.

236. ibid., p.231.

237. ibid., p.237.

238. ibid., p.247.

239. ibid., pp.251-252.

240. ibid., p.264.

241. ibid., p.267.

242. ibid., p.269.

243. ibid., p.271.

244. ibid., p.276.

245. ibid., pp.277-278.

246. ibid., p.278.

247. ibid., pp.334-335.

248. ibid., p.335.

249. ibid., p.344.

250. ibid., pp.280-345.

251. ibid., p.307.

252. ibid., p.310.

253. ibid., pp.321-322.

254. ibid., p.324.

255. ibid., p.345.

256. idem., "Feminine Franchise - A Reply to my Critics," English Review, Volume 38, March 1924, p.372.

257. ibid., p.376.

258. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), pp.99-118.

259. ibid., p.106.

260. ibid.

261. ibid., p.108.

262. ibid., p.116.

263. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Lysistrata; or woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), pp.99-118.

264. idem., "Reply to A.E. Linton," Letter to the English Review, Volume 45, August 1927, p.250.

265. idem., "Anti-Feminism," Letter to the English Review, Volume XLV, July 1927, p.2.

266. idem,"Matriarchy and the Mothers [Review of The Mothers: A Study of the Origins of Sentiments and Institutions, by Robert Briffault, 3 volumes (Allen & Unwin)]," English Review, Volume XLV, November 1927, p.602.

267. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.15.

268. ibid., p.16.

269. ibid., p.18.

270. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth-control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), pp.54-55.

271. ibid., pp.58-59.

272. ibid., pp.124-125.

273. ibid., p.129.

274. ibid., p.137.

275. ibid., p.141.

276. ibid., p.223.

277. ibid., p.229.

278. ibid., pp.275-276.

279. idem., "The Importance to Women of a Youthful Marriage," Marriage Hygiene, Volume 1, No.4, May 1935, p.396.

280. ibid., p.397.

281. ibid., p.402.

282. idem., "The Case Against Legalised Artificial Abortion," in Abortion, by F.W. Stella Browne, Anthony Mario Ludovici, Harry Roberts, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935), p.61.

283. ibid., pp.61-62.

284. ibid., p.93.

285. ibid., pp.100-101.

286. ibid., p.104.

287. ibid.

288. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.113.

289. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.469.

290. idem., The Future of Woman (London: Kegan Paul, 1936), pp.22-23.

291. ibid., pp.78-79.

292. ibid., pp.151-152.

293. idem., "Hitler and Nietzsche -II," English Review, Volume 64, No. 2, February 1937, pp.194-195.

294. Friedrich Nietzsche; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.196.

295. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Truth about Childbirth. Lay Light on maternal morbidity and mortality (London: Kegan Paul, 1937), p.163.

296. idem., "Prostitution [Review of Prostitution, by Dr. Tage Kemp (Heinemann)]," New English Weekly, Volume XI, No.25, September 16, 1937, pp.368-369.

297. idem., "Equal Pay [Review of Equal Pay: What is and what it means, with a foreword by Lord Percy (Aims of Industry)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXVI, No.8, December 30, 1944, p.69.

298. David Valentine [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Poet's Trumpeter (London: Jonathan Cape, 1939), pp.57-58.

299. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Enemies of Women, The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), p.119.

300. ibid., p.162.

301. idem., The Child: an adult's problem (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), p.133.

302. ibid., p.134.

303. idem., Woman: A vindication (London: Constable, 1923), pp.13-14.

304. idem., The Child: an adult's problem (London: Carroll & Nicholson, pp.15-16.

305. ibid., p.89.

306. ibid., p.123.

307. ibid., p.205.

308. ibid., p.221.

309. idem., "Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline (VI)," South African Observer, Volume II, No. 3, July, 1956, p.13.

310. idem, "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 111 , June 1922, pp.958-959.

311. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Art: The Royal College of Art," New Age, Volume XIII, No.16, August 14, 1913, p.463.

312. Friedrich Nietzsche, Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by Maximilian A. Mugge, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18. vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911), Volume II: p.78.

313. Anthony Mario Ludovici, What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.134.

314. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp. 126-

315. ibid., p.127.

316. ibid., pp.127-128.

317. ibid., pp.130-131.

318. ibid., p.149.

319. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth-control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), p.154.

320. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.25.

321. idem., "Education in Modern England (IX)," South African Observer, Volume VI, No. 5, September 1960, p.13.

322. idem., "Education in Modern England (X)," South African Observer, Volume VI, No. 6, October 1960, p.13.

323. idem., "Education in Modern England (XI)," South African Observer, Volume VI, No.7, November 1960, p.12.

324. idem., "Education in Modern England (XII)," South African Observer, Volume VI, No.8., December 1960, p.12.

325. Arthur Schopenhauer, Sämmtliche Werke, Dr. Griseback's Edit. Volume VI, Chap. VI and Volume V, Chap. XXVIII: cited in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.13.

326. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Public Opinion in England (II)," South African Observer, Volume XI, No.1, August 1965, p.14.

327. idem., Religion for Infidels (London; Holborn, 1961), p.8.

328. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), pp.99-100.

329. ibid., p.262.

330. idem., "The Conservative Programme: A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 113, April 1923, p.612.

331. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.10.

332. ibid., pp.18-19.

333. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.95.

334. ibid., p.230.

335. ibid., p.233.

336. John Green, "Youth Speaks Out II - A Political Writer [Anthony Mario Ludovici]," National Review, Volume 103, August 1934, p.223.

337. ibid., pp.223-224.

338. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil, Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, introduced by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed. 2nd impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), p.59.

339. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Notes" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarathustra, translated by Thomas Common, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols. (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), Volume XI: p.408.

340. ibid., p.409.

341. ibid., pp.433-434.

342. Friedrich Nietzsche, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.434.

343. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.436.

344. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), pp.43-44.

345. ibid., p.181.

346. ibid., p.184.

347. ibid., p.194.

348. idem., Nietzsche: his life and works,preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910), p.42.

349. ibid., pp.42-43.

350. ibid., p.44.

351. ibid., pp.46-47.

352. ibid., p.47.

353. ibid., p.56.

354. ibid., pp.56-57.

355. ibid., pp.90-91.

356. idem., Mansel Fellowes, [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.220.

357. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), p.220.

358. ibid., p.237.

359. idem., French Beans (London: Butchinson, [1923]),pp. 191-192.

360. ibid., p.305.

361. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), pp.104-105.

362. ibid., pp.110-111.

363. ibid., p.111.

364. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), pp.100-161.

365. ibid., p.340.

366. idem., The Night-Hoers; or the case against birth-control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), pp.75-76.

367. ibid., p.242.

368. ibid., p.248.

369. ibid., p.249.

370. ibid., pp.250-251.

371. ibid., p.256.

372. ibid., p.38.

373. ibid., pp.78-79.

374. idem., "Self-Righteousness and the Refugee Problem," New Pioneer, No. 10, September 1939, p.247.

375. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.205.

376. ibid., p.212.

377. ibid., p.338.

378. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961)) p.9.

379. ibid., p.31.

380. ibid., p.55.

381. ibid., p.275.

382. ibid., p.276-277.

383. ibid., p.277.

384. ibid., p.83.

385. ibid., pp.84-85.

386. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.89.

387. ibid., p.130.

388. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A Text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.284.

389. ibid., p.285.

390. ibid., p.286.

391. ibid., p.287.

392. ibid., p.288 ff.

393. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.v.

394. ibid., p.19.

395. ibid., p.20.

396. ibid., p.60.

397. ibid., p.64.

398. Viscount Bolingbroke, On the Spirit of Patriotism (T. Davies Edition, 1775), p.8: quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.73.

399. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.73.

400. ibid., p.77.

401. ibid., p.78.

402. ibid., p.79.

403. ibid., p.168.

404. ibid., pp.248-262.

405. ibid., p.257.

406. ibid., p.259.

407. ibid., p.261.

408. ibid., p.262.

409. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.25.

410. ibid., pp.44-60.

411. ibid., p.51.

412. ibid., pp.51-52.

413. ibid., p.52.

414. ibid., pp.55-56.

415. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The False Assumption of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.25.

416. ibid.

417. ibid., p.57.

418. ibid., p.58.

419. ibid., p.59.

420. ibid., pp.62-63.

421. ibid., pp.64-65.

422. ibid., p.69.

423. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.117.

424. ibid., pp.117-118.

425. ibid., p.118.

426. ibid., pp.119-120.

427. ibid., p.120.

428. idem., Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), pp.11-12.

429. ibid., p.12.

430. ibid., p.14.

431. ibid., pp.14-15.

432. ibid., p.15.

433. idem., The Child: an adult's problem (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), p.44.

434. ibid., p.49.

435. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), p.229.

436. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism (London: Britons, 1967), p.67.

437. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.viii.

438. ibid., p.x.

439. ibid., pp.2-3.

440. ibid., p.76.

441. ibid., p.244.

442. ibid., p.264.

443. ibid., p.329.

444. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London Constable, 1915), p.427.

445. idem., "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 111, June 1922, p.956.

446. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.1.

447. ibid., p.8.

448. ibid., p.9.

449. ibid., pp.12-13.

450. ibid., p.15.

451. ibid., p.21.

452. ibid., p.22.

453. ibid., p.23.

454. ibid., pp.245-246.

455. Friedrich Nietzsche, Beyond Good and Evil. Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, (4th ed., 2nd impression; London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967), p.129.

456. ibid., p.223.

457. ibid., p.225.

458. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Notes" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarathustra, translated by Thomas Common, in The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, ed. Dr. Oscar Levy, 18 vols, (Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909), p.411.

459. idem., "Nietzsche and Science," Letter to the Spectator, January 8, 1910, p.52.

460. idem., Nietzsche; his life and works, preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, (London: Constable, 1910), pp.75-76.

461. ibid., pp.78-79.

462. ibid., pp.92-93.

463. idem., Mansel Fellowes [A novel] (London: Grant Richards, 1918), pp.108-109.

464. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), pp.90-91.

465. ibid., pp.91-92.

466. ibid., p.92.

467. idem., Too Old for Dolls, A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), pp.41-42.

468. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Too Old for Dolls, A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), pp.42-43.

469. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.32.

470. ibid., p.62.

471. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.118-119.

472. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.78.

473. ibid., p.108.

474. idem., "Reply to A.E. Linton," Letter to the English Review, Volume 45, August 1927, p.251.

475. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.335.

476. idem., "Hitler and the Third Reich," English Review, Volume 63, No.1, (July 1936), p.35.

477. ibid., p.36.

478. ibid., p.38.

479. idem., The Future of Woman (London: Kegan Paul, 1936), p.54.

480. idem., "Army Officers and Saluting," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XVIII, No.21, March 13, 1941, p.241.

481. ibid., p.242.

482. idem., English Liberalism (London: English Array [1939]), pp.31-32.

483. ibid., p.32.

484. idem., The Four Pillars of Health. A Contribution to Post-War Planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), p.1.

485. idem., "The Science of Social Adjustment [Review of Human Ecology, by Thomas Robertson (Glasgow, William McLellan)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXXIV, No.6, November 18, 1948, p.68.

486. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.89.

487. ibid., p.199.

488. ibid., p.201.

489. ibid.

490. idem., "Personality and Human Destiny," South African Observer, Volume 1, No.6, October 1955, p.8.

491. ibid., p.9.

492. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government (1)," South African Observer, Volume IX, No.2, September 1963, p.13.

493. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government (II)," South African Observer, Volume IX, No.4, November 1963, p.16.

494. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.152.

495. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.35.

496. idem., "The Conservative Programme: A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 113, April 1923, p.665.

497. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), pp. 19-20.

498. ibid., p.24.

499. ibid., pp.24-25.

500. ibid., p.39.

501. ibid., p.68.

502. ibid., pp.154-155.

503. ibid., pp.201-202.

504. ibid., p.220.

505. idem., Catherine Doyle; the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), p.19.

506. ibid., p.35.

507. ibid., pp.43-44.

508. ibid., p.59.

509. ibid., pp.127-128.

510. ibid., p.104.

511. ibid., p.138.

512. ibid., pp.151-152.

513. idem., Too Old for Dolls. A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.25.

514. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.88.

515. ibid., p.121.

516. ibid., p.122.

517. ibid., pp.123-124.

518. ibid., p.157.

519. Anthony Mario Ludovici, What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.189.
520. ibid., p.202.
521. ibid., pp.203-204.
522. ibid., pp.207-208.
523. ibid., p.208.
524. ibid., pp.208-209.
525. ibid., p.209.
526. ibid., p.210.
527. ibid., p.212.
528. ibid., pp.231-232.
529. ibid., p.237.
530. ibid., p.248.
531. ibid., p.248.
532. ibid., p.280.
533. ibid., pp.283-284.
534. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p.90.
535. ibid., p.143.
536. ibid., p.144.
537. ibid., p.277.
538. ibid., p.301.
539. idem., The False Assumption of "Democracy"(London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), p.122.
540. ibid., pp.122-123.
541. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), pp.242-243.
542. ibid., pp.244-245.
543. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth-control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), p.67.
544. ibid., p.69.
545. ibid., p.151.
546. ibid., p.149.
547. ibid., p.252.

548. idem., Man: an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.323.

549. idem., Creation or Recreation (London: The First of St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1934), p.14.

550. ibid., p.18.

551. ibid., p.19.

552. ibid., pp.20-21.

553. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.231.

554. idem., "Hitler and the Third Reich," English Review, Volume 63, No. 1, July 1936, p.41.

555. idem., "Hitler and the Third Reich - II," English Review, Volume 63, August 1936, pp.151-152.

556. Friedrich Nietzsche, no source given; quoted in Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.192.

557. Anthony Mario Ludovici, ibid., p.193.

558. ibid., pp.192-193.

559. Cobbett [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Jews and the Jews in England (London: Boswell, 1938), p.56.

560. ibid., p.85.

561. ibid., p.88.

562. ibid., p.95.

563. ibid., p.96.

564. ibid., p.97.

565. ibid., p.98.

566. ibid., p.99.

567. ibid., p.100.

568. ibid., pp.100-101.

569. Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield, Biography of Bentinck, pp.487-498; quoted in Cobbett pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici ibid., p.102.

570. Cobbett [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici] ibid., p.104.

571. ibid., p.106.

572. ibid., p.109.

573. ibid., p.111.

574. ibid., p.113.

575. ibid., pp.113-114.

576. Cobbett [pseud. Anthony Mario Ludovici], Jews and the Jews in England (London: Boswell, 1938), p.116.

577. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "The Politics of Charles A. Beard [Review of Charles A. Beard's The Economic Basis of Politics, (New York, Alfred Knopf)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXVIII, No.10, December 20, 1945, p.94.

578. idem., "The English Working Class," New Pioneer, No.5, April 1939, p.26.

579. idem., "Freedom and the Workers," New Pioneer, No.6, May 1939, p.151.

580. idem., "Equality and the Working Class," New Pioneer, Volume 1, No.7, June 1939, p.175.

581. ibid.

582. idem., "The Worldly Philosophy of the English Working Class," New Pioneer, No.8, July 1939, p.200.

583. ibid., pp.200-201.

584. ibid., p.201.

585. idem., "The Worldly Philosophy of the English Working Class (II)," New Pioneer,No. 9, August 1939, p.222.

586. idem., English Liberalism (London: English Array, [1939]), pp.29-30.

587. idem., A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories (London: Constable, 1915), p.ix.

588. ibid., p.1.

589. ibid., p.25.

590. ibid., p.263.

591. ibid., p.372.

592. idem., A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.6.

593. ibid., p.7.

594. ibid., p.12.

595. ibid., p.15.

596. ibid., p.16.

597. ibid., p.17.

598. ibid., p.18.

599. ibid., pp.45-46.

600. ibid., p.81.

601. ibid., p.82.

602. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.137.

603. ibid., p.160.

604. ibid., p.162.

605. ibid., p.166.

606. ibid., pp.166-167.

607. cf. "Religion and the Constitution," Chapter V of ibid., pp.168-207.

608. ibid., p.183.

609. ibid., p.186.

610. ibid.

611. ibid.

612. ibid., p.190.

613. ibid., p.191.

614. ibid., p.195.

615. ibid., pp.206-207.

616. ibid.

617. ibid., p.207.

618. idem., "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 111, June 1922, p.960.

619. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.82.

620. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.77-94.

621. ibid., pp.78-79.

622. ibid., p.80.

623. ibid., p.82.

624. ibid., p.83.

625. ibid., p.85.

626. ibid., p.89.

627. ibid., pp.92-93.

628. ibid., p.214.

629. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth-control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), p.243.

630. ibid., p.250.

631. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Violence, Sacrifice and War (London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]), pp.15-16.

632. idem., The Sanctity of Private Property (London: Heath Cranton, 1932), p.v.

633. ibid., p.10.

634. ibid.

635. ibid., p.11.

636. ibid., p.14.

637. ibid., p.15.

638. ibid., p.18.

639. ibid., p.22.

640. ibid., pp.24-25.

641. ibid., p.25.

642. ibid., p.26.

643. ibid., p.27.

644. ibid., p.28.

645. ibid., p.30.

646. ibid., p.31.

647. ibid., p.32.

648. ibid., pp.36-37.

649. ibid., p.41.

650. ibid., p.43.

651. ibid., p.44.

652. ibid., pp.45-46.

653. ibid., p.46.

654. ibid., pp.47-48.

655. idem., "Hitler and the Third Reich," English Review, Volume 63, No.1, July 1936, p.37.

656. idem., "Hitler and the Third Reich-II," English Review, Volume 67, August 1936, p.152.

657. idem., "Review of English Saga 1840-1940 by Arthur Bryant (Collins and Eyre and Spottiswoode)," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XVIII, No.23, March 27, 1941, p.266.

658. idem., "Political Misuse of Words," New Pioneer, Volume 1, No.2, January 1939, p.47.

659. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Political Misuse of Words," New Pioneer, Volume 1, No.2, January 1939, p.52.

660. idem., English Liberalism (London: English Array, [1939]), p.7.

661. ibid., p.10.

662. ibid., p.13.

663. ibid., p.14.

664. ibid.

665. ibid., p.15.

666, ibid., pp.16-17.

667. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider 1952) pp.69-70

668. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government (VIII)," South African Observer, Volume IX, No.11, June 1964, p.14.

669. ibid., p.15.

670. idem., "The Essentials of Good Government (X)," South African Observer, Volume IX, No.12, July 1964, p.18.

671. ibid., p.19.

672. idem., "Public Opinion in England (XIV)," South African Observer, Volume XII, No.3, December 1966, p.13.

673. idem., The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion (London: Britons, 1967), p.99.

674. ibid., p.53.

675. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), pp.79-80.

676. idem., The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]), pp.212-213.

677. idem., Lysistrata; or woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), pp.108-109.

678. ibid., pp.110-111.

679. idem., Man: an indictment (London; Constable, 1927), p.168.

680. idem., "Hitler and the Third Reich - II," English Review, Volume 63, August 1936, p.151.

681. ibid., p.152.

682. idem., "Review of England and the Farmer. A Symposium, collected and edited by H.J. Massingham (Batsford)," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XIX, No.26, October 16, 1941, p.250.

683. idem., English Liberalism (London: English Array, [1939]), p.15.

684. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), p.133.

685. idem., Enemies of Women, The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon feminism (London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948), p.136.

686. ibid., pp.135-136.

687. idem., "Conditions in England (1)," South African Observer, Volume XV, No.1, December 1969, p.14.

688. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), p.21.

689. ibid., pp.191-192.

690. idem., Too Old for Dolls. A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), p.11.

691. ibid., pp.38-39.

692. ibid., p.39.

693. idem., French Beans (London: Hutchinson, [1923]), p.7.

694. ibid., p.8.

695. ibid., pp.100-101.

696. ibid., p.174.

697. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), pp.76-77.

698. idem., Health and Education through Self-Mastery (London: Watts, 1933), pp.21-22.

699. idem., "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 111, (June 1922), p.157.

700. idem., "The Conservative Programme: A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume 113, (April 1923), p.613.

701. idem., Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady (London: Hutchinson, [1919]), pp.263-264.

702. ibid., pp.264-265.

703. idem., Too Old for Dolls. A novel (London: Hutchinson, [1920]), pp.2-3.

704. ibid., p.16.

705. idem., What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]), p.39.

706. ibid., p.144.

707. idem., The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), pp.21-22.

708. Anthony Mario Ludovici, The Goddess that Grew Up (London: Hutchinson, [1922]), p.22.

709. ibid., pp.24-25.

710. ibid., p.28.

711. ibid., p.29.

712. idem., The Taming of Don Juan (London: Hutchinson, [1924]), p.9.

713. ibid., pp.25-26.

714. ibid., p.26.

715. ibid., p.49.

716. ibid., p.99.

717. ibid., p.282.

718. ibid., p.299.

719. idem., Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.viii.

720. ibid., pp.x-xi.

721. ibid., p.58.

722. ibid.

723. ibid., pp.75-76.

724. ibid., pp.81-82.

725. ibid., p.82.

726. ibid., p.83.

727. ibid., p.95.

728. ibid., pp.112-113.

729. ibid., pp.110-111.

730. ibid., p.116.

731. ibid., p.118.

732. ibid., p.119.

733. ibid., p.122.

734. ibid., p.123.

735. ibid., p.125.

736. ibid., p.135.

737. ibid., pp.149-150.

738. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition (London: William Heinemann, 1921), p.149.

739. ibid., p.152.

740. ibid., p.155.

741. ibid., pp.159-160.

742. ibid., p.162.

743. ibid., pp.137-138.

744. ibid., pp.164-165.

745. ibid., p.165.

746. ibid., p.170.

747. ibid., p.197.

748. ibid., p.199.

749. ibid., p.242.

750. idem., Woman. A Vindication (London; Constable, 1923), p.11.

751. idem., Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman (London: Kegan Paul, [1924]), p.10.

752. ibid., p.24.

753. ibid., p.99.

754. ibid., pp.117-118.

755. idem., "The Health of the School Child," English Review, Volume LXIV, March 1927, p.347.

756. ibid., pp.347-348.

757. idem., Man; an indictment (London: Constable, 1927), p.317.

758. ibid., p.318.

759. ibid., p.320.

760. ibid., p.348.

761. idem., The Night-Hoers; or, the case against birth-control and an alternative (London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928), p.199.

762. idem., Health and Education through Self-Mastery (London: Watts, 1933), p.xiii.

763. ibid., p.ix.

764. ibid., p.4.

765. ibid., p.7.

766. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Health and Education through Self-Mastery (London: Watts, 1933), p.8ff.

767. ibid., p.13.

768. ibid., pp.21-22.

769. ibid., p.22.

770. ibid., pp.116-117.

771. ibid., p.125.

772. idem., The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning (London: Heath Cranton, 1945), pp.2-3.

773. ibid., pp.3-4.

774. ibid., p.7.

775. ibid., pp.142-143.

776. ibid., pp.143-144.

777. ibid., pp.144-145.

778. ibid., p.145.

779. ibid., p.151.

780. idem., "The Case Against Legalised Artificial Abortion," in Abortion, by F.W. Stella Browne, Anthony Mario Ludovici, Harry Roberts, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935), p.107.

781. idem., The Truth about Childbirth. Lay Light on Maternal Morbidity and Mortality (London: Kegan Paul, 1937), pp.70-71.

782. ibid., p.153.

783. ibid., p.42.

784. ibid., pp.212-213.

785. ibid., p.237.

786. ibid., p.238.

787. idem., "A Newton of Health [Review of The Universal Constant in Living, by F. Mathias Alexander (Chatterton Ltd.)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXVI, No.12, January 4, 1945, p.104.

788. idem., The Choice of a Mate (London: John Lane, 1935), p.2/3.

789. ibid., pp.301-302.

790. idem., "Transform Society's Values," in Gentile and Jew; a symposium on the future of the Jewish people, compiled and edited by Chaim Newman, with a foreword by the Rt. Hon. Lord Strabolgi, (London: Alliance Press, 1945), p.167.

791. idem., "Public Opinion in England (XX)," South African Observer, Volume XII, No. 11, August 1967, p.12.

792. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Public Opinion in England (XX)," South African Observer, Volume XII, No.11, August 1967, p.12.

793. idem., "Caesar and Caesarism [Review of No other Caesar, by Felix Grendon (John Lane)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XIX, No.15, July 31, 1941, p.153.

794. idem., "Transform Society's Values," in Gentile and Jew; a symposium on the future of the Jewish people, compiled and edited by Chaim Newman, with a foreword by the Rt. Hon. Lord Strabolgi, (London: Alliance Press, 1945), pp.173-174.

795. ibid., p.174.

796. ibid., p.175.

797. ibid., pp.175-176.

798. ibid., p.176.

799. ibid., p.177.

800. ibid., pp.177-178.

801. ibid., p.178.

802. ibid., p.175.

803. ibid., pp.180-181.

804. ibid., p.182.

805. ibid., p.183.

806. ibid., p.184.

807. ibid.

808. idem., "The False Assumptions of Democracy (XI)," South African Observer, Volume III, No.6, October 1957, p.14.

809. idem., The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952), p.9.

810. idem., "Public Opinion in England (XXII)," South African Observer, Volume XIII, No.3, December 1967, p.12.

811. idem., Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), pp.72-73.

812. H.J. Massingham, "Values," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Volume XXI, No.26, October 15, 1942, p.219.

813. R.B. Kerr, Our Prophets Studies of Living Writers (Croydon: R.B. Kerr, 1932), p.99.

814. Anthony Mario Ludovici, "Public Opinion in England (XI)," South African Observer, Volume XI, No.11, July 1966, p.14.

814. idem., The Truth about Childbirth. Lay Light on maternal morbidity and mortality (London: Kegan Paul, 1937), p.xiii.

CHAPTER 6, LUDOVICI'S POLITICAL AFFILIATIONS

The only evidence we possess that Ludovici had any connection with the Conservative Party is that he dined with A.J. Balfour on Friday March 3, 1922, at a dinner given by Lady Cunard in Carlton House Terrace, and that he found the experience disagreeable.[1] If Ludovici was not a Conservative he was, however, the foremost ideologue of two fascist movements called the English Mistery and the English Array, a splinter movement of the former*; and associated with another, the Order of the Red Rose.

The English Mistery dated from a resolution of May 28, 1930, and a formal declaration made by the founders on September 10, 1930.[2] It was the personal inspiration of one man, William John Sanderson. The latter was born in 1883 in Newcastle and educated at Marlborough and Jesus College, Cambridge, read for the Bar and was called by the Inner Temple in 1906. He joined the North-Eastern Circuit but decided to go over to the Chancery side. At Lincoln's Inn he became associated with Crawford Cree, another member of the North-Eastern Circuit who had abandoned Common Law Work. The latter, Sanderson and Lord Willoughby de Broke, allying themselves to no political party, founded their own political movement called the Order of the

---

*The following publications of Anthony Mario Ludovici were addressed to the English Mistery, or developed out of speeches that he originally gave to them as contributions to their political doctrine: The Sanctity of Private Property, (London: Heath Cranton, 1932); The Secret of Laughter, (London: Constable, 1932); Health and Education through Self-Mastery, (London: Watts & Co., 1933); Violence, Sacrifice and War, (London: St. James' Kin of the English Mistery, [1933]); Creation or Recreation, (London: The First or St. James' Kin of the English Mistery, 1934); Recovery. The quest of regenerate national values, (London: St. James' Kin of the English Mistery, 1935). He addressed English Liberalism, (London: English Array, [1939]), to the English Array. Furthermore, Ludovici contributed copiously to the pamphlets, leaflets, and newspapers, of both the English Mistery and the English Array.

Red Rose in 1913 which continued publishing their doctrine throughout World War I until 1923. However, Crawford Cree was killed and Lord Willoughby de Broke died soon after peace was signed . Their object was militant national regeneration and the English Mistery recognised them as concerned:"to promulgate and develop those principles which later led to the foundation of the English Mistery." [3]

The significance of Ludovici's association with the Order of the Red Rose is that it sought, like Ludovici, to transform conservatism into a doctrine indistinguishable from fascism. The Association of Arthur Maximillian Landrassy with the Society of the Friends of Order in Ludovici's novel of 1921, What Woman Wishes, is, I suggest, of autobiographical significance. The Society of the Friends of Order, like the Order of the Red Rose, is devoted to the transformation of collectivist conservatism into fascism. The description of the leaflets of the Friends of Order, and its organisation and membership, closely resemble that of the Order of the Red Rose.[4] A.M. Landrassy's Vindication of the Rule of the Best probably refers to Ludovici's A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories. Whilst the Friends of Order's first major publication, A Hand book for Anti-Bolshevists, with its advocacy of legislation for the purification and proper preparation of common foodstuffs, and realist denunciation of 'justice' 'liberty', 'equality', 'social reform', and socialist diatribes against private property, matches Ludovici's The False Assumptions of "Democracy", of 1921. Indeed, we are informed that the former book was the joint work of A.M. Landrassy and Lord Chiddingly, the leader of the Friends of Order, whilst the False Assumptions of "Democracy" is introduced by Lord Willoughby de Broke, one of the leaders of the Order of the Red Rose. In his introduction to Ludovici's The False Assumptions

of "Democracy", Lord Willoughby de Broke endorses Ludovici's denunciation of liberalism, as their generation had been sacrificed for its delusions on the battlefields of World War I.[5] Reciprocally, in his A Defence of Conservatism, Ludovici recounts that when he used to visit the 1900 Club in Pickering Place, London, before World War I, he delighted in persuading Lord Willoughby de Broke that any speech supporting the Constitution was "humbug", especially after the advent of the Parliament Act in 1911.[6] He praised Lord Willoughby de Broke for his conviction that the repeal of the Parliament Act of 1911 should be the first object of the Conservative Party.[7]

The Order of the Red Rose's synthesis of fascism with collectivist conservatism is perfectly explicit in the following passage:

> Toryism then holds the future of England in the hollows of its hand. But Toryism must purge itself of Whiggery and declare war upon the money-grubbers. It must expose the conspiracy of exploitation which is the foundation of Radicalism. So shall the Radical Party crumble to dust. Toryism must recognise that the trade unionist is the best man in the working classes, and declare war upon bureaucracy in his name. So shall Socialism be blown sky-high. Toryism must declare solidly for the tradition of Duty and the Protection of the Fit. So shall it subdue the Intellectual. And lastly it must purchase a smattering of brains. So shall it become articulate.[8]

Their repudiation of traditional conservatism was such that they reckoned even Vicount Bolingbroke, whom they regarded as one of the greatest of Tories, "speaks of the alien revolution of 1689 as the 'glorious revolution.'" but, what could they be conserving if they believed that from this epoch the biological elite of the race had been neglected and "Jewish or trading traditions commonly called Whiggery and Radicalism" were England's only traditions?[9] They thought the accession of William of Orange and the introduction of alien influences and alien finance had obliterated all ancient

tradition that had been restored in part by the reigns of Elizabeth I and the early Stuarts up to the Civil War. Indeed:

> The life of Bolingbroke shows that Conservatism was practically extinct at the beginning of the eighteenth century... since Bolingbroke's time Conservatism has, as a matter of fact, been fighting a losing battle against the forces of individualism and anarchy. It has been recognised by the greatest Conservatives that in this country a constructive policy was hopeless in the face of the suicidal philosophy of personal exploitation which held sway. Lord Shaftesbury and the Young England Party made a stand with social reform, and Disraeli tried at least to give them good sewers and drains, but no-one born, since the death of Charles I, attempted a constructive policy.[10]

However, they lamented, the Tory revolt to the inhuman and intolerable conditions caused by laissez-faire in the nineteenth century only succeeded in introducing mere palliatives like the Factory and Truck Acts, and later the Compensation Acts.[11] They considered Bolingbroke to be the last and least of the Tories.[12] Indeed, Sanderson thought 'Whiggery' had made Tory legislation impossible of accomplishment throughout the nineteenth century, as it had completely infected the Tory Party.[13] He idealised a 'golden age' from which he believed England had degenerated:

> The particular character encouraged was that which was best fitted for creating the wealth of the country by agriculture and protecting it by War. The party which encouraged the productive character, the character which had power to produce and on which the life of the race depended, the Tory Party, very naturally claimed to be the National Party of England.[14]

However, the collectivist 'conservatism' that Sanderson and the Order of the Red Rose advocated was quite different from that of Disraeli as the "'submerged tenth'" should not be aided by public beneficence but either: "drowned instantly or gradually and kindly eliminated."[15] Their 'conservatism' entailed attending to the dictates of racial memory[16] and regarding miscegenation as criminal.[17] When a race:

> ...is struggling against climatic conditions or in military exploits, it clings to a Conservative policy and acts very strictly on the lines of its own experience, and it is only when life gets very much easier through the accumulation of wealth, that it is able to indulge in false ideas of republicanism and democracy.[18]

Indeed, the doctrine of the Order of the Red Rose is unequivocally fascist. Sanderson, as early as 1913, wrote that the motive of racial growth and perfection is the races acquisition of power. tradition of England should be that of War, whose motive is unconcious.[19] War is the sole creative force in history[20], and its progress is unfolded in the development ofthe art of war.[21] He called aggression noble, it is enhanced in the face of danger and teaches discipline and cooperation in the task of enslaving other races through war, the only effective means of regeneration.[22] His ideal was the warrior who disregards comfort and materialism, the creed of arrested development and 'Semitism'. He thought the Jews should be exterminated as should all races that fail in the struggle for life.[23] The English are the elite of the Aryan race as only they would have the requisite qualities to invade her isolated position.[24] The demand for Home Rule and Welsh dissestablishment was regarded by Sanderson as the cry of conquered inferior races.[25] Those who do not recognise the mystical origins of the patriot were deemed useless to the race and should be eliminated.[26] Class conciliation was advocated because it was deemed as in "the interest of the race"[27], the supreme criterian of political action. The unfit and alien among the population should be eliminated, Sanderson deemed it necessary for the regeneration of the English race.[28]

Sanderson plaintively asserted that rationalism had succeeded instinct and established a system that threatened the health and vigour of the English.[29] He transmuted collectivist conservatism

into fascist populism with his claim that exploitation was Jewish and not English in origin.[30] He believed England was undergoing a revolution and needed a great leader to "save it from a hideous conflict between manipulators and producers."[31] The middle-class did not escape his condemnation for their subordination of every racial and national interest to the pursuit of profit.[32] Usury and exploitation had been tolerated as England had degenerated from a time when private property was merely the reward for aristocratic leaders who possessed the authority to command others and to organise society for the public good.[33] The corruption of laissez-faire had thwarted the 'natural' elite and facilitated control by international Jewry, organised throughout the world to control and exploit nations by destroying their character.[34] Government in England had become the instrument of alien control and capitalist exploitation, not of the popular will.[35] Sanderson believed that the party system was controlled by an alien financial system that had occasioned the degredation of the working classes.[36] The Order of the Red Rose avoided identification with the party system[37] and, typical of the way established political parties identified fascist movements, Sanderson confessed that socialists had reviled the Order of the Red Rose as old-fashioned Tories whereas Tories regarded it as a dangerous varient of socialism.[38] Parliament did not satisfy their active ideal of politics. They dismissed it as a 'talking shop.'[39] Action was their key word. Language which did not lead to action was denounced as the prostitution of energy.[40] The traditions which they sought to establish could only be founded through action, not through the 'talk' of Parliament.[41]

The Order of the Red Rose conjoined the foregoing ideas with the familiar elitism of fascism. Sanderson admired William the Conqueror and the Papacy for they fulfilled the essentials of the elitist organisation of society he desired:

> The function of an upper class is to organise society. And to fit itself for its purpose it must be divided into a priesthood with leisure and ability to think, and an aristocracy that is able to act.[42]

Sanderson defined it as the purpose of the Order of the Red Rose to rear leaders[43] who would supersede the moribund elite which had promoted capitalism and exploitation.[44] The new elite would not be encumbered by the deliberation of democracy as the mass were deemed incapable by 'instinct' of aspiring to statesmanship.[45]

In his advocacy of total change Sanderson referred to Anthony Mario Ludovici's Mans Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition for his intention to drastically change the brewing industry to restore the health of the populace.[46] Implementation of Ludovici's prescriptions concerning ale would accompany revolutionary success[47] which entailed absolute unanimity of purpose among the members of the Order of the Red Rose.[48] They explicitly advocated violent and "fascist methods" to secure their political objective, even at the cost of their own life and liberty, if the necessity arose.[49] However, some ambiguity still remained as to the depth to which they intended to transform collectivist conservatism into fascism. Although they believed civilisation had gone past "redemption point", they advocated that the upper classes, as an alternative to "destructive revolution", should: "lead and organise a revolution from the top."[50] Their prescription was that England should evolve a "new feudalism"[51] in which all private property would be socialised by ensuring that it would be carefully administered in the interests of the race. Those landlords who

failed to maintain a certain number of men fit for military service would be deprived of their estates.[52] Private land and industry would be strictly controlled in the interest of the nation, according to "military models".[53] Sanderson deprecated contempory society for its urbanism, individualism, and legal system. They had destroyed the instincts of the race and were not conducive to "military ideals".[54] Sanderson thought that the only hope for: "the restoration of the health and prosperity of the race lies in the institution of a new feudalism, with a sound motive propounded by a natural priesthood, and a genuine policy onnunciated by a patriotic aristocracy."[55] In his advocacy of the above he made frequent references to Anthony Mario Ludovici's A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories, a formulation which Sanderson believed could restore England from the corruption of a century and a half of lassaiz-faire.[56]

Not surprisingly by 1929 Sanderson was contributing to the Fascist, the newspaper of Arnold Spencer Leese's Imperial Fascist League. In his advocacy of fascism he criticised the party system for diverting attention from its popular objectives. Fascism was a menace to Conservatives who had betrayed their trust and irresponsible Liberals and servile Socialists. He called the party system absurd, a means of popular exploitation, whilst fascism would not debate with fools but lead.[57] In one article he wrote a panegyric of war. It taught men to place their lives at the disposal of the nation.[58] Reciprocally, the Imperial Fascist League advertised the published writings of William John Sanderson as recommended literature for fascists.[59]

Sanderson proceeded to found the English Mistery in 1930. Two of his books outlined its doctrine. The first, That Which was Lost -

A Treatise on Freemasonry and the English Mistery, elaborated the theory that all civilisations have a parbolic development, but that at any point in the parabola of progress and decline it is possible for an entirely new impetus to be given by an effective political lead, which he saw as the role of the English Mistery.[60] Conjoined with the preceding were such fascist notions as the belief that "the greater part of knowledge is comprised by instinct"[61], and that the parties of the Parliamentary system were mercenaries of the 'moneyed interest' that had secured the acquiescence of the people in their own exploitation.[62] He referred to Anthony Mario Ludovici's Mans Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition to support his claim that people unaffected by miscegenation have sound instincts.[63] If Englishmen abandon safety and live dangerously an elite, thus created, could achieve more in England than had been done since Elizabethan times.[64] Unusual among other anit-Semitic groups the English Mistery accepted Freemasonry as they thought it maintained the importance of selective breeding.[65] Sanderson wrote in the Freemason that : "Love, in fact, and common sense, implies selection, and does not exclude hatred."[66] The second book of Sandersons that outlined the doctrine of the English Mistery, Statecraft - A Treatise on the Concerns of our Lord the King, contained the assertion that reason was dangerous.[67] Any devotion to abstract thought such as reading and writing were detrimental to 'instinct'.[68] It advocated that the weak should be enslaved.[69]

Sanderson gave his reason for founding the English Mistery as England's degeneration. England had degenerated through tolerance and her regeneration could only be achieved through: "the most unpleasant ways"[70] He believed that if peoples instincts or emotions troubled them they should not suppress them with morality as Puritans do.[71] He combined this anarchist notion with the

authoritarian one that bondage leads to freedom,[72] a combination of political extremes that is typically fascist. He thought society should be based on reciprocity through a barter economy, that would render the 'money power', which had corrupted political democracy, weak. Political democracy was dismissed as: "the result of turning greed into a religious faith."[73]

The English Mistery's name came from the phrase Crafts and Misteries. The latter implied a derivative from the word Mister in turn derived from Master or in Latin Magister, such as a master worker not an apprentice in the old medieval craft guilds.[74] Their task was to synthesise collectivist conservatism such as that of Disraeli, to whom they made frequent laudatory references[75], with fascism.

They sought to restore power to the monarchy and the aristocracy in a revived feudalism:

> As Englishmen we can say with Bolingbroke, the greatest of our exponents of Royalism, that we are free men who claim the right to look our King in the face and tell him that upon him, and upon him alone, devolves the duty to lead the nation.[76]

And, in so doing, they closely identified themselves with the Order of the Red Rose. They shared a common attempt to restore collectivist conservatism, which formed the matrix of their respective doctrines, the kernel being fascism:

> We who are building this new institution to cherish an old tradition have taken over this task from those who fail in the first German War. They conceived that they were rekindling the quenched torch of the Tory Revolt, known as the Young England Party, overthrown under the leadership of Lord George Bentinck in 1848.[77]

Indeed, Gerald Vernon Wallop, otherwise known as Vicount Lymington, who was the executive leader or Chief Mister of the English Mistery and from August 29, 1937, the leader or Marshall of the English Array a splinter movement of the English Mistery, had been in

Parliament as Conservative M.P. for Basingstoke between 1929 and the winter of 1934 when he resigned. He gave as his reason for resignation from the Conservative Party that they had forgotten to be "Tories in the real sense", and: "we were conserving the 19th century Liberal ideas of laissez-faire of devil take the hindmost in our self-blind progress. To me it seemed that personal responsibility should be part of our philosophy."[78] He felt himself: "more and more in sympathy with the tragic sincerity of the Labour Party."[79] Indeed, contemporaneously he was especially concerned at what he deemed to be the corruption of the Conservative Party besides that of the party system as a whole:

> We have, as a Conservative Party, a tendancy to inherit the Whig accomplishments of the last hundred years, and to forbear in attacking the Socialist changes of the last decade. We accept the Whig value of vested interests; and because Disraeli thought (wrongly as we can now see) that the proletariats' vote would correct the selfishness of the moneyed vote, we accept the all in all of the Socialist idea of democracy.[80]

After making derogatory speeches about Baldwin's leadership he was approached by representatives of the English Mistery and accepted the offer to become its executive leader. Contemporaneously, he justified this by claiming that the English Mistery was an agency of "Toryism" that promised to restore the nation and "the fullfilment of our traditions". Indeed, the English Mistery represented for Wallop: "a real and uncompromising return of Toryism."[81]

The English Mistery defined its purpose as that of national regeneration and the re-creation of the body politic.[82] Discipline was one of its emphatic objects. It was to be internally disciplined by the Syndicate of the English Mistery which consisted of the Lords of the Mistery and forty two Syndics, the Chief Syndic being known as the Chancellor. Those allowed to take one step towards the Throne were called

Companions and bound by oath to act as servants of English Royalty. Those permitted to take two steps were called Proctors if they elected not to take the third step, whilst those who took the third step were called Misters of Englishry, or simply Misters. Each rank in the hierarchy was strictly subordinate to their superiors.[83]

They attributed what they regarded as the failure of modern politics to the invidious multiplication of deliberative assemblies which compromised leadership and action. They considered total unanimity as vital to the existence of society, and believed there should be a single leader for the nation.[84] Indeed, the Chancellor of the English Mistery performed "the essential service of ruling the motive of the Mistery." Indicative of the power he wielded, the Chancellor could only be appointed by the unanimous decision of the Lords of the Mistery. The latter consisted of: "Princes of the Blood, Peers of the Realm, eldest sons of Peers and persons who according to ancient tradition, were fit to be created Peers."[85] The Recorder acted as Secretary to the Syndicate and was appointed by and responsible to the ChiefMister. Similarly, Syndics were appointed by the Lords of the Mistery, the Misters of Englishry, and only one could be appointed by the Chief Mister in those counties in which the Mistery operated. Indicative of the authoritarian organisation of the English Mistery, the appointment and removal of the Chief Mister of each Kin was in the hands of the County Syndics, who also recommended and selected for the approval of the Chancellor, a Vice-Chancellor of the Kin.[86]

Besides their common doctrinal transformation of collectivist conservatism into fascism both the English Mistery, and the Order of the Red Rose, had the common emblem of a five-petalled red rose

which the English Mistery placed on a black background symbolising mourning for the nobility which had been undermined by 'Whiggery.' The English Mistery intended to mount the five-petalled red rose on a St. George's flag as soon as the monarch had been restored as the 'leader' of the people.[87]

The English Mistery rejected the recent history of England as being dominated by the 'money power' whose baneful control was even traced to the press which imposed uniformity of opinion in the interests of its alien masters. It advocated total change. Each member of the Mistery was instructed to militantly oppose every aspect of contempory society, to battleagainst contempory degeneration, and if society was unresponsive:

> ...fight without compromise, regardless even of the cost to yourselves and to your families, regardless even of your lives, for the danger to your race is greater than it ever was even in the blackest hours of war... the forces of death must collapse before the forces of life .[88]

Only those of English race were eligible for membership of the English Mistery[89] as progress was considered by the English Mistery to be the sole result of cooperation between those of the same race and 'unconscious' aims.[90] They regarded themselves as descendants of the Nordic race and avoided all those whom they regarded as of mongrelized or other race, especially Americans.[91] One member of the English Mistery thought that the House of Lords should only comprise men: "who are leaders in the application of racial values."[92] Jews were strictly excluded from membership of the English Mistery, as they believed, the best cocker spaniel could never make a good greyhound.[93] Accordingly, they advocated the strict prevention of miscegenation.[94] Their monism led to their concern that the 'yeomen' among England's "livestock" should be conserved through selective breeding.[95] Men must recreate and regain their "animal qualities"[96], reject reason

and live according to 'instinct.'[97] They believed that the spread of the Latin peoples and Christandom had led to the domination of scientific method, which they regarded as dangerous.[98] They actually claimed that science was devoid of explanatory power as to 'understand' meant to stand under and worship something that could not be comprehended. Thus, the English Mistery could not be explained but only unquestioningly supported.[99] Thought emanates from instinct, they claimed.[100] Deliberation could only stultify action.[101] Indeed, they exalted action. Each member of the English Mistery should deploy himself: "as an instrument for action and not for clever wit."[102] They were instructed to express themselves in action rather than words.[103] Anthony Mario Ludovici's A Defense of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories was recommended as it was considered a book to reflect in action, not to reason about.[104] Not surprisingly, the English Mistery greeted World War II as a relief from degeneracy and the inauguration of a new era that depended on action and not on deliberation.[105]

Their desideratum of totalitarianism was portrayed as a government whose regenerative action would not be encumbered by a parliament and other deliberative assemblies, whose role would be merely advisory.[106] Indeed, debate was prohibited within the Kin of the English Mistery. They claimed to find their direction in 'instinct.'[107] Accordingly, no decision of the English Mistery was ever to be made by a majority vote.[108] They rejected constitutionalism as they thought no constitution could be effective, their criterion being action, in conditions other than those of unanimity.[109] They liberated themselves from legal regulation by either claiming England had no constitution[110], or if it did, it was alien, or 'Venetian', and should be eradicated.[111] Furthermore, they

reinforced their rejection of the party system by advocating withdrawal of support from those candidates who were unwilling to organise their constituency on the basis of a functional representation that accorded with Governmental omnipotence.[112] They claimed Parliaments legislation conflicted with the interest of the race.[113] Indeed, the English Mistery repudiated both the 'left' and the 'right'[114] as it believed both to be controlled by the 'money power.'[115] The English Mistery was called a "movement" which transcended the party system and its associated ideologies.[116] Socialism was dismissed as symbolising the end of party government and liberalism.[117]

The English Misterydeemed that power and authority could not come from elections[118], which were toally absent from their movement. They thought responsibility could only rest on great leaders.[119] The 'natural' elite could only secure the regeneration of England by eschewing the corrupt democratic system and superseding the nobility who had, unfortunately, forfeited their salutary power to political parties and pawned their land to the Jews. Significantly, all Ludovici's books were recommended as guides to the creation of a new elite.[120] Government should be carried on by men of power, called Lords, who: "are recognised rather than made or unmade by authority."[121] Men can only be representative if their authority is derived from racial memories[122] not from democracy, with its delegation and election, which was dismissed as a vehicle of destruction.[123] Democracy either frustrated or eliminated the 'natural' elite: the "sahib class"; the peasantry; the elite of the working class.[124] The creation of a naturally selected elite supplied the motive for perfection[125], which the English Mistery believed could be attained in two generations at least.[126] They believed their ideal of government had already been realised in the

Portugal of Salazaar.[127]

The English Mistery's ideal of perfection was a new feudalism from which faction and autonomous spheres of social activity would be eradicated. To secure this they identified themselves as an anti-party that would sweep away the party system[128] and replace it with a monolythic corporate State that would unleash the popular, and governmental, will from all legal and institutional regulations.[129] The 'right' of private ownership would be contingent on the fulfillment of duties to a popular monarch.[130] In the elaboration of their ideal of a new feudalism it was stipulated that Anthony Mario Ludovici's A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories and his The Choice of a Mate "should be owned by everyone and kept for constant reference."[131] The executive would be chosen by and solely responsible to the monarch, and this elite would govern independently of political parties through a corporate State untainted by alien influence.[132] Indeed, the English Mistery specifically sought the reconstitution of a nobility[133] which would equitably adjust the conflicting claims of a revived guild system.[134] Furthermore, they had a very bizarre and disciplined ceremony reminiscent of feudality, devoid of a constitution and deliberately contrived to be puzzling to liberals.[135]

Undoubtedly, the Mistery received a major set back to its dwindling fortunes with the defection of Wallop, Ludovici, and others, to form the English Array in 1937. An equally serious blow was to come on April 15, 1941, when the Chancellor, William Sanderson, died. He was succeeded by the High Steward, Lord Howard de Walden.

Nevertheless, the ideological direction of Ludovici persisted after his departure. For example, Henry Snell's explanation of laughter was taken almost verbatum from Ludovici's The Secret of Laughter.[136] The Mistery continued to advocate fascism throughout World War II. It asserted that the Eighth Army provided an elite which, through selective breeding, could inaugurate England's racial perfection.[137] It also maintained that: "the agitation against Mosley has been assiduously fostered by aliens."[138] Indeed, the members of the English Mistery continued their diatribe against the 'money power'[139] and party politics[140] until after World War II. However, evidently an increasingly moribund English Mistery received its final set back with the death of its High Steward, Lord Howard de Walden, on November 5, 1946.

Much of the English Mistery's vigour was lost through the division which occurred when a minority refused to accept an order of the Council of Strength removing William Sanderson as Chancellor. This minority continued as the English Mistery whereas the majority relinquished all past association with the English Mistery and on August 28, 1937, Wallop proposed the name Array, a word derived from the Gothic and implying militant response to duty, as their name. This was approved and on August 29, 1937, the new Keepers of the Array appointed Wallop as Marshall. Ludovici abandoned the English Mistery and joined the English Array[141], which proved even more racialist than the former and was supposed to have been involved in a plot to poison many prominent Jews.[142]

According to Wallop war is indemic between races[143] and its renunciation is tantamount to national degeneration.[144] He believed democracy propogated "weeds and vermin", that should be eliminated. He did not conceal his advocacy of fascism.[145]

Neither did the English Array, which greeted the Nazi conquest of Czechoslovakia[146] as an indication of mankind's natural and providential inclination to struggle, and cited Anthony Mario Ludovici's Jews, and the Jews in England as affording further evidence for this claim.[147]

However, as Wallop despairingly conceded, the English Array, like the English Mistery, despite its efforts was a force in British politics of no significance.[148] In his autobiography he confessed that both the English Mistery and the English Array had provided the outside world with ridicule and laughter.[149] They were regarded as "near fascist".[150] Indeed, Wallop himself narrowly avoided being imprisoned during World War II under Defence Regulation 18b. of 1940.[151]

Quite clearly Wallop's disaffection from the Conservative Party reflected his inability to persuade them to adopt fascism. As early as 1931 in a book addressed to conservatives, Ich Dien. The Tory Path, he attempted a synthesis of collectivist conservatism with fascism. He complained that the 'leaders' of democracy spend their time: "walking with the crowd, not directing the march."[152] He thought the democracy he was dissatisfied with should be superseded by the functional representation of a corporate state.[153] He thought England should realise Joseph Chamberlain's dream of imperial self-sufficiency, as it would be conducive to a strong nationalism. Whilst, a powerful House of Lords would be a 'cure' for democracy.[154] Furthermore, in 1932 while still a Conservative M.P. he asserted in his Horn, Hoof and Corn. The Future of British Agriculture that progress could only be racial[155], and that the pastoralisation of England would restore its people's 'blood.'[156]

However, it was in the years subsequent to his resignation from the Conservative Party in 1934 that Wallop's avowal of fascism became more intensive. Although, his conviction to transform collectivist conservatism into fascism persisted. He thought that neither: "the rococo reconstruction of Bolingbroke's philosophy by Disraeli nor the arduous and all too short labours of Lord George Bentinck and his friends succeeded in arresting the inevitability of inertia."[157] In his book of 1938, Famine in England, much recommended by the Imperial Fascist League, Wallop maintained that the dregs of the 'blood' congregated in the cities. He thought that the unexploited Dominions, whose soil was the means of regenerating English 'blood', were threatened by "yellow and brown races".[158] Laissez-faire had also threatened the purity of the white races.[159] Subsequently, he asserted that the history of civilisation is that of its soil. Like animals, each race adapts to the necessities of its soil which moulds its physique, thoughts, and actions.[160] Through his elaboration of his notion of 'blood and soil' he concluded that the English were an aristocratic race.[161] Monistically, he asserted that mind and body are indivisible and as the latter is older its instincts are more important than reason.[162] He reckoned England should engage in a "war of calculated and ruthless aggression" to instil it with the qualities requisite for its racial regeneration.[163] England had degenerated under the dominance of finance[164], whose 'money power' controlled democracy.[165] The contempory degenerate aristocracy and middle-class had been corrupted through the 'money standard.' Wallop advocated their supersession by a popular elite created from the working classes who, according to Wallop had: "the good stock left that makes England the pivot of Western civilisation."[166] His ideal of

government was totalitarian, one that combined elitism with populism.[167] Government should be sufficiently powerful to imitate the husbandman. It should protect the biological elite from 'weeds' and 'parasites'[168] by eliminating them.[169] Indeed, through the rule of 'blood and soil', and the sacrifice of those deemed biologically inferior[170], Wallop believed that if:

"we can regard the human stock of England as we should regard her soil, there are no summits which she may not reach."[171]

Furthermore, Wallop was elected President of the British Council Against European Commitments in September 1938.[172] The latter was essentially a co-ordinating body for the National Socialist league led by William Joyce and John Beckett; the English Array; and the League of Loyalists, an even smaller body.[173] Their programme was isolationist, an attempt to immobilise opinion against war with Nazi Germany which, Wallop asserted, could only mean aiding bolshevism.[174] However, the venture amounted to little.[175] The Council was allowed to lapse with John Beckett leaving the National Socialist League at the same time and joining with the Marquis of Tavistock, (later the Duke of Bedford) and Wallop to form, in March 1939, the British Peace Party (later the British Peoples' Party). John Beckett was the General Secretary, the Marquis of Tavistock the President, and Wallop one of the members of the Executive.[176] Its aims were virtually identical with the British Council Against European Commitments, and was very anti-Semitic. They also shared a common insignicance. Several of the British Peace Party's members were imprisoned under Defence Regulation 18b. in 1940.[177]

However, the monthly journal of the British Council Against European Commitments, the New Pioneer, edited by Wallop and John

Beckett, is of considerable ideological significance. It was ultra-patriotic and pro-Nazi. Wallop wrote of the New Pioneer: "While it cannot be held to be part and parcel of Array doctrine, its use in spreading Array ideas in it should be very strong."[178] Most importantly, Ludovici contributed numerous articles and book reviews to the New Pioneer. Indeed, Ludovici's social and political thought is quite representative of one vein of the doctrinal elaborations to be found in the New Pioneer. Besides its unconcealed advocacy of fascism there can be identified, in the New Pioneer, a parallel doctrinal vein of thought which sought the synthesis of collectivist conservatism with fascism. The following passage, taken from another contributor, is representative of the latter doctrinal vein which abounded in the New Pioneer:

> The English people have their own corporatist tradition...which a large number of Tories, including Disraeli, Cross, Lord Milner and Lord Robert Cecil were highly interested in...
>
> The effort of Conservatives such as Disraeli, Oastler, and Cross whose spirit is still to be discerned in places within the modern Conservative Party, to restore the regulative intentions of government in industry have never been completely followed up by the modern Conservative Party. But if ever that Party...dares to announce a programme aimed at regulation in a manner and to a degree which forces us to see similarities with the Guild regulative system then we may manage to avoid the coming disaster.[179]

In the New Pioneer, Wallop advocated a truce with Nazi Germany[180] and the extirpation of communist Russia, which he regarded as the agency of international Jewry.[181] Arthur Keith Chesterton, cousin of G.K.Chesterton, and a founding member of Oswald Mosley's British Union of Fascists* and who spent two of his six years in the B.U.F. as

---

*Hereafter referred to as the B.U.F..

editer of Action, and was Oswald Mosley's official biographer[182], contributed prolifically to the New Pioneer. He contended that President Roosevelt rather than Hitler was the enemy of the English working man as the former was the mouth piece of Jewry and the 'money power.'[183] Whilst the fascist nations refused: "to remain in the power of gold."[184] John Scanlon, who used to write for the B.U.F. under the pseudonym John Emery, also frequently contributed to the New Pioneer. As did John Greene and John Beckett who were both ex-B.U.F. members, and the secretary and treasurer respectively of the British Peace Party. Both of the latter were imprisoned under Defence Regulation 18b. in 1940.

All of the foregoing, including Ludovici, elaborated fascism explicitly in the New Pioneer throughout the initial phase of World War II. They agreed with its policy of isolation, that: "the golden hordes of the future (Jews and Communists) are watching with patient jealous eyes for the civil war of Europe - England versus Germany, Bolshevism versus internal regeneration, or whatever form the struggle may take. "[185] Indeed, Joan Morgan wrote that Hitler was fulfilling the Nietzchean promise of the 'Superman'.[186] In the last issue of the New Pioneer, in January 1940, she wrote that "Ghouls and Idealists" had precipitated degeneration by their recipe of: "Internationalism, Federalisation, Collective Security, Mongrelisation, Soil Erosion, World War, Civil War, Propoganda, Taxation, Armaments, Trustification, also all sorts of vices and perversions."[187]

Finally, two of Ludovici's books were published by organisations whose clientele was fascist or extremely anti-Semitic. His Jews, and the Jews in England was published by Boswell, primarily the creation

of the Duke of Northumberland, which was eventually taken over by the Britons Publishing Society. Ludovici's The Specious Origins of Liberalism; the genesis of a delusion was published by the latter in 1967. The Britons Publishing Society was founded in 1918 by Henry Hamilton Beamish, an anti-Semite of some notoriety. It was a significant source of racialist and anti-Semitic publications in England[188], from its inception.[189]

Thus, the obvious conclusion of this final chapter is that Ludovici's political affiliations were fascist. Furthermore, and of major significance for this thesis, his primary affiliations like William John Sanderson, Gerald Vernon Wallop, the Order of the Red Rose, the English Mistery and the English Array were, like Ludovici, attempting to transmogrify the nature of conservatism into a doctrine indistinguishable from fascism. Indeed, Ludovici's doctrine provided direction for both the English Mistery and the English Array movements, and provided a source of inspiration for the Order of the Red Rose.

Notes to Chapter 6: Ludovici's Political Affiliations

1. Anthony Mario Ludovici, Religion for Infidels (London: Holborn, 1961), pp.214-215.

2. English Mistery, Orders of 1932, July 1, 1932.

3. idem., Recorder's Quarterly Guide, June 1941, p.1.

4. Anthony Mario Ludovici, What Woman Wishes (London: Hutchinson, [1921]),pp.91-92.

5. Lord Willoughby de Broke, "Introductory Letter," to Anthony Mario Ludovici's The False Assumptions of "Democracy" (London: Heath Cranton, [1921]),pp.vii-viii.

6. Anthony Mario Ludovici, A Defence of Conservatism (London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927), p.187.

7. Lord Willoughby de Broke, National Review,October 1911, p.208; cited in Anthony Mario Ludovici., ibid., pp.191-192.

8. Order of the Red Rose [William John Sanderson], Before and After, Red Rose Pamphlet No.1, 1913, p.44.

9. idem., The Body Without Soul, Red Rose Pamphlet No.5, 1914, p.22.

10. idem., Rosemary for Rememberance, Red Rose Pamphlet No.16, 1923, p.24.

11. ibid., p.35.

12. ibid., p.24.

13. William John Sanderson, The Industrial Crisis (London: Siegle Hill & Co., 1914), p.11.

14. ibid., p.6.

15. ibid., p.48.

16. ibid., p.14.

17. ibid., p.16.

18. ibid., p.17.

19. Order of the Red Rose [William John Sanderson], Before and After, Red Rose Pamphlet No.1, 1913, p.10.

20. ibid., p.11.

21. idem., The Needle's Eye, Red Rose Pamphlet No.8., 1916, p.10.

22. ibid., p.17.

23. ibid., p.22.

24. ibid., p.24.

25. Order of the Red Rose [William John Sanderson], Drones in the Hive, Red Rose Pamphlet No. 10, 1916, pp.24-25.

26. idem., Before and After, Red Rose Pamphlet No.1, 1913, p.39.

27. idem., The Body Without a Soul, Red Rose Pamphlet, No.5, 1914, pp.42-43.

28. William John Sanderson, The Industrial Crisis, (London: Siegle Hill and Co., 1914), p.49.

29. ibid., p.6.

30. Order of the Red Rose [William John Sanderson], The Cause of the Amble Miners, Red Rose Pamphlet No.3, 1913, p.6.

31. William John Sanderson, The Industrial Crisis (London: Siegle Hill, 1914), p.6.

32. Order of the Red Rose [William John Sanderson], Like a Thief in the Night, Red Rose Pamphlet No.12, 1918, p.3.

33. ibid., pp.16-17.

34. idem., The Rule of the Rose,Red Rose Pamphlet No.13, 1919, p.11.

35. idem., Voluntary Insurance, Red Rose Pamphlet, No.7, 1914, p.4.

36. idem., The National Debt, Red Rose Leaflet No.11, 1916, pp.1-2.

37. idem., The Rule of the Rose, Red Rose Pamphlet No.13, 1919, p.11.

38. idem., Private Property, Red Rose Pamphlet No.11, 1917, p.54.

39. idem., A Red Rose, Red Rose Pamphlet No.9, p.17.

40. idem., The Body Without a Soul, Red Rose Pamphlet No.5, 1914, p.22.

41. ibid., pp.81-82.

42. idem., The Needle's Eye, Red Rose Pamphlet No.8, 1916, p.74.

43. idem., The Rule of the Rose, Red Rose Pamphlet No.13, 1919, p.7.

44. ibid., p.22.

45. idem., The Industrial Crisis and its Effect upon the Amble Miners, Red Rose Pamphlet No.15, 1921, p.7.

46. ibid., p.24.

47. ibid., p.32.

48. idem., Memorandum on the Position and Aims of the Red Rose, Red Rose Leaflet No.18 [1919], p.7.

49. idem., The Order of the Red Rose, Red Rose Leaflet No.22, [1923].

50. idem., The Industrial Crisis and its Effect upon the Amble Miners, Red Rose Pamphlet No.15, 1921, p.7.

51. Order of the Red Rose [William John Sanderson], Before and After Red Rose Pamphlet No.1. 1913, p.39.

52. idem., Private Property, Red Rose Pamphlet No.11, 1917, p.42.

53. idem., Rosemary For Rememberance, Red Rose Pamphlet, No.16, 1923, p.23.

54. ibid.

55. ibid., pp.25-26.

56. ibid., pp.34-35.

57. William John Sanderson, "The Spirit of Fascism," in the Fascist (London: Imperial Fascist League), August 6, 1929, p.1.

58. idem., "The Duty of Military Proficiency," in the Fascist (London: Imperial Fascist League), September 7, 1929, pp.3-4.

59. Imperial Fascist League, Fascist, July 28, 1932, p.4.

60. William John Sanderson, That Which was Lost - A Treatise on Freemasonry and the English Mistery (London: Constable, 1930), p.10.

61. ibid., p.11.

62. ibid., p.26.

63. ibid., p.63.

64. ibid., pp.125-126.

65. George Thayer, The British Political Fringe (London: Anthony Blond, 1965), p.106.

66. William John Sanderson, "The Significance of the Royal Chair," in the Freemason, November 8, 1930.

67. idem., Statecraft. A Treatise on the Concerns of our Sovereign Lord the King (4th ed.; Wentworth: Roger Gresham Cooke, Recorder to the English Mistery, 1941), p.13.

68. ibid., p.64.

69. ibid., p.45.

70. idem., in the Recorder's Quarterly Guide (London: English Mistery), December 2, 1936, p.1.

71. idem., "Atonement in the Company of the English Mistery," supplement to the Recorder's Quarterly Guide (London: English Mistery), No.20, March 1941, p.1.

72. idem., in the Recorder's Quarterly Guide (London: English Mistery), June 1939, p.3.

73. ibid., pp.3-4.

74. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, A Knot of Roots (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1965) p.127.

75. English Mistery, Recorder's Quarterly Guide, June 1940, p.1.

76. idem., Function and Composition of the Syndicate, Order of 1930, No.2, p.2.

77. idem., Recorder's Quarterly Guide, June 1940, p.1.

78. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, A Knot of Roots, (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1965), p.122.

79. ibid., p.124.

80. idem., Ich Dien, The Tory Path (London: Constable, 1931), p.118.

81. ibid., p.123.

82. English Mistery, Constitution, Order of 1930, No.1, p.1.

83. ibid., p.4.

84. idem., Function and Composition of the Syndicate, Order of 1930, No.2, pp.1-2.

85. ibid., p.4.

86. ibid., pp.4-5.

87. idem., Orders of 1933, p.1.

88. idem., Rules of Conduct for Companions, Order of 1930, No.5, pp.9-10.

89. idem., Rules of Procedure for All Audiences of the Syndicate and Meetings of the Kin, Order of 1930, No.4, p.5.

90. idem., Rules of Conduct for Companions, Order of 1930, No.5, pp.3-4.

91. ibid., pp.8-9.

92. Bryant Irvine, "Is the House of Lords Noble?," National Review, Volume 101, (July 1933), p.466.

93. English Mistery, The English Mistery, Leaflet No.2, 1934, p.2.

94. idem., A Description of the English Mistery, Leaflet No.5, 1938, p.1.

95. idem., Recorder's Quarterly Guide, March 1938, p.3.

96. idem., Notes on the Orders, 1933, p.11.

97. ibid., p.6.

98. ibid., p.22ff.

99. idem, Recorder's Quarterly Guide, March 1938, p.4.

100. ibid., December 1938, p.1.

101. idem., Notes on the Orders, 1933, p.42.

102. English Mistery, Rules of Conduct for Companions, Order of 1930, No.5, p.8.

103. ibid., pp.10-11.

104. idem., Notes on the Orders, 1933, p.13.

105. Lord Howard de Walden, in the Recorder's Quarterly Guide (London: English Mistery), March 1940, p.3.

106. English Mistery, Recorder's Quarterly Guide (London: English Mistery), March 1938, p.3.

107. idem., Rules of Conduct for Companions, Order of 1930, No.5, pp.3-4.

108. ibid., pp.10-11.

109. idem., Orders of 1931, Nos.1-6, p.4.

110. idem., A Description of the English Mistery, Leaflet No.5, 1938, pp.9-10.

111. idem., Recorder's Quarterly Guide, September 1937, p.2.

112. idem., Revised Orders of 1931: Nos. 1-8, second edition, pp.28-29.

113. idem., Orders of 1931: Nos 1-6, p.26.

114. idem., Notes on the Orders, 1933, p.4.

115. idem., Chancellor's Index of Literature, first edition, 1936, p.4.

116. idem., Recorder's Quarterly Guide, December 1936, p.1.

117. ibid., December 1939, pp.3-4.

118. Bryant Irvine, "Back to Nobility," National Review,Volume 160, (January 1933), p.778.

119. English Mistery, Orders of 1933, p.17.

120. idem., Chancellor's Indix of Literature, first edition, 1936, p.4.

121. idem., Recorder's Quarterly Guide, December 1936, p.1.

122. ibid., June 1938, pp.3-4.

123. ibid., June 1939, pp.1-2.

124. ibid., March 1939, p.1.

125. ibid., December 1937, p.1.

126. ibid., June 1940, p.4.

127. ibid., June 1938, pp.3-4.

128. idem., The English Mistery, Leaflet No.1. 1934, p.1.

129. English Mistery, The English Mistery, Leaflet No.2. 1934, p.1.

130, idem., The English Mistery, Leaflet No.1, 1935. p.7.

131. idem., The Chancellor's Index of Literature, second edition, 1936, p.2.

132. idem., A Description of the English Mistery, Leaflet No.5, 1938, p.1.

133. ibid., pp.9-10.

134. idem., An Introduction to the English Mistery, 1944, p.8ff.

135. idem., Book of Ceremonial (London : English Mistery, 1938), p.37.

136. Henry Snell, "Laughter," in the Recorder's Quarterly Guide, (London: English Mistery), March 1941, pp.1-2.

137. English Mistery, Recorder's Quarterly Guide, June 1943, p.1.

138. ibid., March 1944, p.1.

139. ibid., March 1945, p.1.

140. ibid., June 1945, p.1.

141. English Array, Quarterly Gazette of the English Array, No.1, September 1937, p.1.

142. George Thayer, op.cit., p.106.

143. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, in the Quarterly Gazette of the English Array, No.2, December 1937, p.1.

144. ibid., No.3, April 1938, p.4.

145. ibid., No.4, July 1938, p.1ff.

146. English Array, Quarterly Gazette of the English Array, No.5, October 1938, p.2.

147. ibid., p.3ff.

148. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, in the Quarterly Gazette of the English Array, No.6, January 1939, p.1.

149. idem., A Knot of Roots (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1965), p.127.

150. ibid., p.129.

151. ibid., p.185.

152. idem., Ich Dien, The Tory Path (London: Constable, 1931), pp.23-24.

153. ibid., p.31ff.

154. ibid., p.120.

155. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Horn, Hoof and Corn, The Future of British Agriculture, (London: Faber and Faber, 1932), p.145.

156. ibid., p.170.

157. idem., Famine in England (London: H.F. & G. Wetherby, 1938), pp.42-43.

158. ibid., pp.201-202.

159. ibid., p.203.

160. idem., Alternative to Death (London: Faber and Faber, 1943), p.17.

161. ibid., p.29.

162. idem., Famine in England (London: H.F. & G. Wetherby, 1938), pp.74-75.

163. ibid., p.18.

164. idem., Alternative to Death (London: Faber and Faber, 1943), p.37.

165. idem., Famine in England (London: H.F. & G. Wetherby, 1938), p.140.

166. ibid., pp.17-18.

167. idem., Alternative to Death (London: Faber and Faber, 1943), p.64.

168. idem., Famine in England (London: H.F. & G. Wetherby, 1938), p.118.

169. idem., Alternative to Death (London: Faber and Faber, 1943), p.30.

170. idem., Famine in England (London: H.F. & G. Wetherby, 1938), p.208.

171. ibid., p.209.

172. Anon., News Review, September 15, 1938, p.7.

173. Robert Benewick, The Fascist Movement in Britain (London: Penguin, 1972), p.287.

174. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, Should Britain Fight? The British Position and some facts on the Sudeten Problem (London: British Council Against European Commitments, 1938), p.4.

175. Robert Benwick, loc.cit.

176. Mr. Jay, "Pro-Nazis Start New Party," in the Tribune, June 30, 1939, p.11.

177. Robert Benewick, op.cit. p.288.

178. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, in the Quarterly Gazette of the English Array, No.6, January 1939, p.1.

179. H.W.J. Edwards, "The English Guilds: And a New Outlook," in the New Pioneer, Volume 1, No.8, July 1939, p.201.

180. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, in the New Pioneer, Volume II, No.14, January 1940, pp.319-320.

181. ibid., Volume I, No.12, November 1939, p.277ff.

182. George Thay er, op.cit., p.54.

183. Arthur K. Chesterton, "Addressing Mr. Roosevelt," in the New Pioneer, Volume I, No.4., March 1939, p.93.

184. idem., "The War of the Jews' Revenge," in the New Pioneer, Volume I, No.6, May, 1939, p.146.

185. Gerald Vernon Wallop, Viscount Lymington, "Soil and Civilisation," in the New Pioneer, Volume I, No.3, February 1939, pp.77.

186. Joan Morgan, "Thus Spake Hitler," in the New Pioneer, Volume I, No.10, September 1939, p.243.

187. idem., "Macabre Tapestry," in the New Pioneer, Volume II, No. 14, January 1940, p.341.

188. Gisela C. Lebseltzer, Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939 (London: Macmillan, 1978), p.49ff.

189. George Thayer, op.cit., p.99ff.

CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions of this thesis are that it is the tradition of ideologies that are incommensurable, not ideologies per se. That it is not logically impossible for fascism to be introduced into a party system, which it intends to succeed, through rendering the ideology of an established political party commensurable with fascism. That fascists have attempted to render established ideologies commensurable with fascism, and have succeeded. The doctrine of Anthony Mario Ludovici and his affiliates, in which conservatism is commensurable with fascism, demonstrates the above in relation to conservatism. Indeed, history is profuse with instances of established ideologies being rendered commensurable with fascism. Especially before World War I in continental Europe, 'socialists', 'conservatives', and those disillusioned with traditional ideologies generally, repudiated the traditions of established ideologies and rendered them commensurable with all political extremes. Some, on occasion, called themselves 'revolutionary conservatives', or 'national socialists'. Their innovations were intended for adoption by the adherents of political parties who were disillusioned with the traditions of their respective ideologies.

That the fascists who had rendered established ideologies commensurable with fascism, like Anthony Mario Ludovici and his affiliates, contingently failed to get their innovations accepted by the adherents of established ideologies, for whose adoption they were intended. They failed because ideologies are traditions, and the respective traditions of ideologies are incommensurable visions of how men should be associated and authority and power distributed. Incommensurable ideologies are both cause and consequence of the political divisions of party systems whose political parties deploy them as the language of their adherence.

The practical success of an innovation in any ideology is always and everywhere decided by its contingent acceptance or rejection by the custodians of the traditions of an ideology, political parties and their constituents. Political ideologies tend to inertia because they are traditions that are incommensurable. It is this inertia that the fascists who rendered established ideologies commensurable with fascism, could not overcome. Hence the obscurity of Ludovici and his affiliates.

Fascism is an ideology that could not be sustained in the party systems in which it arose. The inertia of political parties and the incommensurability of the traditions of their ideologies has overwhelmed those who have attempted to render the latter commensurable with fascism. Consequently, fascists renounced their original parties of affiliation. Oswald Mosley, after failing to render the ideologies of both the Conservative and Labour parties commensurable with fascism; Benito Mussolini and those fascists who were originally affiliated to political parties, renounced them. The 'revolutionary conservatives' of Weimar Germany, as their name implies, renounced all affiliations with conservatives and allied themselves with the National Socialists. Whilst Hitler and the National Socialists never attempted to operate within German socialist parties, they knew it would be futile. Fascists have succeeded in rendering established ideologies commensurable with fascism. However, they have found it practically impossible to transform the ideologies of their parties of origin and to get them accepted as commensurable with fascism. If they had succeeded in overcoming the inertia then the latter would have become what we now regard as 'fascist'.

Fascists only succeeded when they became associated in movements independent of the political parties whose ideologies they rendered commensurable in their eclectic ideology which drew

from all areas of the political spectrum. Their ideology reflected their recruitment from persons, like themselves, who were disillusioned with political parties and the traditions of their associated ideologies. Their success has occurred with the crises of party systems, especially the immediate aftermath of World War I and the Great Depression which provided the disillusionment with political parties and their associated ideologies on which fascism was sustained. Nowhere have fascists succeeded as the adherents of the political parties whose ideological inertia they condemned.

Ludovici and his affiliates are obscure because they attempted to reverse this familiar pattern. They never succeeded in getting themselves regarded as conservatives because the traditions of conservatism and the consensus among conservatives about its meaning as its traditions created sufficient inertia that the innovations which Ludovici and his affiliates sought could not be effected in the contemporary party system. If they had succeeded conservatism would have become regarded by 'conservatives', and others, as commensurable with fascism. Nevertheless, the reasons for the failure of Ludovici and his affiliates are contingent. The prognosis of Harold Nicolson* when noting the difficulty of launching a fascist movement where the political culture is governed by a party system, is not impossible of achievement: "The English mind functions only in a groove; get it out of that groove and it flops into panic distaste..... I also believe that if we ever have fascism in this country it will creep in disguised in the red, white and blue of patriotism and the young conservatives." The success of Ludovici and his affiliates could be posthumous.

---

* Harold Nicolson to Osward Mosley, 29 June, 1932, MS uncatalogued Nicolson Papers; Gisela Lebseltzer, Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939 (London: Macmillan, 1978), p.176.

APPENDIX: ANTHONY MARIO LUDOVICI'S UNPUBLISHED PAPERS AND MANUSCRIPTS

Anthony Mario Ludovici died on 3 April 1971, aged eighty-nine years. His will specifies that two of his manuscripts be published from the moneys derived from the sale of his estate, and he published of a quality not inferior to that of his The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders (London: Rider, 1952). The two manuscripts are: "The English Countryside", "My Autobiography (The Confessions of an Anti-feminist)". They have not been published due to the absence of any publisher willing to accept them as suitable for publication.[1] However, the only surviving Executor, Mr. Thomas R.T. Manning of Manning, Rollin & Co., Solicitors and Commissioners for Oaths, Park House, Mere Street, Diss, Norfolk, (telephone 0379-3555) is prepared to release temporarily the deceased's manuscripts, consisting of "several large files",[2] to a responsible Repository for the purposes of bona fide study.[3]

Unfortunately, the deceased's papers have been lost to posterity. It was understood by the surviving Executor that the deceased's papers were sent by the deceased's nephew, Mr. John Ludovici of 1 Han's Place, London SW1, to Edinburgh University's Department of Social Medicine.[4] The deceased's papers were indeed offered to the Department of Social Medicine of Edinburgh University. However, the Department of Social Medicine declined the offer. Subsequently, the deceased's papers, several teachests full, were lost, whilst in store, when John Ludovici, in whose permanent

---

1. John Ludovici, "Interview with the Author", 19 March 1980.
2. Thomas R. T. Manning, "Letter to the Author", 11 April 1980.
3. Idem., "Letter to the Author", 9 June 1980.
4. Idem., "Letter to the Author", 11 April 1980.

custody they were, went to Iran for two and a half years.[1]

Misfortune, or perhaps deliberate misinterpretation, also blighted the deceased's substantial bequest to Edinburgh University. In his will, after sundry bequests, he goes on to bequeath the residue of his Residuary Estate in trust to the University Court of the University of Edinburgh. It was to be held in trust for the following purposes. Firstly, a sum of £2,000 was to be invested in trustee securities and the income thereof to be used to provide a money prize to be known as the "Ludovici Prize" to be awarded annually or at the discretion of the said University Court for the purpose of research into the influence of miscegenation on man's quality and well-being, such research being carried out under the auspices of the University Department of Social Medicine. However, the Department of Social Medicine chose to study Huntington's chorea rather than the effects of miscegenation - with Ludovici's financial bequeathment. I think the following is fair comment on the subject:

> If we have universities refusing to carry out research because they fear that there will be a certain amount of popular criticism against them for doing so, then we have a degree of suppression of the facts of the case. Ludovici did not demand that they were to find that the white races should prove superior to the black races; or that the crosses would prove to be bad between the two stocks. He merely asked that scientific research should be done.[2]

---

1. John Ludovici, op. cit.
2. R.Gayre, "The late A.M. Ludovici's Bequest to the University of Edinburgh", Mankind Quarterly, Volume XIII, No.4, pp. 191-194.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ANTHONY MARIO LUDOVICI: PRIMARY SOURCES

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "The Adams Family of America," New English & New Age, Vol. XXIII, No.23 (September 23,1943), pp.173-174.

_____ "All about the Family [Review of Nation and the Family, Alva Myrdal (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVII, No.16-20 (August 30, 1945), pp.144-145.

_____ "Ananda K. Coomaraswamy," New English Weekly, Vol.XXXII, No.9 (December 11, 1947), pp.82-83.

_____ "An Anti-Democratic Malgre Lui [Review of The Impulse to Dominate, by D.W. Harding (George Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XX, No.13 (January 22, 1942), p.121.

_____ "An Artist's Farewell to His Mistress [a poem]," New Age, Vol. XXIX, No.12, (July 21, 1921), p.144.

_____ "Anglo-American Co-Operation [Review of The Atlantic System. The Story of Anglo-American control of the Seas, by Forrest Davis (George Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXIII, No.7 (June 3, 1943), pp.56-57.

_____ "Army Officers and Saluting," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XVIII, No.21, (March 13, 1941), pp.241-242.

_____ _____, Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XVIII, No.24 (April 3, 1941), p.280.

_____ "Art," New Age, Vol. XII, No.6 (December 12, 1912), p.135.

_____ "Art: A Dialogue Overheard at a Picture Gallery," New Age, Vol. XI, No.27 (October 31, 1912), pp.642-644.

_____ "Art: An Open Letter to my Friends," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.9 (January 1, 1914), pp.278-281.

_____ "Art: A Question of Finish," New Age, Vol. XII, No.21 (March 27, 1913), p.508.

_____ "Art: A Stroll Down Bond Street," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.2 (May 8, 1913), p.42.

_____ "Art Criticism," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIII, No.13, (July 24, 1913), p.374.

_____ _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIII, No.16 (August 14, 1913), pp.470-471.

_____ "Art: False Remedies and Other Considerations," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.11 (January 15, 1914), pp.345-346.

_____ "Artificial Incemination," Letter to The Times, July 4, 1945, p.2.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Artificial Insemination", Letter to The Times, June 20, 1945, p.

_____ "Art: Les Independents and the Salon des Beaux Arts," New Age, Vol. XV, No.2 (May 14, 1914), p.44.

_____ "Art: Modern Dutch Masters," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.20, September 11, 1913), pp.576-577.

_____ "Art: Mr. Bergson's Views," New Age, Vol. XI, No.23, (October 23, 1912), pp.547-548.

_____ "Art; Mr. Walter Sickert and Others," New Age, Vol. XII, No.19 (March 13, p.458.

_____ "Art: Nietzsche, Culture and Plutocracy," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.13 (January 29, 1914), pp.411-412.

_____ "Art: Over Production in the Graphic Arts," New Age, Vol.XIII, No.22 (September 25, 1913), pp.638-639.

_____ "Art: Pictures and Sculpture by Book-Post," New Age, vol. XIII, No.6, (June 5, 1913), pp.152-153.

_____ "Art: Raw Material at the Dudley Galleries," New Age, vol. XIII, No.24 (October 9, 1913), pp.703-704.

_____ "Art: Review of Rodin, by Muriel Ciolkowska (Methuen)," New Age, Vol.XI, No.19 (September 5, 1912), pp.451-452.

_____ "Art: Rue Lafitte, The Boulevard, and Elsewhere," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.25 (April 23, 1914, p.792.

_____ "The Arts and Crafts," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XII, No.16 (February 20, 1913), p.390.

_____ _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol. XII, No.18, (March 6, 1913), p.438.

_____ "The Arts and Crafts Exhibition at the Grosvenor Gallery," New Age, Vol. XII, No.13 (January 30, 1913),

_____ "Art: The Art of India [Review of The Arts and Crafts of India and Ceylon, by Ananda Coomaraswamy (Foulis)]," No.I, New Age, Vol. XIV, No.15, (February 12, 1914), pp.474-475.

_____ _____, Number II, New Age, Vol. XIV, No.17, (February 26, 1914), pp.539-540.

_____ _____, Number III, New Age, Vol.XIV, No.19, (March 12, 1914), pp.599-600.

_____ _____, Number IV, New Age, Vol. XIV, No.21, (March 26, 1914), pp.665-666.

_____ "Art: The Arts and Crafts Again," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.23, (April 9, 1914), pp.728-729.

_____ "Art: The Carfax, the Grosvenor and the Goupil Galleries," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.10 (July 3, 1913), p.273.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Art: The Gordon Craig Theatre," New Age, Vol. XI, No.21 (September 19, 1912), pp.497-498.

_____ "Art: The Goupil and Carfax Galleries," New Age, Vol. XII, No.17 (February 27, 1913), p.411.

_____ "Art: The Goupil, the Alpine Club, and the Dorien Galleries," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.5, (December 4, 1913) pp.152-153.

_____ "Art: The Grafton Galleries," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.12 (July 17, 1913), pp.337-338.

_____ "Art: The International Society of Sculptors, Painters and Gravers," New Age, Vol. XII, No.25, (April 24, 1913), pp.619-620.

_____ "Art: The Little Gallery and the Fine Art Society," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.1 (November 6, 1913), pp.23-24.

_____ "Art: The London Salon," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.14 (July 31, 1913, pp.398-399.

_____ "Art: The Modern Society of Portrait Painters at the Royal Institute," New Age, Vol. XII, No.15, (February 13, 1913), pp.358-359.

_____ "Art: The New English Art Club," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.8, (June 19, 1913), pp.211-212.

_____ "Art: The New English Art Club and the Chenil Gallery," Number I, New Age, Vol. XII, No.9. (January 2, 1913), pp.210-211.

_____ _____, Number II, New Age, Vol. XII, No. 11 (January 16, 1913), p.260.

_____ "Art: The Poster-Impressionist Exhibition," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.18 (August 28, 1913), pp.521-522.

_____ "Art: The Pot-Boiler Paramount," New Age, Vol. XII, No.3 (November 21, 1912), pp.66-67.

_____ "Art: The Psychology of Inspiration and the Grafton Galleries," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.26 (October 23, 1913), pp.765-767.

_____ "Art: The Royal College of Art," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.16 (August 14, 1913), pp.463-464.

_____ "Art: The Royal Society of Oil Painters and the Royal Society of Painters in Water Colours," New Age, Vol. XI, No.4 (November 28, 1912), pp.

_____ "Art: Suffolk Street and the Goupil Gallery," New Age, Vol. XII, No.23 (April 10, 1913), p.563.

_____ "Art: White Roses at the Stafford and the Carfax Galleries," New Age, Vol. XI, No.251(October 17, 1912), p.596.

_____ "Art: William Blake at the Tate Gallery," New Age, Vol. XIV, No.3, (November 20, 1913), pp.89-90.

_____ "Auguste Rodin's Art [Review of The Sculptures of Auguste Rodin, 119 Redproductions in Menochrome Photogravure, with a life and review of his work by Somerville Storey and a Catalogue Raisonne by Georges Grappe (Allen & Unwin, 1939)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXI, No.6 (May 28,1942),pp.52-53.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Back to the Jungle," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXII, No.15 (January 22, 1948), pp.144-145.

_____ "Birth Control," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.19 (February 22, 1945), p.148.

_____ "Birth Control [Review of Control of Life, by Halliday Sutherland, M.D. (Burnes, Oates and Waterhouse Ltd.)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.14, (January 18, 1945), pp.102-103.

_____ "Britain's Conservative Statesmen," South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.4 (August 1955), pp.5-6.

_____ "A British Conservative Looks at the Black Invasion of Britain," South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.3., (July 1955), pp.5-6.

_____ "Caesar and Caesarism [Review of No other Caesar, by Felix Grendon (John Lane)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XIX, No.15 (July 31, 1941), p.153.

_____ "Cant at the Tate Gallery," New Age, Vol. XI, No.17 (August 22, 1912), pp.403-404.

_____ "The Case Against Legalised Artificial Abortion," in F.W. Stella Browne, Anthony Mario Ludovici, Harry Roberts, Abortion, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1935, pp.53-108.

_____ "A Case for Freud," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XXIII, No.18 August 29, 1918), p.291.

_____ "The Case of Nietzsche," Letter to the New Age, Vol. VIII, No.22 (March 30, 1911), p.527.

_____ Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady London: Hutchinson, [1919]). pp.288.

_____ "Causality," letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXV, No.15 (July 27, 1944), p.730.

_____ _____, Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXV, No.17-20 (August 31, 1944), p.156.

_____ " Ce Que Femme Veut Dien le Veut [a poem]," New Age, Vol. XXIX, No.17 (August 25, 1921), p.204.

_____ "Mr. Chesterton and Anarchy," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XI, No.7 (June 13, 1912), pp.166-167.

_____ " The Child: an adult's problem. London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948, pp.288.

_____ "The Child Mind [Review of Child Psychology, by Fowler A. Brooks, with the collaboration of Lawrence D. Shaffer (Methuen)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXII, No.6 (November 20, 1947), pp.33-34.

_____ The Choice of a Mate London: John Lane, 1935, pp.xxi 510.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Civilisation and the Aeroplane [Review of Air Power and Civilisation, by M.J. Bernard Davy (George Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XX, No.14, (January 29, 1942), pp.129-130.

_____ "Mr. Clutton Brock on Art [Review of Clutton Brock, Essays on Art (Methuen)]," New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.13 (January 29, 1920), pp.201-202.

_____ "Coincidence," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XXII, No.6 December 12, 1912), p.141.

_____ _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol. XXII, No.8 (December 26, 1912), p.190.

_____ "Conditions in England," Number I, South African Observer, Volume XV, No.1., December 1969, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Volume XV, No.2, January 1980, p.13.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Volume XV, No.3, February 1970, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number IV, South African Observer, Volume XV, No.4, March 1970, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number V, South African Observer, Volume XV, No.6, May 1970, p.14.

_____ "Confusion in the Arts," Contemporary Review, Volume 192, (August 1957), pp.106-110.

_____ "Conscience and Fanaticism, A reply to Mr. G. Pitt-Rivers's The Sick Values of a Sick Age (A reply to A.M. Ludovici's review of Mr. G. Pitt-Rivers's Conscience and Fanatacism)of November 13, 1919," New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.10 (January 8,1920), pp.155-156.

_____ "Conscience and Fanaticism [Review of Conscience and Fanaticism: An Essay on Moral Values (Heinemann)]," New Age, Vol. XXV, No.24 (October 9, 1919), pp.395-396.

_____ "The Conservative Programme: A Further Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume CXIII, (April 1923), pp.600-614.

_____ "The Conservative Programme - A Suggestion," Fortnightly Review, New Series, Volume CXI, (June 1922), pp.948-962.

_____ Creation or Recreation London: The First of St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1934. pp.37.

_____ "The Crisis in Modern Art [Review of Professor Wladimir Weidle, The Dilemma of the Arts, (SCM Press Ltd)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXIV, No.13 (January 6, 1949), pp.152-153.

_____ "The Crisis in Psycho-Therapy [Review of Technique of Analytical Psychotherapy, by William Stekel (translated by Eden and Cedar Paul, John Lane, London)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XVI, No.3 (November 2, 1939), pp.42-43.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Culture and Indian Nationalism [Review of Louis Fischer, A Week with Gandhi (G. Allen & Unwin) and Talking to India ed. George Orwell, by E.M. Forster, Richie Calder, Cedric Dover and Others (G. Allen & Unwin]" New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXIV, No.24 (March 30, 1944), pp.201-202.

_____ A Defence of Aristocracy. A text book for Tories. London: Constable, 1915, ppxxi, p. 459.

_____ _____, 2nd. and rev. ed., London: Constable, 1933. pp.xx.458.

_____ A Defence of Conservatism London: Faber & Gwyer, 1927, pp.vi.276.

_____ "Democracy and Mr. Cox," Letter to the New Age, Volume XIV, No.18 (March 1914), p.575.

_____ _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.20 (March 19, 1914), p.639.

_____ _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.23 (April 9, 1914), pp.734-735.

_____ _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIV, No.26 (April 30, 1914), pp.825-826.

_____ "A Disturbing Treatise [Review of Advance to Barbarism, by A. Jurist [pseud.] (Thomas & Smith Ltd.,)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXIV, January 13, 1949, pp.163-164.

_____ "A Doctor's Memoirs [Review of Dr. Vere Pearson's Man, Medicine and Myself, (Museum Press Ltd.)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXX, No.19-21. (March 6, 1947), p.180.

_____ "The Dominant Sex," Letter to the Spectator, September 29, 1923, pp.420-421.

_____ "Dr. Dewey on the Responsibility of Philosophy [Review of Problems of Men (New York: Philosophical Library, 1946)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXX, No.2 (October 24, 1946), pp.17-18.

_____ "Dr. Oscar Levy [Obituary]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXX, No.5 (November 14, 1946), pp.49-50.

_____ "Education in Modern England," Number I, South African Observer, Volume V, No.9 January 1960, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Volume V, No.10, February 1960, pp.12-14.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Volume V, No.11, March 1960, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number IV, South African Observer, Volume V, No.12, April 1960, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number V, South African Observer, Volume VI, No.1, May 1960, pp.8-9.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Education in Modern England," Number VI, South African Observer, Vol. VI, No.2, June 1960, pp.11-12.

_____ _____,Number VII, South African Observer, Vol. VI, No.3, July 1960, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number VIII, South African Observer, Vol. VI, No.4, August 1960, pp.10-11.

_____ _____, Number IX, South African Observer, Vol.VI, No.5, September 1960, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number X, South African Observer, Vol. VI, No.6, October 1960, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number XI, South African Observer, Vol. VI, No.7, November 1960, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number XII, South African Observer, Vol. VI. No.8, December 1960, pp.12-14.

_____ _____, Number XIII, South African Observer, Vol. VI, No.9, January 1961, pp.10-11.

_____ _____, Number XIV, South African Observer, Vol. VI, No.10, February, 1961, pp.11.13.

_____ Enemies of Women. The origins in outline of Anglo-Saxon Feminism. [With a portrait]. London: Carroll & Nicholson, 1948. pp.222.

_____ "The Enfranchisement of the Girl of Twenty-One," English Review, Vol. 44. (June 1927), pp.651-666.

_____ "England and the Farmer," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XX, No.4 (November 13, 1941), p.36.

_____ "The English Flapper [a poem]," New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.5 (December 4, 1919), p.84.

_____ English Liberalism London: English Array, [1939], pp.32.

_____ "The English Working Class," New Pioneer, Vol. 1. No.5, April 1939, p.26.

_____ "Equality and the Working Class," New Pioneer, Vol. 1, No.7, June 1939, p.175.

_____ "Equal Pay [Review of Equal Pay: What it is and what it means, with a foreword by Lord Percy (Aims of Industry)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.8 (December 7, 1944), pp.68-69.

_____ "Essays by Thomas Mann [Review of Essays of Three Decades, by Thomas Mann, (Secker & Warburg)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXIV, No.11, (December 23, 1948), pp.127-128.

_____ "The Essentials of Good Government," Number I, South African Observer, Vol. IX, No.2 September 1963, pp.12-14.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Vol. IX, No.4, November 1963, pp.13-14.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "The Essentials of Good Government," Number III, South African Observer, Vol. IX, No.5, December 1963, pp.13-14.

_____, Number IV, South African Observer, Vol. IX, No.7, February 1964, pp.10-11.

_____, Number V, South African Observer, Vol. IX, No.8, March 1964, pp.13-15.

_____, Number VI, South African Observer, Vol IX, No.9, April 1964, pp.14-15.

_____, Number VII, South African Observer, Vol.IX, No.10, May 1964, pp.12-13.

_____, Number VIII, South African Observer, Vol. IX, No.11, June 1964, pp.14-15.

_____, Number IX, South African Observer, Vol. IX, No.12, July 1964, pp.18-19.

_____, Number X, South African Observer, Vol X, No.1, August 1964, pp.13-14.

_____, Number XI, South African Observer, Vol.X, No.2, September 1964, pp.12-13.

_____, Number XII, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.3. October 1964, pp.12-13.

_____, Number XIII, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.4, November 1964, pp.13-14.

_____, Number XIV, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.5, December 1964, pp.12-13.

_____, Number XV, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.6, January 1965, pp.12-14.

_____, Number XVI, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.7.

_____, Number XVII, South African Observer, Vol.X No.8, March 1965, pp.14-15.

_____, Number XVIII, South African Observer, Vol.X, No.9, April 1965, pp.14-15.

_____, Number XIX, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.10. May, 1965, pp.12-13.

_____, Number XX, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.11, June 1965, pp.14-15.

_____ "Eugenics and Consanguineous Marriage," Eugenics Review, Vol. XXV, No.3, October 1933, pp.147-157.

_____ The False Assumptions of "Democracy" London: Heath Cranton, [1921], pp.222.

_____ "The False Assumptions of Democracy," Number I, South African Observer, Vol. II, No.8, December 1956, pp.13-14.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "The False Assumptions of Democracy," Number II, South African Observer, Vol. II, No.9, January, 1957, pp.8-9.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Vol. II, No.10, February 1957, pp.10-11.

_____ _____, Number IV, South African Observer, Vol. II, No.11, March 1957, pp.7-8.

_____ _____, Number V, South African Observer, Vol.II, No.12, April 1957, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number VI, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.1, May 1957, pp.7-8.

_____ _____, Number VII, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.2, June 1957, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number VIII, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.3, July 1957, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number IX, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.4, August 1957, pp.15-16.

_____ _____, Number X, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.5, September 1957, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number XI, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.6, October 1957, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number XII, South African Observer, Vol.III, No.7, November 1957, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number XIII, South African Observer, Vol. III, NO.8 December 1957, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number XIV, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.10, February 1958, pp.10-11.

_____ _____, Number XV, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.11, March 1958, pp.12-13.

_____ "Faust Retranslated [Review of Goethe's Faust, Part I: A New American Translation by Carlyle F. Macintyre with illustrations by Rockwell Kent (New Directions)]," New English Weekly,Vol. XXXI, No.24 (September 25, 1947, pp.177-178.

_____ "Feelings Masquerading as Thoughts in the Modern World," Number I, South African Observer, Vol. VIII, No.9, April 1963, pp.9-10.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Vol. VIII, No.10. May 1963, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Vol. VIII, No.11, June 1963, pp.14-15.

_____ "Feminine Franchise - A Reply to my Critics," English Review, Vol. 38, March 1924, pp.371-376.

_____ "The Folly of Feminine Franchise," English Review, Vol.37, November 1923, pp.571-579.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, The Four Pillars of Health. A contribution to post-war planning. London: Heath Cranton, 1945, pp.viii, 159.

_____ "Freedom and the Workers," New Pioneer, Vol.1. No.6, (May 1939), p.151.

_____ French Beans London: Hutchinson, [1923] pp.319.

_____ "Freud and Veblen on Society [Review of The Freudian Psychology and Veblen's Social Theory, by Louis Schneider, (New York: King's Crown Press)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXIV, No.1 (October 14, 1948).

_____ "Further Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin," Number I, Cornhill Magazine, Vol. LIX, No.334, New Series, (December 1925), pp.754-766.

_____ _____, Number II, Cornhill Magazine, Vol. LX- No.355, New Series, (January 1926), pp.111-126.

_____ _____, Number III, Cornhill Magazine, Vol. LX- No.356, New Series, (February 1926), pp.213-226.

_____ The Future of Woman, London: Kegan Paul 1936. pp.viii.152.

_____ The Goddess that Grew Up. London: Hutchinson, [1922] p.304.

_____ "A Great Book on Education [Review of History, Heritage and Environment, by Mr. Harry McNicol (Faber and Faber)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXX., No.28 (March 20, 1947), pp.200-201.

_____ [pseud. Theognis]. "Happiness and Social Reform," Oxford Fortnightly, Vol. III, No.9 (November 1913), pp.6-10.

_____ "Happiness in Asia [Review of Solution in Asia, by Owen Lattimore (Little, Brown & Co., Boston); India and the Indian Ocean, by K.M. Pannikar (George Allen & Unwin): Report from Red Asia, by Harrison Forman (Henry Holt & Co., New York)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVII, No.15, (July 26, 1945), pp.128-129.

_____ Health and Education through Self-Mastery, London: Watts & Co. 1933, pp.xv. 125.

_____ "The Health of the School Child," English Review, Vol. LXIV, March 1927, pp.340-348.

_____ "The Heart of an English Maid [a poem]," New Age, Vol. X, No.18 (February 29, 1912).

_____ "The Heart of an Englishman [a poem]," New Age, Vol. X, No.11 (January, 1912), p.253.

_____ "High and Low Birth Rates [Review of Dr. G.F. McCleary's Race Suicide (George Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVII, No.10 (June 21, 1945, pp.86-87.

_____ "A History of English Food [Review of The Englishman's Food by J.C. Drummond and Anne Wilbraham (Jonathan Cape, 1939)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XV. No.13 (July 13, 1939, pp.201-202.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Hitler and Nietzsche," Number I, English Review, Vol. LXIV, No.1 (January 1937), pp.44-52.

_____ _____ Number II, English Review, Vol. LXIV, February 1937, pp.192-202.

_____ " Hitler and the Third Reich," Number I, English Review, Vol. 63, No.1 (July 1936), pp.35-42.

_____ _____, Number II, English Review, Vol. 63, August 1936, pp.147-153.

_____ _____, Number III, English Review, Vol. 63. No.3 (September 1936), pp.231-239.

_____ "Hitler's Generals [Review of Liddell Hart, The Other Side of the Hill (Cassell)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXIII, No.25 (September 30, 1948), pp.223-224.

_____ "How the Blind lead the Blind," South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.5, September 1955, pp.7-8.

_____ "The Hundred and Forty-Fifth Royal Academy," New Age, Vol. XIII, No.4, (May 22, 1913), pp.95-96.

_____ "The Importance of Racial Integrity," Number I, South African Observer, Vol. III, No.12, April 1958, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.1, May 1958, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.2, June 1958, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number IV, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.3, July 1958, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number V, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.4, August 1958, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number VI, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.5, September 1958, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number VII, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.6, October 1958, pp.10-12.

_____ _____, Number VIII, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.7, November 1958, pp.10-11.

_____ _____, Number IX, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.8, December 1958, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number X, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.9, January 1959, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number XI, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.10, February 1959, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number XII, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.11, March 1959, pp.10-11.

_____ _____, Number XIII, South African Observer, Vol. IV, No.12, April 1959, pp.12-13.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "The Importance of Racial Integrity," Number XIV, South African Observer, Vol.V, No.1, May 1959, pp.12-13.

_____, _____, Number XV, South African Observer, Vol. V, No.2, June 1959, pp.12-13.

_____, _____, Number XVI, South African Observer, Vol. V, No.3, July 1959, pp.10-11.

_____, _____, Number XVII, South African Observer, Vol. V, No.4, August 1959, pp.12-13.

_____, _____, Number XVIII, South African Observer, Vol. V, No.5, September 1959, pp.12-13.

_____ "The Importance to Women of Youthful Marriage," Marriage Hygiene, Vol.1, No.4 (May 1935), pp.393-404.

_____ "In-and-outbreeding," Letter to the Eugenics Review, Vol. XXVI, No.1 (April 1934), pp.90-91.

_____ "In Defence of Conservatism," South African Observer, Vol.1 No.2, June 1955, pp.5-7.

_____ "India and the Western World," in K. Bharatha Iyer, ed., Art and Thought: Issued in honour of Dr. Ananda K. Coomaraswamy on the occasion of his 70th birthday, London: Luzac, 1947, pp.238-244.

_____ "In the Worker's Paradise [Review of The Rabbit Kings of Russia, by R.O.G. Urch (The Right Book Club)]," New Pioneer, Vol.1, No.4, March 1939, p.105.

_____ "Is there a Sex War? [Review of Mrs. Bertrand Russell's Hypatia, or Woman and Knowledge (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner)]," New Age, Vol. XXXVII, No.3 (May 31, 1925), pp.29-30.

_____ "Jesus Christ [Review of Jesus Christ XIX Centuries After. (The Search Symposium by Leaders of the Great World Faith). Published by Search Publishing Co., 1933]," New English Weekly, Vol. III, No.24, (September 28, 1933), pp.562-563.

_____ [pseud. Cobbett]. Jews and the Jews in England. London: Boswell, 1938.

_____ "Judgement on Freud [Review of La Methode Psychoanalytique, et la Doctrine Freudienne, by Dr. Roland Dalbiez, Desclee de Brouner et Cie, Paris, 1936; 2 vols.]," New English Weekly, Vol. XI, No.6 (May 20, 1937), pp.107-109.

_____ "The Jungle [Review of London's Overgrowth and the Causes of Swollen Towns, by S. Vere Pearson, M.A., M.D., (Daniell)]," New Pioneer, Vol. 1, No.7 (June 1939), pp.181-182.

_____ "Juvenile Delinquency [Review of Kate Friedlander's The Psycho-Analytical Approach to Juvenile Delinquency, (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. Ltd.,)]," New English Weekly, Vol.XXXI, No.25 (October 2, 1947), pp.189-190.

_____ "The Latest Form of Puritanical Brutality," letter to the New Age, Vol. XIII, No.1 (Mayl, 1913), p.19.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "The Latest Form of Poisonous Hate," New Age, Vol. XII, No.2, (November 14, 1912), pp.32-33.

_____"Laughter," Sunday Referee, December 31, 1928, p.9.

_____"Lenin. An Epic of Stubborn Health [Review of Lenin, by David Shub (Doubleday)]," New English Weekly, Vol.XXXV, No.7 (May 26, 1949), p.78.

_____"Lethal Benevolence in England," South African Observer, Vol.1, No.6 (October 1959), pp.12-13.

_____Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman. London: Kegan Paul, [1924], pp.117.

_____"Man: an indictment. London: Constable, 1927, pp.xx 374.

_____Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition. London: William Heinemann, 1921, pp.xi 255.

_____Mansel Fellowes, [a novel]. London: Grant Richards, 1918, pp.295.

_____"Matriarchy and the Mothers [Review of The Mothers: A Study of the Origins of Sentiments and Institutions, by Robert Briffault, 3 vols. (Allen & Unwin)]," English Review, Vol. XLV, November 1927, pp.597-602.

_____"The Meaning of 'Civilised' [Review of Tradition of Civility by Sir Ernest Parker (Cambridge University Press)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXIII, No.22, (September 9, 1948), pp.201-202.

_____"The Menace of Depopulation [Review of Parents Revolt, by Richard & Kathleen Titmus, with a preface by Beatrice Webb (Secker & Warburg)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXII, No.8 (December 10, 1942), pp.64-65.

_____"Missouri Compromise [Review of Missouri Compromise, by Tris Coffin (Boston: 1947)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXI, No.16, (July 31, 1947), p.138.

_____" More about Thorstein Veblen [Review of The Place of Science in our Civilisation; Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution; Essays on our Changing Order (all by Thorstein Veblen and published by Viking Press, New York)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXXVIII, No.4 (November 8, 1945, p.37.

_____"The Need of a Masculine Renaissance," English Review, Vol. 37, August 1923, pp.193-199.

_____"A New Interpretation of Jesus [Review of A.D.33. A Treat for The Times, by Hugh Ross Williams, (Collins)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XIX, No.18 (August 21, 1941), pp.177-178.

_____"A New Political Science [Review of Geopolitics: The Struggle for Space and Power, by Robert Strausz-Hupe, (Pitman's, New York)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXII, No.8, December 10, 1942), pp.65-65.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "A Newton of Health. [Review of The Universal Constant in Living, by F. Mathias Alexander (Chatterton Ltd.)]," Number I, New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.12 (January 4, 1945), pp.104-105.

_____, Number II, New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.13 (January 11, 1945), pp.94-95.

_____ "The 'Next War' [Review of The Next War, Series edited by Capt. B.H. Liddell Hart. Sea Power in the Next War, by Commander Russell Grenfell, R.N., Air Power in the Next War, by J.M. Spaight, C.B., C.B.E., Propaganda in the Next War, by Sidney Rogerson; Tanks in the Next War, by Major E.W. Sheppard, O.B.E., M.C. (Geoffrey Bles)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XIV, No.20 (February 23, 1939), pp.297-298.

_____ "Nietzsche and Art," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XX, No.19 (September 7, 1911), pp.454-455.

_____ Nietzsche and Art. London: Constable, 1911. pp.xvi 236.

_____ "Nietzsche and Science," Letter to the Spectator, January 8, 1910, p.52.

_____ "Nietzsche and the National Guild System," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIV, No.14, (February 5, 1914), p.445.

_____ "Nietzsche: his life and works. Preface by Dr. Oscar Levy, London Constable, 1910. pp.xv.101.

_____ "Nietzsche Once Again. [Review of The Story of a Human Philosopher, by H.A. Reyburn, in collaboration with H.E. Hinderks and J.G. Taylor, (Macmillan and Co.)]," New English Weekly, Vol. XXXIII, No.5 (May 13, 1948), pp.45-46.

_____ The Night-Hoers: or the case against birth-control and an alternative, London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928, pp.288.

_____ "Notes" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thus Spake Zarathustra, translated by Thomas Common. Volume XI of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy. Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909, pp.405-458.

_____ "Nutrition," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XV, No.22 (September 14, 1939), p.291.

_____ "Peace and its Perpetuation [Review of The Nature of Peace by Thorstein Veblen (New York: Viking Press)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXIX, No.14, (July 18, 1946), pp. 136-137.

_____ "Peace by Contract. [Review of Total Peace by Ely Cuthbertson (Faber & Faber Ltd)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXVII, No.9, (June 14, 1945), pp.76-77.

_____ "Personality and Human Destiny," South African Observer, Vol. 1, no.6, October 1955, pp.7-9.

_____ "Personality in Statesmanship," South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.7, November 1955, pp.11-13.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Personality in Statesmanship," Number III, South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.8, December 1955, pp.5-6.

_____, Number IV, South African Observer, Vol.1, No.9, January 1956, pp.13-14.

_____

_____ Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin [With plates, including a portrait.] London: John Murray, 1926. pp.xi, 204.

_____ "Personal Reminiscences of Auguste Rodin," Number 1, Cornhill Magazine, Vol. LV- No.325, New Series, July 1923, pp.1-13.

_____, Number II, Cornhill Magazine, Vol. LV- No.326, New Series, August 1923, pp.131-143.

_____ "A Phase of the World War Plot [Review of the Czech Conspiracy, by George Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers (Boswell, 1938)]," New Pioneer, Vol.1, No.3, February 1939, p.81.

_____ "A Philosophy of Marriage [Review of Marriage and Freedom by Dr. Eustace Chesser, (Rich and Cowan, Medical Publications)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXX, No.7, (November 28, 1946), pp.69-70.

_____ "Poetic Justice," South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.1., May 1955, pp.9-10.

_____ [pseud. David Valentine]. Poet's Trumpeter. London: Jonathan Cape, 1939.

_____ "The Political Misuse of Words," New Pioneer, Vol. 1, No.2. January 1939, pp.47,52.

_____ "Politics and the Mythical [Review of The Myth of the State by Ernst Cassirer. Yale University Press]," New English Weekly, Vol.XXXI, No.8 (June 5, 1947), p.70.

_____ "The Politics of Charles A. Beard. [Review of Charles A. Beard's The Economic Basis of Politics (Alfred Knopf, New York)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXVIII, No.10 (December 20, 1945), p.94.

_____ "Population [Review of Population, Today's Question by G.F. McCleary (George Allen & Unwin)]" New English Weekly, Vol. XIV, No.1 (October 13, 1938), pp.7-8.

_____ "Preface to the Third Edition," of Friedrich Nietzsche, The Case of Wagner, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Vol. VIII of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy. Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911, pp.xv-xxv.

_____ "The Problem of Freedom [Review of Bronislaw Malinowski Freedom and Civilisation. George Allen & Unwin]" New English Weekly, Vol. XXXII, No.20, (February 26, 1948), pp.193-194.

_____ "Prophecy in Morals [Review of Sex Morality Tomorrow, by Kenneth Ingram (George Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XVIII, No.10 (December 26, 1940), p.115.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Prostitution [Review of Prostitution, by Dr. Tage Kemp, Heinemann]" New English Weekly, Vol.XI, No.23 (September 16, 1937), pp.368-369.

_____ "Psychology and Music. [Review of Dr. Percy C. Bruck Psychology for Musicians (Oxford University Press)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.1, (October 19, 1944), pp.6-7.

_____ "A Psychologist's Appeal to Adolescents. [Review of Letters to Margaret, by Theo dore Faithfull, (George Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XX, No.14 (January 29, 1942), pp.129-130.

_____ "Public Opinion in England," Number 1, South African Observer, Vol. X, No.12, July, 1965, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.1, August 1965, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.2, September 1965, pp.14-16.

_____ _____, Number IV, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.3, November 1965, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number V, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.4, December 1965, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number VI, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.5, January 1966, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number VII, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.6, February 1966, pp.11-13.

_____ _____, Number VIII, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.7, March 1966, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number X, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.10, June 1966, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number XI, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.11, July 1966, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number XII, South African Observer, Vol. XI, No.12, August 1966, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number XIII, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.2, November 1966, pp.16-17.

_____ _____, Number XIV, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.3, December 1966, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number XV, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.4, January 1967, pp.12-14.

_____ _____, Number XVI, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.5, February 1967, pp.13-15.

_____ _____, Number XVII, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.6, March 1967, pp.13-14.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Public Opinion in England," Number XVIII, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.8, May 1967, pp.12-14.

_____, Number XIX, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.10. July 1967, pp.13-14.

_____, Number XX, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.11, August 1967, pp.12-13.

_____, Number XXI, South African Observer, Vol. XII, No.12, September 1967, pp.11-12.

_____, Number XXII, South African Observer, Vol. XIII, No.3, December 1967, pp.11-12.

_____, Number XXIII, South African Observer, Vol. XIII, No.4, January 1968, pp.13-14.

_____, Number XXIV, South African Observer, Vol. XIII, No.5, February 1968, pp.12-13.

_____, Number XXV, South African Observer, Vol. XIII, No.6, March 1968, pp.12-13.

_____, Number XXVI, South African Observer, Vol. XIII, No.7, May 1968, pp.13-14.

_____, Number XXVII, South African Observer, Vol. XIII, No.8, June 1968, pp.12-13.

_____ "The Question of Culture [Review of Primitive Polynesian Culture, by Raymond Firth (Routledge)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XVII, No.12 (July 11, 1940), pp.144-145.

_____ The Quest of Human Quality. How to rear leaders. London: Rider, 1952, pp.228.

_____ " 'R.H.C.' and Nietzsche," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.16, (February 19, 1914), pp.508-509.

_____ Recovery.The Quest of Regenerate national values, London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1935, pp.27.

_____ "The Re-Educationist [Review of The Neurosis of Man,by Trigant Burrow (Routledge and Kegan Paul ltd.]) " New English Weekly, Vol.XXXV, No.8 (June 2, 1949), p.95.

_____ "Reflections of my Patron Saint [a poem]," New Age, Vol.XXIII, No.3, (May 18, 1918), p.48.

_____ Religion for Infidels, London: Holborn, 1961.

_____ "Replies to Critics," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIV, No.25, (April 23,1914), pp.798-799.

_____ "Reply to A.E. Linton," Letter to the English Review, Vol. 45, August 1927, pp.250-251.

_____ "Re-Reading Nietzsche [Review of What Nietzsche Means, by Professor Morgan (Harvard University Press 1943)]" New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXVII, No.23 (September 20,1945), pp.169-170.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Review of Above all Liberties, by Alec Craig (G. Allen & Unwin)," English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.3., (May 7, 1942), p.27.

_____ "Review of Dynamic Defence, by Liddell Hart (Faber and Faber)," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XVIII, No.11, (January 2, 1941), p.121.

_____ "Review of England and the Farmer, A Symposium, collected and edited by H.J. Massingham (B.J. Batsford)," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XIX, No.26 (October 16, 1941), p.250.

_____ "Review of English Saga 1840-1940, by Arthur Bryant (Collins and Eyre and Spottiswoode)," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XVIII, No.23, (March 27, 1941), pp.265-266.

_____ "Review of Married Life in an African Tribe, by J. Schapera (Faber and Faber)," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XVII, No.21, (September 12, 1940), p.237.

_____ "Review of Nietzsche et les Theories Biologiques Contemporaines, by Claire Richter, (Mercure de France, Paris)," New Age, Vol.IX, No.20,(September 14, 1911), pp.473-474.

_____ "Review of Rodin, Immortal Peasant, by Anita Leslie, "New Pioneer, No.13, December 1939, p.314.

_____ "Review of Sex and Culture, by J.D. Unwin, M.C. Ph.D., Oxford University Press, 1934," New English Weekly, Vol. VII, No.3 (May 2, 1935), pp.52-53.

_____ "Review of The Defence of Democracy, by John Middleton Murray," New Pioneer, No.14, January 1940, pp.330-332.

_____ "Review of The Fascist Movement in Italian Life, by Pietro Gorgolini, Fisher Unwin, 1923," English Review, Vol.37, October 1923, pp.487-492.

_____ "Review of The Feminine Character, by Dr. Viola Klein, Kegan Paul, Trench Trubner & Co," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXIX, No.23, (September 19,1946), pp.188-189.

_____ "Review of The Hawkspur Experiment, by David Wills. George Allen & Unwin," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XX, No.9, (December 18, 1941), p.78.

_____ "Review of The Law of Civilisation and Decay, by Brooks Adams, New York: Alfred Knopf, 1943," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXV, No.23 (September 21, 1944), pp.177-178.

_____ "Review of The Life of Friedrich Nietzsche, by M. Halevy, translated by J.M. Hone, with an introduction by J.M. Kettle. (T. Fisher Unwin)," New Age, Vol.VIII, No.17, (February 23, 1911), pp.402-403.

_____ "Review of The Loom of Language, by Dr. Bodmer, George Allen & Unwin," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXIV, No.25, (April 6, 1944), pp.209-210.

_____ "Review of The Mastery of Life, by G.T. Wrench, Stephen Swift," New Age, Vol.XI, No.5 (May 30, 1912), pp.112-113.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Review of The New Psychology and Religious Experience, by Thomas Hywel Hughes M.A., D.Litt., D.D.; George Allen & Unwin," New English Weekly, Vol.V, No.15, (July 26, 1934), pp.356-358.

_____ "Review of The Problem of Sex Control, by William Brown; The Meaning of Sex, by M. Macauley; The Mysteries, Beauties and Perplexities of Sex, by A. Herbert Gray; Why Are Sex Relations Without Marriage Definitely Wrong?, by A. Herbert Gray," English Review, Vol. 63, August 1936, pp.147-153.

_____ "Review of The Romance of Reality, by Janet Chance, with preface by Olaf Stapledon, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1934," New English Weekly, Vol. VI, No. 12 (January 3, 1935), pp.258-259.

_____ "Review of The War Diary of a Square Peg, by Maximilian A. Mugge, George Routledge and Sons, 1920," New Age, Vol. XXVII, No.26 (October 28, 1920), pp.369-370.

_____ "Review of The Way of All Women, by M. Esther Harding, M.D., with introduction by C.G. Jung, New York: Longmans Green and Co.," New English Weekly , Vol.III, No.5, (May 18, 1933), pp.105-106.

_____ "Review of Woman, Theme and Variation, by A. Corbett-Smith, (Noel Douglas)," New English Weekly, Vol.1, No.7, (June 2, 1932), pp.155-157.

_____ "Review of Worry in Women, by A.B. White. (Victor Gollancz)," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.14, (July 23, 1942), pp.122-123.

_____ The Sanctity of Private Property, London: Heath Cranton, 1932, pp.48.

_____ "A Sane View of Art and Humanity, [Review of Why Exhibit Works of Art? by Dr. Ananda Coomaraswamy, (Luzac and Co.,)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXIV, No.6, (November 25, 1943), p.49.

_____ "The Science of Social Adjustment. [Review of Human Ecology., by Thomas Robertson, Glasgow: William McClellan]," New English Weekly, Vol.XXXIV, No.6 (November 18, 1948), pp.67-68.

_____ "A Scientist's Special Pleading [(Review of Man's Most Dangerous Myth: The Fallacy of Race, by Dr. Ashley Montagu, (2nd. edition; Columbia University Press)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXXVIII, No.13, (January 10, 1946), pp.126-127.

_____ The Secret of Laughter, London: Constable, 1932, pp.134.

_____ "Self-Righteousness and the Refugee Problem," New Pioneer, Vol.1, No.10, September 1939, pp.246-247.

_____ " Sex Antagonisms [Review of Theodore Besterman's Men Against Women: A Study of Sexual Relations, Methuen and Co.1934]," New English Weekly, Vol.VII, No.19, (September 19,1935), pp.375-376.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "A Sex Encyclopedia [Review of The Encyclpedia of Sex Practice, by Drs. A. Willy, L. Vander, and O. Fisher, partly edited by Norman Haire, Ch.M., M.B., (Torch Publishing Co,)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XIX, No.9 (June 19, 1941), pp.92-93.

_____ "Slavery, Life and Revolution," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XIX, No.1 (April 24, 1941), pp.7-8.

_____ "Social Credit Today and Tomorrow," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XVII, No.1, (April 25, 1940), pp.15-16.

_____ "Social Values," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.9 (June 18,1942), p.79.

_____ Some Reasons For Fear, London: English Mistery, 1936.p.16.

_____ "The Sonderbund Exhibition at Cologne," Number 1, New Age, Vol.XI, No.13 (July 25, 1912), p.307.

_____ _____, Number II, New Age, Vol.XI, No.15, (August 8, 1912), p.348.

_____ The Specious Origins of Liberalism; genesis of a delusion, London: Britons, 1967.

_____ "The Specious Origins of Liberalism," Number I, South African Observer, Vol.VI, No.11, March 1961, pp.8-9.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Vol.VI, No.12, April 1961, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.1, May 1961, pp. 9-10.

_____ _____, Number IV, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.2, June 1961, pp.9-10.

_____ _____, Number V, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.3, July 1961, pp.11-13.

_____ _____, Number VI, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.4, pp.9-10, August 1961.

_____ _____, Number VII, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.5, pp.10-12, September 1961.

_____ _____, Number VIII, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.6, October 1961, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number IX, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.7, December 1961, pp.11-13.

_____ _____, Number X, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.8, January 1962, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number XI, South African Observer, Vol. VII, No.9, February 1962, pp.9-11.

_____ _____, Number XII, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.10, March 1962, pp.11-12.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "The Specious Origins of Liberalism," Number XIII, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.11, April 1962, pp.13-14.

_____ _____, Number XIV, South African Observer, Vol.VII, No.12, May 1962, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number XV, South African Observer, Vol.VIII, No.1, June 1962, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number XVI, South African Observer, Vol.VIII, No.2, July 1962, pp.10-11.

_____ _____, Number XVII, South African Observer, Vol.VIII, No.3, October 1962, pp.11-12.

_____ _____, Number XVIII, South African Observer, Vol.VIII, No.4, November 1962, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number XIX, South African Observer, Vol.VIII, No.5, December 1962, pp.10-12.

_____ _____, Number XX, South African Observer, Vol.VIII, No.6, January 1963, pp.12-14.

_____ "A Study in Human Responsibility [Review of Infant and Maternal Mortality in Relation to Size of Family and Rapidity of Breeding, by C.M. Burns, with preface by Lord Eustace Percy, (from the Department of Physiology, King's College, University of Durham),]" New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXIII, No.13 (July 15, 1943), pp.113-114.

_____ "Subsidised Sloth and Subnormality in the Socialist State," South African Observer, Vol.V, No.5, December 1959, pp.12-13.

_____ The Taming of Don Juan, London: Hutchinson, [1924], pp.312.

_____ "Thorstein Veblen [Review of Thorstein Veblen and this America, by Joseph Dorfman, New York: Viking Press, 1940]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXVII, No.6 (May 1945), pp.61-62.

_____ "Thoughts on War [Review of Why Don't We Learn From History? (P.E.N. Books, G. Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXV, No.15, (July 27, 1944), p.130.

_____ "Three Accounts of the English [Review of English Enigma by Dorothy Jane Ward (Arthur Barker Ltd.), The Secret of the English, by Ranjee Shahani (Adam & Charles Black)" New English Weekly, Vol.XXXIV, No.23, (March 17,1949), pp.277-278.

_____ Too Old for Dolls. A novel London: Hutchinson, [1920], pp.287.

_____ "Transform Society's Values," in Chaim Newman, ed., Gentile and Jew; a symposium on the future of the Jewish people, with a foreword by the Rt. Hon. Lord Strabolgi, London: Alliance Press, 1945, pp.165-185.

_____ "Translator's Introduction," to Friedrich Nietzsche, Ecce Homo, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Vol.XVII of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911, pp.vii-xiv.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Case of Wagner, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Vol. VII of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London; T.N. Foulis, 1911, pp. ix-xiv.

_____ "Translator's Preface," to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Twilight of the Idols, The Antichrist, Eternal Recurrence, Notes to Zarathustra, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Vol.XVI of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London; T.N. Foulis, 1911, pp.vii-xvii.

_____ "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Will to Power, Books I and II, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Vol.XIV of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909, pp.vi-xiv.

_____ "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, The Will to Power, Books III and IV, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Vol.XV of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche,edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1910, pp.vi-xix.

_____ "Translator's Preface" to Friedrich Nietzsche, Thoughts out of Season, Part 1, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, Vol. IV of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909, pp.xxix-xxxviiii

_____ The Truth about Childbirth. Lay Light on maternal morbidity and mortality. London; Kegan Paul, 1937, pp.xvi-294.

_____ "The United States and the Peace [Review of Professor N. Peffer's America's Place in the World, (Viking Press, New York)]" New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXIX, No.14, (July 18, 1946, pp.136-137.

_____ "Values," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XXI, No.22 (September 17, 1942), pp.179-180.

_____ _____, Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.25, (October 8, 1942), p.208.

_____ _____, Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.1 (October 22, 1942), p.8.

_____ "Van Gogh and his Art," introductory essay to Vincent Van Gogh, The Letters of a Post-Impressionist, translated by Anthony Mario Ludovici, London: Constable, 1912.

_____ Violence, Sacrifice and War, London: St. James's Kin of the English Mistery, 1933 pp.31.

_____ "Visitors by Night. [a poem]" New Age, Vol.XXV, No.26, (October 23, 1919), p.432.

_____ "War Reduced to Essentials [Review of the Logic of War, by Squadron Leader Murray Harris (George Allen & Unwin)]" New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXVI, No.3 (November 2, 1944), p.26.

_____ "Welcome Light on Proust. [Review of Introduction to Proust, by Derrick Leon, (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.)]" New English Weekly & New Age, Vol. XVIII, No.17 (February 13, 1941), pp.195-196.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "Western Europe's Social History - In One Word," South African Observer, Vol.VIII, No.12, July 1963, pp.13-14.

_____ What Woman Wishes, London: Hutchinson, [1921] pp.288.

_____ Who is to be Master of the World? An introduction to the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche, with introduction by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909, p.xii.199.

_____ "Wine and Spirits, [Review of Wine and Spirits, by Andre L. Simon, (Duckworth),]" New Age, Vol.XXV, No.2 (May 13, 1920), p.24.

_____ Woman. A vindication. London: Constable, 1923, p.xvi 378.

_____ Woman's Contribution to Britain's National Decline," Number 1, South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.10, February, 1956, pp.9-10.

_____ _____, Number II, South African Observer, Vol.1, No.11, March 1956, pp.11-13.

_____ _____, Number III, South African Observer, Vol. 1, No.12, April 1956, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number IV, South African Observer, Vol. II, No.1, May 1956, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number V, South African Observer, Vol.II, No.2, June 1956, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number VI, South African Observer, Vol.II, No.3, July 1956, pp.12-13.

_____ _____, Number VII, South African Observer, Vol.II, No.4, August 1946, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number VIII, South African Observer, Vol.II, No.5, September 1956, pp.14-15.

_____ _____, Number IX, South African Observer, Vol.II, No.6, October 1956, pp12-13.

_____ _____, Number X, South African Observer, Vol.II, No.7, November 1956, pp.13-14.

_____ "Woman's Encroachment on Man's Domain," Current History, Vol.27, (October 1927), pp.21-25.

_____ "Women and World Planning [Review of Dr. Maude Royden's Women's Partnership in the New World (Allen & Unwin)]," New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.6 (May 28, 1942), pp.52-53.

_____ "Work in Western Civilisation," Hibbert Journal, Vol.55, (October 1956), pp.30-34.

_____ "The Worldly Philosophy of the English Working Class," Number 1, New Pioneer, Vol.1, No.8, July 1939, pp.200-201.

LUDOVICI, Anthony Mario, "The Worldly Philosophy of the English Working Class," Number II, New Pioneer, Vol.1, No.9, August 1939, pp.222,228.

_____ "Mr. Wyndham Lewis's Methods," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIV, No.11 (January 15, 1914), p.351.

_____ "Young, Woodley" English Review, Vol.46, May 1928, pp. 555-560.

ANTHONY MARIO LUDOVICI: SECONDARY SOURCES

BALFOUR, Lady Frances, "The Anti-Feminist Folly," English Review, Vol.37, December 1923, pp.741-744.

BARKER, Rodney, Political Ideas in Modern Britain, London: Methuen, 1978.

CLUTTON-BROCK, A. "An Open Reply to Mr. Ludovici," New Age, Vol. XXVI, No.15 (February 12,1920), p.239.

COOK, E. Wake, "Nietzsche and Art," Letter to New Age, Vol.IX, No.18, (August 31, 1911), p.431.

_____, _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol.IX, No.16 (August 17, 1911), p.382.

COOMARASWAMY, Ananda, "The Art of India," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.22, (April 2, 1914), pp.702-703.

COX, R. "Aristocracy and Mr. Ludovici," Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIV, No.17, (February 26, 1914), p.543.

_____, _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.19 (March 12, 1914), pp.604-605.

_____, _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.25 (April 23, 1914), pp.796-797.

DIXON, T.S., "Aristocracy and Democracy," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.25 (April 23, 1914), pp.797-798.

FREEDMAN, Estelle B., "The New Woman: Changing Views of Women in the 1920s," Journal of American History, Vol.61, No.2 (September 1974), pp.372-393.

GAYRE, R. "The late A.M. Ludovici's Bequest to the University of Edinburgh," Mankind Quarterly, Vol.XIII, No.4, pp.191-194.

GREEN, John, "Youth Speaks Out II - A Political Writer. [Anthony Mario Ludovici]," National Review, Vol. 103, August 1934, pp.220-227.

HARRISON, Austen, "The New Anti-Feminism," English Review, Vol.38, January 1924, pp.80-87.

_____ "Woman Understood [Review of Woman. A Vindication by A.M. Ludovici]," English Review, Vol.37, September 1923, pp.339-344.

HIMES, Norman E. "In-and-outbreeding," Letter to the Eugenics Review Vol.XXVI, No.1, (April 1934), pp.87-89.

HULME, T.E. "Mr. Epstein and the Critics," New Age, Vol.XIV, No.8, (December 25, 1913), pp.251-253.

JEVONS, Henry, "Art Criticism," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIII, No.11, (July 10, 1913), p.311.

_____, _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol. XIII, No.14, (July 31, 1913), p.406.

KERR, R.B. "Anthony M. Ludovici: The Prophet of Anti-Feminism," in his Our Prophets, Studies of Living Writers , Croydon: R.B. Kerr, 1932, pp.84-99.

KHANOLBAR, V.R., and SPACKMAN, W.C., and SOKHEY, S.S., "The Importance to Women of a Youthful Marriage [commentary on Anthony Mario Ludovici's article of the same name]," Marriage Hygiene, Vol.1, No.4 (May, 1935), pp.404-407.

LEWIS, Wyndham, "Epstein and his Critics, or Nietzsche and his Friends," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.10 (January 8, 1914), p.319.

LINTON, A.E. "Anti-Feminism," Letter to the English Review, Vol.XLV, July 1927, pp.2-4.

LUDOVICI, Albert Jnr. An Artist's Life in London and Paris, 1870-1925 London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1926.

_____ "A Pantomime Rehearsal," Theatre, Vol. 26, February 1, 1891, pp.72-75.

LUDOVICI, John, "Interview with the author," March 19, 1980, (conducted at Anthony Mario Ludovici's nephew's residence: 1 Hans Place, London SW1).

MAIRET, Philip, A.R. Orage: A Memoir, London:J.M. Dent, 1936.

MARTINE, Wallace, The 'New Age' Under Orage, Manchester University Press, 1967.

MASSINGHAM, H.J. "Values," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.26, (October 15, 1942), p.219.

_____ "Values and Nature," Letter to the New English Weekly & New Age, Vol.XXI, No.23, (September 24, 1942), p.187.

"NIETZSCHE'S Criticism of Wagner [Review of G.F. Nietzsche The Case Against Wagner and Nietzsche contra Wagner, translated by A.M. Ludovici, (T.N. Foulis)]" Nation (July 9, 1910), pp.533-534.

PEENTY, Arthur J. "Mr. Romney Green's Furniture," Letter to New Age, Vol.XIV, No.25, (April 23, 1914), p.767.

_____, _____, Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.26 (April 30, 1914), p.287.

PITT-RIVERS, George, "The Sick Values of a Sick Age. A Reply to Anthony M. Ludovici (On Conscience and Fanaticism, reviewed October 9, 1919)," New Age, Vol.XXVI, No.2 (November 13, 1919), pp.25-27.

POMERAI, Ralph de, Marriage, Past, Present and Future: An Outline of the History and Development of Human Sexual Relationships. London: Constable, 1930.

"Review of Catherine Doyle: the romance of a thrice-married lady, by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Hutchinson & Co. 1919 ," The Times Literary Supplement, October 30, 1919, p.613(c).

"Review of Lysistrata; or, woman's future and future woman, by A.M. Ludovici, (Kegan Paul), " New Age, Vol.XXXVII, No.2, (May 14, 1925), pp.21-22.

"Review of Man's Descent from the Gods; or, the complete case against prohibition, by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: William Heinemann, 1921)," The Times Literary Supplement, March 24, 1921, p.199 (b).

"Review of Mansel Fellowes, by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Grant Richards, 1918)," The Times Literary Supplement, November 7, 1918, p.541 (b).

"Review of 'Raw Virginity'," in Anthony Mario Ludovici, Too Old for Dolls, London: Hutchinson, 1920 p 296.

"Review of The False Assumptions of 'Democracy,' by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Heath Cranton, 1921 ," The Times Literary Supplement, October 13, 1921, p.667 (b).

"Review of The Secret of Laughter (Constable, 1932), by Anthony Mario Ludovici," Saturday Review, Vol.154, No.4020, (November 12, 1932), p.505.

"Review of Too Old for Dolls, A novel, by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Hutchinson 1928)," The Times Literary Supplement November 25, 1920, p.781 (b).

"Review of What Woman Wishes, by Anthony Mario Ludovici, (London: Hutchinson, 1921)," The Times Literary Supplement, September 22, 1921, p.641(c).

R.H.C. "Nietzsche, Culture and Plutocracy," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XIV, No.14 (February 5, 1914), p.446.

RUSSELL, Dora Winifred Countess, Hypatia; or Woman and Knowledge, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1925.

SELVER, Paul, Orage and the 'New Age' Circle. Reminiscences and Reflections, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1959.

SICKERT, Richard, "Mr. Albert Ludovici. [An Obituary]" Letter to The Times, March 26, 1932, p.15.

SMITH, Hamilton T. "An Open Letter to Mr. Ludovici," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XII, No.15., (February 13,1913), pp.363-364.

_____, "The Arts and Crafts," Letter to the New Age, Vol.XII, No.17, (February 27, 1913), p.414.

ENGLISH MISTERY, An Introduction to the English Mistery, n.d. [July 1944].

_____ Book of Ceremonial, London, 1938.

_____ Chancellor's Index of Literature. Issued February 1, 1936.

_____ Chancellor's Index of Literature. Issued February 20, 1936.

_____ The Constitution. Order of 1930. No.1.

_____ The Constitution. Order of 1930. No.1, New Edition.

_____ A Description of the English Mistery, 1938.

_____ The English Mistery, Leaflet of 1934, No.1.

_____ The English Mistery, Leaflet of 1934, No.2.

_____ The English Mistery, Leaflet of 1935, No.1.

_____ Finance, Order of 1930. No.6.

_____ Functions and Composition of the Syndicate, Order of 1930, No.2.

_____ Functions and Composition of the Syndicate, Order of 1930,

_____ Membership of the English Mistery, Order of 1930, No.3.

_____ Notes on the Orders, 1933.

_____ Objects. Order of 1930. No.7.

_____ Orders of 1932, issued July 1, 1932.

_____ Orders of 1933, issued January 1, 1933.

_____ Orders of 1931, Numbers 1 to 6, n.d.

_____ Revised Orders of 1931, Numbers 1 to 8, n.d. [May 1931].

_____ Revised Orders of 1931. Numbers 1 to 8. n.d. [September 1931].

_____ Rules of Conduct for Companions, Order of 1930, No.5.

_____ Rules of Procedure, for all audiences of the syndicate and meetings of Kin.Order of 1930. No.4.

IRVINE, Bryant, "Back to Nobility," National Review, Vol. 100, January 1933.

_____ "Is the House of Lords Noble?," National Review, Vol.101, July, 1933.

ORDER OF THE RED ROSE, [pseud. William John Sanderson. (According to British Museum Catalogue. Vol.65 column 3562, 1961)]. An English War Memorial, Leaflet No.13, n.d. August, 1916 .

ORDER OF THE RED ROSE, [pseud. William John Sanderson] Rosemary for Rememberance, Pamphlet No. 20, June 1919.

_____ Before and After, Pamphlet No.1. 1913.

_____ The Body Without a Soul, Pamphlet No.5, 1914.

_____ Burn your Bonds, Leaflet No.9, n.d. [August 1916].

_____ Burn your Bonds, Leaflet No.14, n.d. [September 1916].

_____ Burn your Bonds, Leaflet No.17 n.d. [December 1917].

_____ But if not, Pamphlet No.2, 1913.

_____ The Case of the Amble Miners, Pamphlet No.3, 1916.

_____ Drones in the Hire, Pamphlet No.10, 1916.

_____ The Fight Against Degradation, Leaflet No.2, [June 1914].

_____ Forgive us our Debts, Leaflet No.11, n.d. [August 1916].

_____ The Industrial Crisis and its effect upon the Acomb Miners, Pamphlet No. 15, 1921.

_____ Jesus College Rowing Notes, Pamphlet No.14, 1919.

_____ Like a Thief in the Night, Pamphlet No.12, 1918.

_____ Memorandum, Leaflet No.18 n.d. [December 1919].

_____ The National Debt, Leaflet No.10, n.d. [August 1916].

_____ The Needle's Eye, Leaflet No.8, 1916.

_____ Noblesse Oblige and National Service, Second Edition, 1913.

_____ Order of the Red Rose,n.d. [February 1922].

_____ Order of the Red Rose, Leaflet No.21, n.d. [February 1922].

_____ Order of the Red Rose, Leaflet No.22, n.d. [December 1923].

_____ Poor Prisoners, Pamphlet No.6, 1914.

_____ Private Property, An Essay on the Political Significance of the Institution, Pamphlet No.11. 1917.

_____ A Red Rose, Pamphlet No.9, 1916.

_____ The Red Rose, Leaflet No.19 n.d. [February 1919].

_____ Red Rose Report and Balance Sheet, July 1914, Leaflet No.3. n.d.

_____ Red Rose Report and Balance Sheet, June 1915, Leaflet No.6, n.d.

_____ Red Rose Report and Balance Sheet, June 1916, Leaflet No.8. n.d.

ORDER OF THE RED ROSE, [pseud. William John Sanderson] Rosemary for Remèmberance, Pamphlet No.16, 1923.

_____ The Rule of the Rose, Pamphlet No.13, 1919.

_____ The Three Shift System, Leaflet No.1, n.d.

_____ To the Immortal Memory of Arthur Curtis, n.d. [September 1916].

_____ Voluntary Insurance, Pamphlet No.7, 1914.

_____ The Whole Hog! The Northumberland Miners' War Memorial, Leaflet No.12, n.d. [August 1916].

SANDERSON, William John, "The Duty of Military Proficiency," Fascist, London: Imperial Fascist League, September 7, 1929, pp.3-4.

_____ The Industrial Crisis, London: Siegle, Hall and Co., 1914.

_____ "The Significance of the Royal Chair," Freemason, November 8, 1930.

_____ "The Spirit of Fascism," Fascist, London: Imperial Fascist League, August 6, 1929, p.1.

_____ Statecraft. A Treatise on the Concerns of our Sovereign Lord the King. 4th ed. Wentworth: Roger Gresham Cooke, Recorder of the English Mistery, 1941.

_____ That Which was Lost. A Treatise on Freemasonary and the English Mistery, London: Constable, 1930.

WALLOP, Gerald Vernon, Viscount Lymington, A Knot of Roots, London: Geoffrey Bles, 1965.

_____ Alternative to Death, London: Faber and Faber, 1943.

_____ Famine in England, London: H.F. & G. Witherby, 1938.

_____ Horn, Hoof and Corn, The Future of British Agriculture, London: Faber & Faber, 1932.

_____ Ich Dien, The Tory Path, London: Constable, 1931.

_____ Should Britain Fight? The British Position and some facts on the Sudeten Problem, London: British Council Against European Commitments, 1938.

THE MAIN CONTEMPORARY NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS CONSULTED

ACTION, London: New Movement. Vol. 1, nos. 1-13: 8 October-31 December 1931.

ACTION, London: British Union of Fascists, No.1-222: 21 February 1936 - 6 June 1940.

BLACKSHIRT, The, London: British Union of Fascists, Nos.1-37,58-261: February 1933 - 5/11 January, 1 June 1934 - May 1939. Not published between 11 January - 1 June 1934, incorporated by Fascist Week, [continued as British Union News].

BRITISH FACISM, London: British Fascists, No.1-23; Special summer propoganda no. ; Extra autumn issue; [New Series] no [1] - 4. June 1930 - February 1933; (June, October 1933): March - June 1934.

BRITISH LION, The, London: British Fascists. No. [1] -32: June 1926 - [November 1929]. [Continued as British Fascism].

BRITISH UNION NEWS, London; British Union of Fascists. No.262, June 1939.

BRITISH UNION QUARTERLY, London: British Union of Fascists, Vol.I, No.1, No.2: January - April, April - July, 1937.

FASCIST, The, London: Imperial Fascist League, No. 1-124: March 1929 - September 1939.

FASCIST BULLETIN, The, London; British Fascists. Vol.2, No.1-43: 13 June 1925 - 12 June 1926. [Continued as the British Lion].

FASCIST QUARTERLY, The, London: British Union of Fascists. Vol.I, no.1 - Vol.2. no.4: January 1935-October 1936. [Continued as the British Union Quarterly .]

FASCIST WEEK, The, (Incorporated with Blackshirt) London: British Union of Fascists. No.1-29: 10 November 1933 -25 May 1934.

NEW AGE, The. A WEEKLY RECORD OF CHRISTIAN CULTURE, SOCIAL SERVICE AND LITERARY LIFE, London. Vol.XIII No.17 - vol.XXXVII, No.3: 23 February 1911 - 21 May 1925.

NEW ENGLISH WEEKLY, The. A REVIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, LITERATURE AND THE ARTS, London: Vol.1, no.1 - vol.14, no.11; 21 April 1932-22 December 1938. [Continued as the New English Weekly & New Age, etc.]

NEW ENGLISH WEEKLY AND THE NEW AGE, The,etc. London: Vol.14, no.12/13 - vol.31, no. : 5 January 1939 - 10 April 1947. [Changed name to New English Weekly, etc.]

NEW ENGLISH WEEKLY, The, etc. London. Vol.31. no. vol.55, no.24: 17 April 1947 - 22 September 1949.

NEW PIONEER, The, London. No.1-14: December 1938 - January 1940.

QUARTERLY GAZETTE OF THE ENGLISH ARRAY, The,London: English Array, No.1-6: September 1937 - January 1939.

RECORDER"S QUARTERLY GUIDE, The, London: English Mistery, No.1-144: September 1936-March 1947.

SOUTH AFRICAN OBSERVER, The, Stellenbosch, Vol.1, No.1 - Vol.XV no.6: May 1955 - May 1970.

FASCISM: PRIMARY SOURCES

ALLEN, W.E.D, [pseud. James Drennan]. B.U.F.: Oswald Mosley and British Fascism, London: John Murray, 1934.

ANNUNZIO, Gabriele d', The Flame of Life, Boston: L.C. Page, 1900.

BARNES, J.S., The Universal Aspects of Fascism, London: William and Norgate, 1929.

BERNHARDI, Friedrich Adam Julius von., How Germany Makes War, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914).

BON, Gustave le., The Crowd; A Study of the Popular Mind, London: London: Unwin, 1922.

BRITISH UNION OF FASCISTS, A.R.P. Be Prepared! n.d. [April 1939].

_____, Big Boy Bevin, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Blackshirts Back Mosley because Mosley backs Britain, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Britain and Jewry, 2nd impression, n.d. [April 1939].

_____, British Union and the Transport Workers, n. d. [November 1937].

_____, 'British Union' for British Race, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, The British Union stands for Trade Unionism, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Dockers! Nothing has been done, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, The Empire and the British Union, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Is Lancashire Doomed? n.d. [April 1939].

_____, The Marching Song, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Membership Form, November 7, 1932.

_____, The Miners' Only Hope, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Pharmacy in British Union, n.d. [April 1939].

_____, The Simple Jewish Worker, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Support Fascism and Save the Fisherman, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, 10 Points of Fascism, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, To Every Britain, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, Trade, Unionists you are the Victims, n.d. [November 1937].

_____, What Jews did in the War, n.d. [November 1937].

BRUCK, Moeller van den. Germany's Third Empire, translated by A. Lorimer, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1934.

CARTHILL, A. The Legacy of Liberalism, London: Phillip Allen, 1924.

_____ The Lost Dominion, London: William Blackward, 1924.

CELINE, Louis Ferdinand, Journey to the End of the Night, London: Chatto and Windus, 1934.

CHAMBERLAIN, Houston Stewart, The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century, London: John Lane, 1911, 2 volumes.

CHAMBERS-HUNTER, W.K.A.J., British Union and Social Credit, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

CHATER, Don. Jews and Reds cause the trouble, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. November 1937 .

CHESTERTON, Arthur Keith, Apotheosis of the Jew, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [November 1937].

CLARKE, E.G., The British Union and the Jews, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [November 1937].

COLAN, [pseud]. 'Then Atheistic Communism will Cease', London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [November 1937].

FULLER, J.F.C., The Dragon's Teeth, London: Constable, 1932.

_____ Empire, Unity and Defence, Bristol: J.W. Arrowsmith, 1934.

_____ The First of the League Wars, London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1936.

_____ March to Sanity, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

_____ Memoirs of an Unconventional Soldier, London: Iver Nicholson and Watson, 1936.

_____ The Secret Wisdom of Qabalah, A Study in Jewish Mystical Thought, London: Rider, n.d.

_____ Toward Armageddon, London: Lovat Dickson, 1937.

GENTILE, Giovanni, The Genesis and Structure of Society, translated by H.S. Harris, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960.

_____ "The Philosophic Basis of Fascism," Foreign Affairs, Vol. 6, No.2 (January 1928), pp.290-305.

GINI, Corrado, "The Scientific Basis of Fascism," Political Science Quarterly, Vol.42, No.1, (1927), pp.99-115.

GOBINEAU, Arthur, de, Selected Political Writings, edited and introduced by M.D. Biddiss, London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.

GOERING, Herman, Germany Reborn, London: Elkin Matthews and Marrot Ltd., 1934.

GORDON-CANNING, R, The Holy Land, Arab or Jew? British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

GORDON-CANNING, R. The Inward Strength of a National Socialist, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

_____, Mind Britain's Business, 2nd edition, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

GOULDING, Michael, Labour's Peace Policy, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

GUNTHER, Hans F.K., The Racial Elements of European History, London: Methuen, 1927.

HEYWARD, Peter, Menace of the Chain Stores, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

HILL, F.D., 'Gainst Trust and Monopoly, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [November 1937].

HITLER, Adolf, Hitler's Table Talk, edited by H.R. Trevor-Roper, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1953.

_____. Mein Kampf, translated by James Murphy, London: Hurst and Blackett, 1942.

_____ The Speeches of Adolf Hitler, April 1922-August 1939, edited by Norman H. Baynes, Oxford University Press, 1942, 2 volumes.

IMPERIAL FASCIST LEAGUE, Agriculture comes first, n.d. [February 1935].

_____ Destroy British Imperialism..... n.d. [December 1934].

_____ The Era of World Ruin! (The Era of Democracy), n.d. [March 1934].

_____ Fabian Political Control, n.d. [February 1935].

_____ Freemasonry, 1935.

_____ The Growing Menace of Freemasonry, n.d. [May 1935].

_____ The Hidden Hand Revealed in Black and White, n.d. [December 1934].

_____ The Jew: Past and Present, n.d. [December 1934].

_____ Jewish Press Control. The London Newspapers, 2nd edition, Revised September 1937.

_____ Let us all go mad! n.d. [May 1939].

_____ The Mass Madness of September 1938, and it s Jewish Cause, n.d. [May 1939].

_____ Mightier Yet! Back to Reality, June 1935.

_____ Money no Mystery, Mastery by Monopoly, n.d. [December 1934].

_____ The New Jerusalem, Our Contemplated Kosher Government, n.d. [September 1935].

_____ Our Jewish Aristocracy, January 1936.

_____ P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning), n.d. [July 1934].

IMPERIAL FASCIST LEAGUE, The Plan of the Jew, n.d. [March 1934].

_____ Release Leese, n.d.

_____ To a Gentile Jester (of the Variety Profession), n.d. [March 1934].

_____ A Tragic Symphony. No. Englishman Need Apply, n.d. [March 1934].

JENKS, Jorian, The Land and the People, 4th impression, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

JERROLD, Douglas, Georgian Adventure, London: Collins, 1937.

JOYCE, William, National Socialism New, London: National Socialist League, 1937.

KENYON, H.W., Towards Freedom. Trade Unionism: Its History and Future, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939]

KEYSERLING, Herman, Europe, London: Jonathan Cape, 1929.

_____ The World in the Making, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1927.

LANE, Barbara Miller, and RUPP, J., eds. Nazi Ideology before 1933: A Documentation, Manchester University Press, 1978.

LANG, S., and SCHENK, E., eds. Memoirs of Alfred Rosenberg, Chicago and New York: Ziff-Davis, 1949.

LA ROCQUE, A.M.J.F. de, The Fiery Cross. The Call to Public Service in France, London: Lovat Dickson, 1936.

LEESE, Arnold Spencer, Bolshevism is Jewish, n.p: Imperial Fascist League, n.d. [March 1934].

_____ Devilry in the Holy Land, n.p: Imperial Fascist League, n.d. [May 1939].

_____ Disraeli the Destroyer, n.p: Imperial Fascist League, n.d. [March 1934].

_____ My Irrelevant Defence: Meditations Inside Gaol and Out on Jewish Ritual Murder, London: Imperial Fascist League, 1938.

LUDENDORFF, Erich Friedrich Wilhelm, The Nation at War, London: London: Hutchinson, 1936.

LUDWIG, Emil, Talks with Mussolini, London: (George Allen & Unwin, 1932).

LYTTLETON, Adrian, ed. Italian Fascisms: From Pareto to Gentile, London: Jonathan Cape, 1973.

MALAPARTE, Curzio, Coup D'Etat: The Technique of Revolution, New York: E.P.Dutton, 1932.

MAURRAS, Charles, "Prologue to an essay on criticism," Criterion, Vol.VII, No.3, March 1928, pp.204-218.

_____, Criterion, Vol.VII, No.1, January 1928, pp.5-15.

MICHELS, Robert, First Lectures on Political Sociology, New York: Arno Press, 1974.

_____ Political Parties, Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press 1958.

MOSCA, Gaetano, The Ruling Class, edited by A. Livingstone, New York and London: McGraw-Hill, 1939.

MOSLEY, Oswald, Europe: Faith and Plan, London: Euphorion, 1958.

_____ Fascism Explained, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [February 1933].

_____ Fascism: 100 Questions Asked and Answered, London: British Union of Fascists, 1936.

_____ Fascism in Britain, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [November 1937].

_____ The Greater Britain, 2nd impression, London: British Unione of Fascists, 1932.

.... My Answer, Second Edition, Ramsbury, Wiltshire: Mosley Publications, 1946.

_____ My Life, London: Nelson, 1968.

_____ A National Policy, London: Macmillan, 1931.

_____ Taxation and the People, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

_____ Tomorrow We Live, Sixth edition, London: Greater Britain, 1939.

_____ "Tomorrow We Live," 8th edition, in his My Answer, Second Edition, Ramsbury, Wiltshire: Mosley Publications, 1946.

MUSSOLINI, Benito, My Autobiography, Westport, Conneticut: Greenwood Press, 1970.

NAUMANN, Friedrich, Central Europe, London: P.S. King, 1916.

OAKESHOTT, Michael, ed. The Social and Political Doctrines of Contemporary Europe, Cambridge University Press, 1939.

PALMIERI, Mario, The Philosophy of Fascism, New York: Fortuny's, 1936.

PRIMO DE RIVERA, Jose Antonio, Selected Writings, edited and introduced by Hugh Thomas, London: Jonathan Cape, 1972.

QUISLING, Vidkun, Russia and Oursèlves, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1931.

RAMSAY, A.H.M., The Nameless War, 3rd edition, London: Britons, 1954.

RAVEN, Alexander, [pseud. for Alexander Raven Thompson?]. Civilisation as Divine Superman, London: William and Norgate, 1932.

ROSENBERG, Alfred, Selected Writings, edited and introduced by Robert Pois, London: Jonathan Cape, 1970.

SCHMITT, Carl, The Necessity of Politics, with introduction by Christopher Dawson, London: Sheel and Ward, 1931.

SILLANI, T, ed., What is Fascism and Why? London: Ernest Benn, 1931.

SOMBART, Werner, Socialism and the Social Movement, London: J.M. Dent, 1909.

_____ A New Social Philosophy, New York: Greenwood, 1969.

SOREL, Georges, The Illusion of Progress, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1969.

_____ Reflections on Violence, introduced by E.A. Shils, translated by T.E. Hulme and J. Roth, London: Collier-Macmillan, 1972.

SPENGLER, Oswald, The Decline of the West, New York: Knopf. 2 volumes.

_____ The Hour of Decision, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1934, reissued 1963.

_____ Man and Technics, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1932.

_____ Selected Essays, translated and introduced by D.O. White, Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1967.

_____ Spengler's Letters, 1913-1936, translated by A. Helps, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1966.

STAPEL, Wilhelm," The Coming Conservative Revolution," translated by Brian Lunn, English Review, Vol. 53, June 1935.

STIRNER, Max, The Ego and His Own, edited and introduced by J. Carroll, London: Jonathan Cape, 1971.

STRASSER, Otto, Germany Tomorrow, London: Jonathan Cape, 1940.

_____ History in my time, London: Jonathan Cape, 1941.

_____ Hitler and I, London: Jonathan Cape, 1940.

THOMPSON, Alexander Raven, Big Fish and Little Fish, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [November 1937].

_____ The Coming Corporate State, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

_____ Our Financial Masters, London: British Union of Fascists, n.d. [April 1939].

WAGNER, Richard Wilhelm, Richard Wagner's Prose Works, Vol.IV, translated by W.E. Ellam, London: Kegan Paul, French, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1912.

YEATS-BROWN, F. Bengal Lancer, London: Victor Gollancz, 1932.

FASCISM: SECONDARY SOURCES

ADAMS, John Clarke, "Some antecedents of the theory of the corporative system," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.3, No.2, (1942), pp.182-189.

ALIOTTA, Antonio, The Idealistic Reaction Against Science, London: Macmillan 1914.

ALLARDYCE, G., ed., The Place of Fascism in European History, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

_____ "The Political Transition of Jacques Doriot," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1, 1966, pp.56-75.

ANCELET-HUSTACHE, Meister Eckhart, New York, 1957.

ANDERSON, Eugene N., "German Romanticism as an Ideology of Cultural Crisis," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.II, Number 3, 1942, pp.301-317.

ARENDT, Hannah, The Human Condition, New York: Doubleday, 1959.

ARONSFIELD, C.C. "The Britons Publishing Society," Wiener Library Bulletin, Vol.XX, No.3, New Series, No.4, (Summer 1966,) pp.31-37.

ASCHER, Abraham, and LEWY, Guenter, "National Bolsevism in Weimer Germany - Alliance of Political Extremes Against Democracy," Social Research, Vol.23, No.4, (Winter 1956), pp.450-481.

BALL, M. Margaret, "The Leadership Principle in National Socialism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, No.1, (1942), pp.74-93.

BARBU, Z., Democracy and Dictatorship, New York: Grove Press, 1956.

BARZUN, Jacques, Race: A Study in Superstition, New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

_____ "Romantic Historiography as a Political Force in France," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, Number 3, (1942), pp.330-338.

BEETHAM, David, "From Socialism to Fascism. The Relation between Theory and Practice in the work of Robert Michels. From Marxist Revolutionary to Political Sociologist," Political Studies, Vol.XXV, No.1 (March 1977), pp.3-24.

_____ From Socialism to Fascism, the Relation between Theory and Practice in the work of Robert Michels. The Fascist Ideologue," Political Studies, Vol. XXV, No.2 (June 1977), pp.161-181.

_____ "Reply to Bennett," Political Studies, Vol.XXVI, No.4, (December 1978), pp.488-491.

BELL, Daniel, ed., The Radical Right, New York: Anchor, 1964.

BENDA, Julian, The Betrayal of the Intellectuals, Boston: Beacon Press, 1955.

BENEWICK, Robert, The Fascist Movement in Britain, London: Penguin, 1972.

_____ "Interpretations of British Fascism," Political Studies, Vol.24, No.3 (1976), pp.320-324.

BENNETT, E.K. Stefan George, Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1954.

BENNETT, R.J. "The Elite Theory as Fascist Ideology - A Reply to Beetham's Critique of Robert Michels," Political Studies, Vol.XXVI, No.4, (December 1978), pp.474-489.

BERGONZI, Bernard, "Roy Campbell: Outsider on the Right," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.2, No.2 (1967), pp.133-147.

BIDDIS, Michael D, Father of Racist Ideology: The political and social thought of Count Gobineau, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1970.

_____ "Gobineau and the origins of European Racism," Race: Journal of the Institute of Race Relations, Vol.7, No.3, pp.255-270.

_____ "The Intellectualisation of Prejudice: Race and Political Theory," Alta, Winter 1967-1968.

_____ "Myths of Blood," Patterns of Prejudice, Vol.9, No.5 (1975).

_____ "Racial Ideas and the Politics of Prejudice, 1850-1914," Historical Journal, Vol.XIV, No.3 (1972), pp.570-582.

_____ "Racialist Philosophies," Wiener Library Bulletin, Vol.XX, No.3, New Series, No.4 (1966), pp.31-37.

BIERER, Dora, "Renan and his Interpreters: A Study in French Intellectual Warfare," Journal of Modern History, Vol.25, No.4, (December 1953), pp.375-390.

BISCHOFF, R.F. Nazi Conquest through German Culture, Harvard University Press, 1942.

BLOOM, Solomon F., "The Peasant Caesar, Hitler's Union of German Imperialism and Eastern Reaction," Commentary, Vol.23 (1957), pp.406-418.

BLUME, Hilary S, "A Study of Anti-Semitic Groups in Britain 1918-1940" (Sussex University, M.Phil. thesis, 1971).

BOTZ, Gerhard, "Austro-Marxist Interpretations of Fascism, "Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.II, No.4, (1976), pp.129-157.

BOURKE, Vernon, J. "The Philosophical Antecedents of German National Socialism," Thought, Vol.XIV, (June 1939), pp.225-241.

BOWEN, R.H. German Theories of the Corporate State, New York: Russell and Russell, 1971.

BRAMSTED, E.K. Goebbels and National Socialist Propoganda, Michigan ,State University Press, 1965.

BREWER, J.D., "British Union of Fascists, Sir Oswald Mosley and Birmingham: An Analysis of the Content and Context of an Ideology" (Birmingham Univ., M.Soc.Sci. thesis, 1975).

BRIEFS, Goetz A., "The Economic Philosophy of Romanticism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, No.3 (1942), pp.279-300.

BRINTON, Crane, "The National Socialists' Use of Nietzsche," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.1, No.2 (April 1940), pp.131-151.

BROSZAT, Martin, German National Socialism 1919-1945, Santa Barbara, Clio Press, 1966.

BURDEN, Hamilton J. The Nuremberg Party Rallies 1923-1939, London: Pall Mall, 1967.

BURNHAM, James, The Machiavellians, Chicago: Regnery, 1963.

BUTHMANN, William Curt, The Rise of Integral Nationalism in France, Columbia University Press, 1945.

BUTLER, R, D'O, The Roots of National Socialism 1783-1933, London: Faber & Faber, 1941.

BYRNES, Robert F., "Mores 'The First National Socialist'," Review of Politics, Vol.XII, (July 1950), pp.341-362.

CALDWELL, William, Pragmatism and Idealism, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1913.

CAMMETT, John M,"Communist Theories of Fascism 1920-1935," Science and Society, Vol.31, (1967), pp.149-163.

CANNISTRATO, P.V., "Mussolini's Cultural Revolution: Fascist or Nationalist?," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.7, Nos. 3-4, (1972), pp.115-141.

CARPENTER, L.P. "Corporation in Britain 1930-1945," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.II, No.1 (1976), pp.3-27.

CARR, C.T. "Julius Langbehn - a forerunner of German National Socialism," German Life and Letters, Vol.III, 1938-1939, pp.45-54.

CARR, E.H. "Radek's 'Political Salon' in Berlin," Soviet Studies, Vol.III, No.4, 1951-1952, pp.411-430.

CARSTEN, F.L., The Rise of Fascism, London: Batsford, 1967.

CASPAR, C., "Mein Kampf - A Best Seller," Jewish Social Studies, January 1958, pp.3-16.

CECIL , Robert, The Myth of the Master Race; Alfred Rosenberg and Nazi Ideology, New York: Dodd Mead, 1972.

CHANDLER, A.R., "The Political Typology of Moeller van den Bruck," in M.R. Konvitz and A.E. Murphy ed. Essays in Political Theory, New York: Ithaca, 1948.

_____ Rosenberg's Nazi Myth, New York: Greenwood, 1968.

CLARK, Evelyn A. "Adolf Wagner (1835-1917): From National Economist to National Socialist," Political Science Quarterly, Vol. 55, No.3 (1940), pp.378-411.

CLOUGH, R.J. Futurism: The Story of a Modern Art Movement, New York: Philosophical Library, 1961.

COHN, Norman, Warrant for Genocide, London: Pelican, 1970.

CROCE, Benedetto, A History of Italy 1870-1915, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.

CROSS, Colin, The Fascists in Britain, London: Barrie and Rockcliffe, 1961.

CURTIS, M. Three Against the Third Republic, Princeton University Press, 1959.

DEAK, Istran, "National-Socialism in Hungary 1920-1938," (Columbia University M.A. thesis).

DODGE, P. Beyond Marxism: The Faith and Works of Hendrik de Man, Hague: Martinus Nighoff, 1966.

DOMANDI, Mario, "The German Youth Movement," (Columbia University, Ph.D. thesis, 1960).

DORRALEN, Andreas, "Heinrich von Treitzschke," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.7, Nos.3-4, (1972), pp.21-57.

DUFFLER, Jost, "Bonapartism, Fascism and National Socialism "Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.11, No.4, (1976), pp.109-129.

EDMONDSON, Nelson, "The Fichte Society: A Chapter in Germany's Conservative Revolution," Journal of Modern History, Vol.38, (June 1966), pp.161-181.

EDWARDS, P.G., "The Foreign Office and Fascism 1924-1929," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.5, No.2. (1970), pp.153-161.

EISENBERG, Dennis, The Re-Emergence of Fascism, London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1967.

ELBOW, Matthew H. French Corporative Theory, New York: Columbia University Press, 1953.

FALK, Minna R., "Review of Klemens von Klemperer's Germany's New Conservatism: Its History and Dilemma in the Twentieth Century," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol.18, (1958), pp.211-212.

FELICE, Renzo de, Fascism: An Informal Introduction to its Theory and Practice, New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1976.

_____ Interpretations of Fascism, translated by B.H. Everett, Harvard University Press, 1977.

FERKISS, Victor C. "Ezra Pound and American Fascism," Journal of Politics, Vol.17, No.1, February 1955.

_____ "Populist Influences in American Fascism," Western Political Quarterly, Vol.10, No.2, June 1957, pp.350-373.

FIELD, Frank, Three French Writers and the Great War, Cambridge University Press, 1975.

FINE, Martin, "Towards Corporation: The Movement for Capital-Labour Collaboration in France 1914-1936," (Wisconsin Univ. Ph.D. thesis, 1969).

FINER, Herman, Mussolini's Italy, London: Victor Gollancz, 1935.

FORD, Douglas, W. "The Forgotten Falangist: Ernesto Gimenez Caballero," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol 10, No.1 (1975), pp.3-18.

FRIEDRICH, Carl J. and BRZEZINSKI, Zbigniew K., Totalitarian Dictatorship and Autocracy, Cambridge, Massachussetts: Harvard University Press, 1965.

GASMAN, Daniel, The Scientific Origins of National Socialism, Social Dawinism in Ernst Haeckel and the Monist League, London: MacDonald, 1971.

GERMINO, Dante, "Italian Fascism in the History of Political Thought," Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol.VIII, No.2, (May 1964), pp.109-126.

GILBERT, Felix, "Mittel Europa: The Final Stage," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol.7, No.1 (April 1947).

GLASER, Hermann, The Cultural roots of national socialism, translated with an introduction and notes by E.A. Menze, London: Croom Helm, 1978.

GOAD, Harold E, and CURRY, Muriel, The working of a Corporate State, London: Iver Nicholson and Watson, 1933.

GOLDBERG, Harvey, "Jean Jaures and the Jewish Question: The Evolution of a Position, Jewish Social Studies, Vol.XX, No.2, April 1958.

GRANDE, A.J. de, "Curzio Malaparte: The Illusion of the Fascist Revolution," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.7, No.1, (1972), pp.73-91.

GREENE, Nathaniel, ed. Fascism: An Anthology, New York: Crowell, 1968.

GREGOR, A.J., Contemporary Radical Ideologies, New York: Random House, 1968.

_____ "Fascism and Comparative Politics. A Review Essay," Comparative Political Studies, Vol.IX, July 1976, pp.207-222.

_____ "Fascism and Modernization," World Politics, Vol. 26, (1973-1974), pp.370-385.

_____ "Giovanni Gentile and the Philosophy of the Young Karl Marx," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol. XXIV, No.2, (1963), pp.213-231.

_____ The Ideology of Fascism, New York: Free Press, 1969.

_____ "On Understanding Fascism: A Review of Some Contemporary Literature," American Political Science Review, 1976.

_____ "Professor Renzo de Felice and the Fascist Phenomenon," World Politics, Vol.XXX, No.3, (April 1978), pp.433-450.

GRILLI, Marcel, "The Nationality of Philosophy and Bertrando Spaventa," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.3, No.3 (1942), pp.359-371.

GROSS, David, "Heinrich Mann and the Politics of Reaction, Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.8, No.1 (1973), pp.125-147.

GROSSMAN, Stanley, "Neo-Socialism: A Study in Political Metamorphosis," (Wisconsin University, Ph.D. thesis, 1969).

GULINI, Carlo, "Giovanni Pagini and American Pragmatism," Italica, Vol.XXXII (1955), pp.38-48.

GULLACI, Giovanni, "The Pragmatist Movement in Italy," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XXIII, No.1 (1962), pp.91-107.

HAAG, J.J. "Othmar Spann and the Politics of 'Totality': Corperatism in Theory and Practice," (Rice University, Ph.D. thesis, 1969).

HAMILTON, Alistair, The Appeal of Fascism, London: Anthony Blond, 1971.

HARRIS, H.S., The Social Philosophy of Giovanni Gentile, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960.

HARRISON, T.R., The Reactionaries: W.B. Yeats, Wyndham Lewis, Ezra Pound, D.H. Lawrence, London: Victor Gollanz, 1966.

HAYES, Carlton T.H., A Generation of Materialism, 1871-1900, New York and London: Harper Brothers, 1941.

HAYES, P.M., Fascism, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1971.

_____ Quisling, Newton Abbott: David and Charles, 1971.

_____ "Quisling's Political Ideas," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1 (1966), pp.145-158.

HELLIER, Eric, The Disinherited Mind, London: Penguin, 1961.

HENTSCHEL, Cyril, The Byronic Teuton, Aspects of German Pessimism 1800-1933, London: Mathuen, 1940.

HERTZMANN, Lewis, D.N.V.P., Right Wing Opposition in the Weimar Replubic, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1963.

HOFFMAN, Stanley, "Collaboration in France During World War II," Journal of Modern History, Vol.40, No.3, September 1968, pp.396-411.

HOLBORN, Hajo, "Origins and Political Character of Nazi Ideology," Political Science Quarterly, Vol.LXXIX, No.4 (1964), pp. 542-554.

HOLMES, Roger Wellington, The Idealism of Giovanni Gentile, New York: Macmillans 1937.

HUGHES, Arnold and Kolinsky, Martin, "'Paradigmatic Fascism' and Modernisation: A Critique," Political Studies, Vol.XXIV, No.4 (December 1976), pp.371-396.

HUGHES, H. Stuart, Consciousness and Society: The Reorientation of European Social Thought. 1890-1930. London: MacGibbon and Kee, 1959.

_____ Oswald Spengler: A Critical Estimate, London: Charles Scribner's, 1952.

_____ "Review of Germany's New Conservatism: Its History and Dilemma in the 20th Century, by Klemens von Klemperer," Commentary, Vol.XXIV, (November 1957), pp.470-473.

HUMPHREY, Richard, Georges Sorel: Prophet without Honour, Harvard University Press, 1951.

HURST, Michael, "What is Fascism?" Historical Journal, Vol.XI, No.1 (1968), pp.165-185.

HUTTON, P.H., "Popular Boulangism and the Advent of Mass Politics in France, 1886-1890," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol. 11, No.4 (1976), pp.1-17.

INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR PHILOSOPHY AND HUMANISTIC STUDIES, The Third Reich. Essays on the National-Socialist movement in Germany. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1955.

IRVINE, William P. "French Conservatives and the 'New Right' during the 1930s," French Historical Studies, Vol.VIII, No.4, (Fall 1974).

JACKSON, Holbrook, The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the End of the Nineteenth Century, London: Grant Richards, 1913.

JACABSON, Dan, "D.H. Lawrence and Modern Society," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.2, No.2 (1967), pp.65-80.

JAMES, William, "Giovanni Papini and the Pragmatist Movement in Italy," Journal of Philosophy, Psychology and Scientific Methods, Vol.III, No.13 (June 21, 1906), pp.337-341.

JELLICKA, Ludwig, "The Austrian Heimwehr," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1 (1966), pp.127-145.

JENSEN-BUTLER, B. "Theories of Fascism: A study of some interpretations of the rise of the Nazi Party in Germany," (Durham University M.A. thesis, 1973).

JOAD, C.E.M., "Prologomena to Fascism," Political Quarterly, Vol.2, (1931), pp.82-99.

JOLL, James, Three Intellectuals in Politics, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1960.

KANN, Robert A, "Wolfgang Menzel: Pioneer of Integral Nationalism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.2, (1945), pp.385-414.

KELE, Max H. Nazis and Workers: National Socialist Appeals to German Labour, University of North Carolina Press, 1972.

KERMODE, Frank, The Sense of an Ending, Oxford University Press, 1967, reprint 1977.

KESSLER, Harry Klemens Ulrich, graf von, Walter Rathenau: his life and work, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1930.

KITCHEN, Martin, "August Thalheimer: theory of fascism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.34, No.1 (1973), pp.67-78.

_____ Fascism, London: Macmillan, 1976.

KLEMPERER, Klemens von. Germany's New Conservatism, Princeton University Press, 1968.

KOEHL, Robert, "Feudal Aspects of National Socialism," American Political Science Review, Vol.54, No.4, (December 1960) pp.921-934.

KOLNAI, Anrel, The War Against the West, London: Victor Gollancz, 1938.

KREBS, Gerhard, "Moeller van den Bruck: Inventor of the 'Third Reich'," American Political Science Review, Vol.35, No.6, (December, 1941), pp.1085-1106.

KRIEGER, Leonard, The German Idea of Freedom, University of Chicago Press, 1957.

KUEHNEMUND, Richard, "German Prophets of Doom and Hope," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.3, No.4, (1972), pp.443-457.

LANE, Barbara Miller, "Nazi Ideology: Some Unfinished Business," Central European History, Vol.VII, Number 1, (March 1974).

LAQUER, Walter, Russia and Germany: A Century of Conflict, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965.

_____ ed. Fascism: A Reader's Guide, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1976.

LAUTERBACH, Albert J. "Militarism in the Western World," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.5, No.4 (1944), pp.446-478.

LEBOVICS, Herman, Social Conservatism and the Middle Classes in Germany 1914-1933, Princeton University Press, 1969.

LEBSELTZER, Gisela C., Political Anti-Semitism in England 1918-1939.

LEDEEN, M.A., Universal Fascism, New York: Howard Ferfig, 1972.

LEVEY, Jules, "Georges Valois and the Faisceau: The Making and Breaking of a Fascist," French Historical Studies, Vol.VIII, No.2 (Fall 1973).

LION, Aline, The Pedigree of Fascism, London: Sheed and Ward, 1927.

LIPSET, Seymour Martin, "'Fascism' - Left, Right and Centre," in his Political Man, London: Heinemann, 1960, pp.131-173.

LOUGEE, R.W. Paul de Lagarde, 1827-1891, Harvard University Press, 1972.

_____ "Paul de Lagarde as Critic- A Romantic Protest in an Age of Realism," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol.XIII (October 1953), pp.232-245.

LOVEJOY, Arthur, O. "The Meaning of Romanticism for the Historian of Ideas," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, No.3. (1942), pp.257-278.

_____ "The Practical Tendencies of Bergsonism," Parts Iand II, International Journal of Ethics, Vol.XXIII, (1912-1913).

LYTTLETON, Adrian, "Fascism in Italy: The Second Wave," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1 (1966), pp.75-101.

_____ The Seizure of Power; Fascism in Italy 1919-1929, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.

MACDONALD, J.M., A Political Escapade: The Story of Fiume and D'Annunzio, London: John Murray, 1962.

McGOVERN, W.M. From Luther to Hitler: The History of Fascist-Nazi Political Philosophy, 2nd edition, Boston and New York: Houghton Miflin, 1973.

McRANDLE, J.H. The Track of the Wolf, Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1965.

MAEHL, William, "The Triumph of Nationalism in the German Socialist Party on the eve of the First World War," Journal of Modern History, Vol.XXIV, No.1 (March 1952), pp.15-42.

MAIER, L.S. "Between Taylorism and Technocracy," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.15, No.2 (1970), pp.27-61.

MANN, Golo, "The German Intellectuals," Encounter, Vol.IV, June 1955, pp.42-49.

MANNHEIM, Karl, Ideology and Utopia, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1972.

MANNING, Maurice, The Blueshirts, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1970.

MARRUSS, Michael R., The Politics of Assimilation: A Study of the French Jewish Community, at the time of the Dreyfus Affair, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

MASER, Werner, Hitler's 'Mein Kampf,' London: Faber and Faber, 1970.

MASON, John B, "Nazi Concepts of History," Review of Politics, Vo.2 (April 1940).

MASUR, Gerhard, Prophets of Yesterday: Studies in European Culture, 1850-1914, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963.

MATTHEWS, H.L. The Fruits of Fascism, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1943.

MAYER, Carl, "On the Intellectual Origins of National Socialism," Social Research, Vol.IX, No.2, (May 1942), pp.225-247.

MEGARO, Gaudens, Mussolini in the Making, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.

MEISEL, James H. ed. Pareto and Mosca, Englewood Cliifs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

_____, The Genesis of Georges Sorel, Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1958.

_____ The Myth of the Ruling Class, Gaetano Mosca and the Elite, Michigan: Ann Arbor, 1958.

MELOGRANO, Piero, "The Cult of the Duce in Mussoline's Italy," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.11, No.4 (1976), pp.221-239.

MEYER, Henry C, Mitteleuropa in German Thought and Action 1815-1945, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1955.

MICAUD, Charles A, The French Right and Nazi Germany: 1933-1939, New York: Octagon Books, 1964.

MOMMSEN, Hans, "National Socialism," in C.D. Kernig, ed. Marxism, Communism and Western Society, A Comparative Encyclpedia, Vol.VI, New York: Herder and Herder, 1972, pp.65-74.

MOSSE, G.L., "Caesarism, Circuses, and Movements," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.6, No.2 (1971), pp.167-182.

_____ The Crisis of German Ideology, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1964.

_____ The Culture of Western Europe, London: John Murray, 1963.

_____ "The French Right and the Working Class: Les Jaunes," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.7, Nos.3-4, pp.185-209.

_____ "The Genesis of Fascism," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1. (1966), pp.14-27.

_____ "The Mystical Origins of National Socialism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.22, No.1 (1961), pp.81-97.

_____ The Nationalisation of the Masses: Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich, New York: Ferfig, 1975.

_____ "The Poet and the exercise of Political Power: Gabrielle D'Annunzio," Y earbook of Comparative and General Literature, Vol.22, (1973), pp.32-42.

MULLALLY, F. Fascism Inside England, London: Claud Morris, 1946.

MULLER, Klaus-Jurgen, "French Fascism and Modernisation," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.11, No.4, (1976), pp.109-129.

MURPHY, R.E. et. al. National Socialism, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1943.

NAGY-Talavera, The Green Shirts and the Others, Stanford University Press, 1970.

NICOLSON, Harold, Diaries and Letters 1930-1939, London: Collins, 1973.

NOAKES, Jeremy, "Conflict and Development in the NSDAP.," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.4, (1966), pp.3-37.

NOLTE, Ernst, Three Faces of Facism, New York: Signet, 1969.

OBERLANDER, Erwin, "The All-Russian Fascist Party," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1 (1966), pp.158-174.

OSGOOD, Samuel, French Royalism since 1870, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970.

PARKS, M.G., Introduction to Keyserling, London: Jonathan Cape, 1934.

PARSONS, Talcott, "Some Sociological Aspects of the Fascist Movements," in his Essays in Sociological Theory, New York: Free Press, 1964.

PAYNE, Stanley, J. Falange: A History of Spanish Fascism, Stanford University Press, 1971.

PHELPS, Reginald H. "'Before Hitler Came,': Thule Society and German Order n," Journal of Modern History, Vol.XXXV, No.3, (1963), pp.245-262.

_____"Review of Klemens von Klemperer's Germany's New Conservatism," Journal of Modern History, Vol.29, No.4 (December 1957), pp. 402-403.

PHILLIPS, Percival, The 'Red Dragon' and the Blackshirts. The True Story of the Fascist Movement, London: Daily Mail, 1923.

POIS, Robert A, "German Expressionism in the Plastic Arts and Nazism: A Confrontation of Idealists," German Life and Letters, Vol. XXI, No.3, (April 1968), pp.204-214.

POULANTZAS, Nicos, Fascism and Dictatorship; the Third International and the problem of Fascism, London: 1974.

PROSS, Harry, "On Thomas Mann's Political Career," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.2, No.2 (1967), pp.65-80.

PULZER, P.J.,Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria, London: John Wiley, 1964.

RABINBACH, Anson, G. "The Aesthetics of Production in the Third Reich," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.11, No.4 (1976), pp.157-185.

RANDAL, John Herman, "The Changing Impact of Darwin on Philosophy," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XXII, No.4 (1961), pp.435-462.

RAPPARD, William E, et al. Source Book on European Governments, New York: Van Nosfrand, 1937.

RAUSCHNING, Herman, Germany's Revolution of Destruction, Road to Nihilism, London: Heinemann, 1940.

_____ The Beast from the Abyss, London: Heinemann, 1941.

RHODES, Anthony, The Poet as Superman: Gabrielle D'Annunzio, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1959.

RIDGE, George R. The Hero in French Decadent Literature, University of Georgia Press, 1961.

RIDLEY , F.F. Revolutionary Syndicalism in France, Cambridge University Press, 1970.

ROGERS, James A, "Darwinism and Social Darwinism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XXXIII, No.2 (1972), pp.265-281.

ROTENSTREICH, N., The Recurring Pattern, London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1963.

ROTH, J.J., "Revolution and Morale in Modern French Thought: Sorel and Sorelism," French Historical Studies, Vol.III, No.4, (Fall 1963), pp.205-223.

_____ "The Roots of Italian Fascism: Sorel and Sorelismo," Journal of Modern History, Vol.39 (March 1967), pp.30-46.

RUTKOFF, Peter M, "The Ligue des Patriotes: The Nature of the Radical Right and the Dreyfus Affair," French Historical Studies, Vol.VIII, No.4, (Fall 1975).

SALOMONE, A. William, Italian Democracy in the Making, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1945.

SALVEMINI, G. Under the Axe of Fascism, New York: Howard Ferfig, 1969.

SARTI, Roland, "Fascist Modernisation in Italy: Traditional or Revolutionary?" American Historical Review, Vol.LXXV, No.4, (April 1970), pp.1029-1045.

SCHAPIRO, J. Salwyn, Liberalism and the Challenge of Fascism, Social Forces in England and France 1815-1870, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

SCHEIDER, W. "Fascism," in C.D. Kernig ed. Marxism, Communism and Western Society. A Comparative Encyclopedia, Vol.III, New York: Harder and Harder, 1972, pp.282-302.

SCHNURER, Herman, "The Intellectual Sources of French Fascism," Antioch Review, Vol.1 (March 1941), pp.35-49.

SCHORSKE, Carl E, "Politics in a New Key: An Austrian Triptych," Journal of Modern History, December 1967, pp.343-387.

SCHUDDEKOPK, Otto-Ernst, Revolutions of Our Time - Fascism, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1973.

SCOTT, J.W., Syndicalism and Philosophical Realism, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1919.

SELIGER, M. "The Idea of Conquest and Race Thinking during the Restoration," Review of Politics, Vol.22, No 4 (October 1960).

SETON-WATSON, Hugh, "Fascism, Right and Left," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1 (1966), pp.183-197.

SETON-WATSON, Christopher, Italy from Liberalism to Fascism,1870-1925, London: Methuen, 1967.

SETTEMBRINI, Domenico, "Mussolini and the Legacy of Revolutionary Socialism," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.11, No.4, (1976), pp.239-269.

SHEPPARD, Michael D. "Adrian Moulin, Study of a Swedish Right Wing Radical" (Northwestern University, Ph.D. thesis, 1969).

SILBERNER, Edmund, "Anti-Jewish Trends in French Revolutionary Syndicalism," Jewish Social Studies, Vol.15, Parts 3-4, pp.195-202.

SKIDELSKY, Robert, Oswald Mosley, London: Macmillan, 1975.

SMITH, D. Mack, Mussolini's Roman Empire, London: Penguin, 1977.

SOUCY, Robert J. Fascism in France: The Case of Maurice Barres, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1972.

_____ "French Fascist Intellectuals in the 1930s: An Old New Left?" French Historical Studies, (1973), pp.445-458.

_____ "The Nature of Facism in France," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1., (1966), pp.27-56.

_____ "Romanticism and Realism in the Fascism of Drieu La Rochelle," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.31, No.1 (1970), pp.69-91.

_____ "French Fascism as Class Conciliation and Moral Regeneration," Societas, Vol.1, No.4 (Autumn 1971), pp.287-298.

STACHURA, P.D., "The Ideology of the Hitler Youth in the Kampfzeit," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.8, No.3, (1973), pp. 155-167.

STERN, Fritz, The Politics of Cultural Despair, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963.

STERNHELL, Zeev, "Fascist Ideology," in Walter Lagner ed. Fascism: A Reader's Guide, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976.

_____ "Irrationalism and Violence in the French Radical Right: The Case of Maurice Barres," in Philip P. Weiner and John Fisher, ed. Violence and Aggression in the History of Ideas, Rutgers University Press, 1974.

_____ "National Socialism and Anti-Semitism: The Case of Maurice Barres," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.8, No.4 (1973).

_____ "Paul Deroulede, and the origins of modern French nationalism," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.6, No.4 (1971), pp.46-70.

STEWART, William K, "The Mentors of Mussolini," American Political Science Review, Vol.XXII, No.4, (November 1928), pp.843-870.

STIRK, S.D. The Prussian Spirit. A Survey of German Literature and Politics, London: Faber and Faber, 1941.

STRUVE, Walter, Elites against Democracy, leadership ideals in Bourgeois Political Thought in Germany 1890-1933, Princeton University Press, 1973.

SUGAR, P.F., ed. Native Fascism in the Successor States 1918-1945, Santa Barbara, California: 1971.

SZYMANSKI, Albert, "Fascism, Industrialism and Socialism: The Case of Italy," Comparative Studies in Society and History, Vol. 15, No.4 (1973), pp.395-404.

TALMON, J.L. The Unique and the Universal, New York: George Braziller, 1965.

TANNENBAUM, E.R., The Action Francaise: Die hard reactionaries in twentieth century France, New York and London: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1962.

TANNENBAUMER, "The Goals of Italian Fascism," American Historical Review, Vol.LXXIV, No.4, (April 1969), pp.1183-1204.

THAYER, George, The British Political Fringe, London: Anthony Blond, 1965.

THAYER, John A. Italy and the Great War: Politics and Culture 1870-1915. University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

THEWLIS, Harold M., "French Authoritarian Movements of the Right 1924-1940" (Columbia University, M.A. thesis, 1952).

THOMAS, Hugh, "The Hero in the Empty Room: Jose Antonio and Spanish Facism," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1 (1966), pp.174-183.

THURLOW, Richard C, "Racial Populism in England," Patterns of Prejudice, Vol.10, No.4 (1976).

TUCKER, William R. "Fascism and Individualism: The Political Thought of Pierre Dricu La Rochelle," Journal of Politics, Vol.27, No.1 (1965), pp.153-178.

_____ "The Legacy of Charles Maurras," Journal of Politics, Vol.17, No.4 (November 1955).

_____ "Politics and Aesthetics: The Fascism of Robert Brassillach," Western Political Quarterly, Vol. 15, No.4, (1962), pp.605-617.

TURNER, Henry Ashby, "Fascism and Modernisation," World Politics, 1972.

_____ "Hitler's Secret Pamphlet for Industrialists, 1927," Journal of Modern History, Vol.40, No.3 (September 1968), pp.396-411.

_____ ed. Reappraisals of Fascism, New York: Franklin Watts, 1975.

VAJDA, Mihaly, Fascism as a mass movement, London: Allen and Busby, 1976.

VERMEIL, E, The German Scene: Social, Political and Cultural, 1890 to the present day, London: George and Harrop, 1956.

VIERECK, Peter, Metapolitics: From the Romantics to Hitler, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1941.

VIRTANEN, Reino, "Nietzsche and the Action Francaise," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XI, No.2 (1950), pp.191-214.

WAGAR, W.W. ed., European Intellectual History since Darwin and Marx, New York: Harper and Row, 1966.

WATSON, D.R. "The Nationalist Movement in Paris, 1900-1906," in David Shapiro ed. The Right in France, London: Chatto and Windus, 1962.

WEBER, Eugen, The Action Francaise, Royalism and Reaction in Twentieth Century France, Stanford, 1962.

_____ "The Men of the Archangel," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.1 (1966), pp.101-127.

WEBER, Eugen, "Maurice Barres: Un Heritier," Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature, Vol.22 (1973), pp.20-32.

_____ The Nationalist Revival in France, 1905-1914, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1968.

_____ "Nationalism, Socialism, and National Socialism in France," French Historical Studies, Spring 1962, pp.273-307.

_____ Varieties of Fascism, Princeton University Press, 1964.

WEBSTER, Richard A, "The Cross and the Fasces: Christian Democracy in Italy" (Columbia University, Ph.D. thesis, 1959).

WEISS, John, The Fascist Tradition, New York: Harper and Row, 1973.

_____ ed., Nazis and Fascists in Europe, 1918-1945, Chicago: Quadrangle, 1969.

_____ ed. The Origins of Modern Consciousness, Detroit, 1965.

WERNER, Alfred, "Trotsky of the Nazi Party: Otto Strasser," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol.XI, (January 1951),

WERNER, Karl Ferdinand, "On some examples of the National Socialist View of History," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.3, No.2 (1968), pp.193-206.

WHITESIDE, Andrew Gladding, Austrian National Socialism before 1918, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962.

_____ "The Nature and Origins of National Socialism," Journal of Central European Affairs, Vol.XVII, No.1. (April 1957).

WILSON, Stephen, "The Anti-Semitic Riots of 1898 in France," Historical Review, Vol.XVI, No.4 (1973), pp.789-806.

_____ "A View of the Past: Action Francaise Historiography and its socio-political function," Historical Journal, Vol. 19, No.1 (1976), pp.135-161.

_____ "Fustel de Coulanges and L'Action Francaise," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XXIV, No.1 (1973), pp.123-135.

WINEGARTEN, R. "The Fascist Mentality: Drieu La Rochelle," Wiener Library Bulletin, Vol.XXIII, (Winter 1968-1969).

_____ "The Temptations of Cultural Fascism," Wiener Library Bulletin, Vol.XXIII, (Winter 1968-1969.

WINKLER, H.A., "German Society, Hitler and the Illusion of Restoration, 1930-1933," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.11, No.4 (1976), pp.1-17.

WISTRICH, Robert S, "Leon Trotsky's Theory of Fascism," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.11, No.4 (1976), pp.157-185.

WOOLF, Stuart J.,Ed., European Fascism, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968.

WOOLF, Stuart J, ed., "Mussolini as Revolutionary," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.1, No.2, (1966), pp.187-196.

_____ ed., The Nature of Fascism, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1968.

YARROW, Clarence H. "The Forgoing of Fascist Doctrine," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.3, No.2 (1942), pp.151-181.

ZEMEN, Z.A.B., Nazi Propoganda, Oxford University Press, 1964.

CONSERVATISM: PRIMARY SOURCES

AMERY, L.S., The Forward View, London: Geoffrey Bles, 1935.

BEGBIE, Harold, The Conservative Mind: by a Gentleman with a Duster, London: Mills and Boon, 1924.

BOOTHBY, Robert; MACMILLAN, Harold; LODER, John de v.; STANLEY, Oliver, Industry and the State: A Conservative View, London: Macmillan, 1927.

BOYSON, Rhodes, Centre Forward, London: Temple Smith, 1978.

BRAINE, Bernard, Tory Democracy, London: Falcon, 1948.

BUTLER, Geoffrey C, The Tory Tradition, London: John Murray, 1914.

BUTLER, R.A.B., The Art of the Possible, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1971.

CASE, The Case Against Socialism, A handbook for speakers and candidates, with prefatory letter by Right Hon. A.T. Balfour, London: George Allen & Sons, 1908.

CECIL, Lord Hugh, Conservatism,London: Williams and Norgate, 1912.

CHURCHILL, Lord Randolph, "Elijah's Mantle, " Fortnightly Review, Vol.33, May 1, 1883.

CHURCHILL, Winston, Parliamentary Government and the Economic Problem, Oxford University Press, 1930.

CLARKE, David, The Conservative Faith in the Modern Age, London: Conservative Political Centre, 1947.

COOK, E.J. ed., Conservatism and the Future, London: William Heinemann, 1935.

CURZON, George M, "The Conservatism of Young Oxford," National Review, Vol.3, March 1884.

_____ "Poetry, Politics and Conservatism," National Review, Vol.6, September 1885.

DAWSON, Christopher, Beyond Politics, New York: Sheed and Ward, 1939.

_____ Religion and the Modern State, London: Sheed and Ward, 1936.

DISRAELI, Benjamin, Earl of Beaconsfield, Whigs and Whiggism, Political Writings, London: John Murray, 1913.

ELIOT, Thomas Stearns, "The Action Francaise, M. Maurras and Mr. Ward," Criterion, Vol.7, No.3, (1928), pp.195-203.

_____ "L'Action Francaise - A Reply to Mr. Ward," Criterion, vol.7, No.4 (June 1928), pp.84-88.

_____ The Idea of Christian Society, London: Faber & Faber, 1939.

_____ "The Literature of Fascism," Criterion, Vol.8 (December 1928), pp.280-290.

_____ Notes Towards the Definition of Culture, Glasgow University Press, 1948.

_____ Selected Essays, London: Faber and Faber, 1976.

FEILING, Keith, "Principles of Conservatism," Political Quarterly, Vol.XXIV, No.2 (April 1953), pp.129-138.

GILMOUR, Ian, Inside Right. A Study of Conservatism, London: Hutchinson, 1977.

GLENDAY, Roy, The Economic Consequences of Progress, London: George Routledge, 1934.

_____ The Future of Economic Society, London: Macmillan, 1944.

GOLDMAN, Peter, ed. The New Conservatism, London: Conservative Political Centre, 1955.

HEARNSHAW, J.F.C., Conservatism in England, London: Macmillan, 1933.

HOGG, Quinton, Lord Hailsham, The Dilemma of Democracy, London: Collins, 1978.

_____ Toryism and Tomorrow, London: Conservative Political Centre, 1957.

HOLLIS, Christopher, Death of a Gentleman: The Letters of Robert Fossett, 2nd edition, London: Oates, 1954.

_____, Quality y or Equality? London: Signpost, 1944.

HORNBY, Richard, "Conservative Principles," Political Quarterly, Vol.32, No.3 (1961), pp.222-237.

HOWELL, David, Efficiency and Beyond, London: Conservative Political Centre, 1965.

JONES, Aubrey, The Pendulum of Politics, London: Faber & Faber, 1946.

LECKY, William Edward Hartpole, Democracy and Liberty, London: Green and Co., 1913, 2 volumes.

LEWIS, Russell, Principles to Conserve, London: Conservative Political Centre, 1973.

LOFTUS, Pierse, The Creed of a Tory, London: Philip Allen, 1926.

MACMILLAN, Harold, The Middle Way, Second edition, London: Macmillan 1939.

_____ Reconstruction; A Plea for a National Policy, London: Macmillan 1933.

_____ Tides of Fortune 1945-1955, London: Macmillan, 1969.

_____ Winds of Change 1914-1939, London: Macmillan, 1966.

MAINE, Henry Sumner, Popular Government, London: John Murray, 1885.

MALLOCK, W.H., A Critical Examination of Socialism, London: John Murray, 1908.

_____ Aristocracy and Evolution, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1898.

_____ Classes and Masses or Wealth, Wages and Welfare in the United Kingdom, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.

_____ "Conservatism and the Diffusion of Property," National Review, Vol.XI, (March 1888).

_____ "Conservatism and Socialism," National Review, Vol.II, (September 1883).

_____ "Radicalism and the Working Classes," National Review, Vol.II, (September 1883).

_____ "The Functions of Wealth," Contemporary Review, Vol.41, (January 1882).

_____ The Limits of Pure Democracy, 3rd edition, London: Chapman and Hall, 1918.

OAKESHOTT, Michael, "On the Character of a Modern European State," in his On Human Conduct, Oxford University Press, 1975, pp.185-327.

PERCY, Lord Eustace, Government in Transition, London: Methuen, 1934.

POWELL, J.E., A New Look at Medicine and Politics, London: Pitman, 1966.

_____ Freedom and Reality, edited by John Wood, London: Batsford, 1969.

_____ Savings in a Free Society, London: Hutchinson, 1960.

RAISON, Timothy, Conflict and Conservatism, London: Conservative Political Centre, 1965.

ROBERTSON, Edward Stanley, Communism, London: Liberty and Property Defence League, 1884.

ROSE, Richard, "Tensions in Conservative Philosophy," Political Quarterly, Vol.32, No.3 (July 1961), pp.275-283.

SALTER, Arthur, The Framework of an Ordered Society, Cambridge University Press, 1933.

SELLON, Hugh, Democracy and Dictatorship, London: Lovat Dickson, 1934.

SMITH, Paul, ed., Lord Salisbury on Politics, Cambridge University Press, 1972.

STELLING, David, Why I am a Conservative, London: Conservative Headquarters, 1944.

STEPHEN, James Fitzjames, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity, London: Smith, Elder and Co., 1933.

CONSERVATISM: SECONDARY SOURCES

BEER, Samuel H., Modern British Politics, 2nd edition, London: Faber & Faber, 1969.

BOSWORTH, R.T.B., "The British Press, The Conservatives, and Mussolini, 1920-1934," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.5, No.2 (1970), pp.163-182.

ECCLESHALL, Robert, "English Conservatism as an Ideology," Political Studies, Vol.XXV, No.1 (March 1977), pp.62-83.

_____ "Richard Hooker's Synthesis and the Problem of Allegiance," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XXXVII, No.1 (1976), pp.111-124.

FEUCHTWANGER, E.T., Disraeli, Democracy and the Tory Party, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1948.

FORD, D.J. "W.H. Mallock and Socialism in England 1880-1918," in K.D. Brown ed., Essays in Anti-Labour History, London: Macmillan, 1974.

FRIEDRICH, Carl J., "The Political Thought of Neo-Liberalism," American Political Science Review, Vol.XLIX, No.2 (January 1955), pp.509-526.

GLICKMAN, Harvey, "The Toryness of English Conservatism," Journal of British Studies, Vol.1, No.1 (November 1961).

GREENLEAF, W.H., "The Character of Modern British Conservatism," in Robert Benewick ed., Knowledge and Belief in Politics, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1973.

_____ "Idealism, modern philosophy and politics," in P.King and B. Parekh, Politics and Experience: Essays presented to Professor Michael Oakeshott on the occasion of his retirement. Cambridge University Press, 1968.

_____ Oakeshott's Philosophical Politics, London: Longmans, 1966.

HARRIS, Nigel, Competition and the Corporate Society, London: Methuen, 1972.

HUNTINGTON, Samuel P. "Conservatism as an Ideology," American Political Science Review, Vol.51, No.2, (June 1957), pp.454-473.

JESSOP, Bob, Traditionalism, Conservatism and British Political Culture, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974.

KLEMPERER, Klemens von. "Conservatism," in C.D. Kernig, ed. Marxism, Communism and Western Society, Vol.2, New York: Herder and Herder, 1972, pp.164-169.

McDOWELL, R.B., British Conservatism, London: Faber & Faber, 1939.

MINOGUE, Kenneth R, "Michael Oakeshott," in Anthony de Crespigny and Kenneth R. Minogue ed., Contemporary Political Philosophers, London: Methuen, 1976, pp.120-147.

O'SULLIVAN, Noel, Conservatism, London: J.M. Dent, 1976.

PINTO-DUSCHINSKY, Michael, The Political Thought of Lord Salisbury 1854-1968, London: Constable, 1966.

QUINTON, Anthony, The Politics of Imperfection, London: Faber & Faber, 1978.

REES, Richard, "T.S. Eliot on Culture and Progress," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.2, No.2 (1967), pp.103-112.

REMOND, Rene, The Right Wing in France, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1969.

ROTH, Andrew, Enoch Powell: Tory Tribune, London: Macmillan, 1970.

SHORE, Peter, The Real Nature of Conservatism, London: 1952.

SMITH, Paul, Disraelian Conservatism and Social Reform, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967.

SOLDON, N., "Laissez-Faire as Dogma: The Liberty and Property Defence League, 1882-1914, in K.D. Brown, ed., Essays in Anti-Labour History, London: Macmillan, 1974.

TUCKER, Albert V, "W.H. Mallock and Late Victorian Conservatism," University of Toronto Quarterly, Vol.XXXI, No.2 (January 1962), pp.223-242.

WEISS, John, Conservatism in Modern Europe, 1770-1945, London: Thames and Hudson, 1977.

WHITE, J., Ed., The Conservative Tradition, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1969.

WOLIN, Sheldon, "Hume and Conservatism," American Political Science Review, Vol.48, No.4, (1954), pp.999-1017.

_____ "Richard Hooker and English Conservatism," Western Political Quarterly, Vol.6, (1953), pp.28-47.

WOOD, Neal, "A Guide to the Classics: The Skepticism of Professor Oakeshott," Journal of Politics, Vol.21, No.4 (November 1959), pp.647-663.

MISCELLANEOUS

BARKER, Sir Ernest, Political Thought in England 1848-1914, 2nd edition, Oxford University Press, reprint 1959.

BERKI, R.N. and Parekh, B., "The History of Political Ideas: A Critique of A. Skinner's Methodology," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XXXIV, No.2 (1973), pp.163-185.

BURGESS, Anthony, "Politics in the Novels of Graham Greene," Journal of Contemporary History, Vol.II, No.2, (1967), pp.93-99.

COHEN, Morris R, "Causation and its application to history," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, No.1 (1942), pp.12-29.

COLLINGWOOD, R.G., The Idea of History, Oxford University Press, 1966.

DRADER, Hal, "Neo-Corportists and Neo-Reformers," New Politics, Vol.1, No.11 (Fall 1961), pp.87-107.

DUNN, John, "The Identity of the History of Ideas," in P. Laslett ed. Philosophy, Politics and Society, 4th series, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972, pp.158-174.

EAGLETON, Terry, Criticism and Ideology: A Study in Marxist Literary Theory, London.

ECKSTEIN, Walter, "Discussion on Nietzsche," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.3 (1945), pp.304-306.

_____ "Friedrich Nietzsche in the judgement of posterity," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.3 (1945), pp.310-324.

FAIRCHILD, Hoxie N., "Romanticism and the Religious Revival in England," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, No.3, (1942), pp.330-338.

GUTMANN, James, "Discussion on Nietzsche," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.3, (1945), pp.299-303.

HUZSAR, George de, "Nietzsche's theory of decadence and the trasvaluation of all values," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.3 (1945), pp.259-272.

INGLE, S.T., "Politics and Literature: An Unconsummated Relationship," Political Studies, Vol. XXV, No.4 (December 1977), pp.549-562.

_____ "Socialism and Literature: The Contribution of Imaginative Writers to the British Labour Party," Political Studies, Vol.XXII, No.2 (June 1974), pp.158-167.

KARIEL, Henry, S., "Nietzsche's Preface to Constitutionalism," Journal of Politics, Vol.25, No.2 (May 1963), pp.211-225.

KVASTAD, Nils B., "Semantics in the Methodology of the History of Ideas," Journal of the History of Ideas, VOl. XXXVIII, No.1 (January 1977), pp. 157-174.

LOVEJOY, Arthur, O. "Reply to Professor Spitzer," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.5, No.2 (1944), pp.204-219.

LOWITH, Karl, "Nietzsche's Doctrine of Eternal Recurrence," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.3 (1945) pp.273-284.

MACKENZIE, W.J.M., Political Identity, London: Penguin, 1978.

MANDELBAUM, Maurice, "Causal Analysis in History," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, No.1 (1942), pp.30-50.

MORRIS, Charles, "Nietzsche - An Evaluation," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.3 (1945), pp.273-284.

NIETZSCHE, Friedrich, Beyond Good and Evil. Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future, translated by Helen Zimmern, with an introduction by Thomas Common, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, 4th edition, 2nd impression, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967.

_____ Early Greek Philosophy & Other Essays, translated by Macimilian A. Mugge, Vol.II of The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1911.

_____ On the Future of Our Educational Institutions, Homer and Classical Philology, translated with introduction by J.M. Kennedy, Vol.III of the Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, edited by Dr. Oscar Levy, Edinburgh and London: T.N. Foulis, 1909.

POCOCK, J.G.A., "The History of Political Thought: A Methodological Enquiry," in P. Laslett and W.G. Runciman ed., Philosophy, Politics and Society, 2nd series, Oxford: Blackwell, 1962, PP.182-203.

_____ Politics, Language and Time, London: Methuen, 1972.

RIEZLER, Kurt, "Discussion on Nietzsche," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.6, No.3 (1945), pp.294-298.

ROUECK, J.S., "A History of the Concept of Ideology," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.5, No.4, (1944), pp.479-488.

SCHURMANN, Franz, Ideology and Organisation in Communist China, 2nd edition, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

SKINNER, Quentin, "The Limits of Historical Explanation," Philosophy, Vol.XLI, No. 157, (July 1966), pp.199-215.

_____ "Political Theory: The Unimportance of the Great Texts," Political Studies Association Conference, 1968.

SPITZER, Leo, "Geistesgeschichte vs. History of Ideas as Applied to Hitlerism," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.5, No.2 (1944), pp.191-203.

TEGGART, Friedrich J. "Causation in Historical Events," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.III, No.1 (1942), pp.3-11.

WEINER, Philip, P. "Some Problems and Methods in the History of Ideas," Journal of the History of Ideas, Vol.XXII, No.4, (1961), pp.531-548.

WOLIN, Sheldon, Politics and Vision, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961.