

## Introduction

ANDREW FRAYN

Since the centenary of the declaration of the First World War in August 2014, there has been a renewed focus on its meaning in the twenty-first century. The initial response in 2014 was characterized by reconsiderations of the war as a whole, from the academic to the popular. Notable among these was the BBC's Jeremy Paxman-fronted *Britain's Great War* (2014), which did a commendable job within the confines of four hours of primetime television. Recent years have seen prominent commemorations of notable battles and campaigns such as Gallipoli and Jutland; the rules of engagement, to borrow a military metaphor, continue to be broadened.<sup>1</sup> This ground is fought over once more in interpretative terms, and the discussion shows little sign of abating. Combatant nations were affected irrevocably by the First World War. Political institutions and national boundaries changed for many; in all cases the social fabric was altered profoundly. The war played a key role in hastening the decline of empire, from Dublin to Delhi, and the expansion of the franchise by gender, age and (lack of) financial qualification promised a more democratic nation. The cultural impact resonated widely and continues to echo, from the disillusioned works of the War Books boom of 1928-30, written as the 'fit country for heroes to live in' was failing to materialize, to the increased focus on remembrance beginning in the mid to late 1980s as the Thatcher government looked to reinforce cohesive ideals of nationhood after the Miners' Strike. This special issue of *Modernist Cultures* on 'Modernism and the First World War' re-examines canonical works using new critical methodologies, brings into focus oft-neglected middlebrow authors, and makes visible marginalized texts, as well as attending to links between modernism and the *materiel* of war. The contributors to this issue illustrate the range of

innovative scholarship that is taking place at the intersection of the New Modernist Studies and First World War Studies.

Much critical work has been done over the last twenty years to ensure that First World War Studies and Modernist Studies speak to each other. For a cultural moment that prizes the internal and the aesthetic, it is imperative to situate modernist texts in the context of the violence and uncertainty of the early twentieth century. Influential studies by Allyson Booth, Angela K. Smith, Vincent Sherry and Trudi Tate ensured that the First World War was not viewed as a break from the development of high modernism, but as necessarily intertwined with it.<sup>2</sup> Sara Haslam offers a pithy survey of literary modernism and the First World War in Adam Piette and Mark Rawlinson's compendious *Edinburgh Companion to Twentieth-Century British and American War Literature* (2012).<sup>3</sup> However, reluctance remains to link the two. Caution about not over-identifying, say, *The Waste Land* with the First World War is wise and understandable, but too often the relationship between modernism and the First World War continues to be avoided in the interests of not fetishizing it. Indeed, in the pages of *Modernist Cultures* there has only been one article that names the First World War in the title: Ann-Marie Einhaus's thought-provoking 'Modernism, Truth and the Canon of First World War Literature'.<sup>4</sup> Lorraine Sim's exploration of Lee Miller's captivating photographs is the only other article to declare its allegiance to war studies in the title.<sup>5</sup> The same is true of other major journals: work on war and modernism has, as here, tended to be collected into valuable special issues, such as 'Wars', in the *Journal of Modern Literature*, 'Writing War, Writing Lives', in *Textual Practice*, and 'The Great War: Centenary Perspectives', in *The Space Between: Literature and Culture, 1914–1945*.<sup>6</sup> *Modernism/modernity* has had the steadiest trickle of articles in this mode.<sup>7</sup> There is still space to see more consideration of First World War Studies under the expanding aegis of modernist

studies.<sup>8</sup> Patrick J. Quinn and Steven Trout's edited collection *The Literature of the Great War: Beyond Modern Memory* (2001) was an early attempt to shift discussion beyond the terms outlined by Paul Fussell's seminal, but now dated, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (1975), although Nanette Norris's recent collection *Great War Modernism: Artistic Response in the Context of War, 1914-1918* (2016) reasserts the value of the canon.<sup>9</sup> Adding further nuance to definitions of war literature is vital in thinking more precisely about the enduring impact of the conflict, particularly in communicating the range, texture, and variety of First World War literature and experience to non-academic audiences.

Writing about previous wars, whether literary, historical, or critical, is necessarily distorted by retrospect and the prevailing views of the contemporary moment. There is, however, certainly value in the return to the scene of the modern, as Michael North puts it; writing about the First World War can help us to understand war writing more generally.<sup>10</sup> To do so helps us to understand better the ways in which manifold and diverse narratives, which now often seem unlikely or counterintuitive, coexisted during the First World War. Rather than returning to the beginning or end of the war, or to major advances, battles, celebrities, dignitaries and events, these essays primarily examine how the war was written as it continued. Contributors were asked to engage with 1917 or wartime writing, although this was a suggestive guideline rather than a diktat. This special issue points to the texture and complexity of the war as it happened. The process of refining representations of the conflict into memory and narrative means that the mess of immediacy is tidied, and incongruous aspects overwritten.

Wartime writing should be considered distinct from war writing. Writing produced during a conflict, particularly in a nation directly touched by war, differs from that written at other times and that represents the subsequent material and/or psychological impact. In wartime,

survival is the ongoing aim, particularly of those fighting, while family and friends wait to hear via letters, postcards and official communications whether they have been successful; all tend to experience the present as a point in the drive towards completion of the war. It is that fundamental difference in the experience of wartime that I suggest is worth treating separately to works written in retrospect, with the undoubted benefit of hindsight. Santanu Das asks: 'Where do we draw the line? Are all poems written between 1914 and 1918 war poems? Not necessarily – all wartime poems, like all poems by war poets, cannot be called war poetry. To qualify as a First World War poem, the war does not have to be directly present or mentioned, but at the same time some context of the war has to be registered and evoked, however obliquely.'<sup>11</sup> The points of intersection of these categories are blurred. For example, should writings about mass culture during wartime be considered wartime war writing? Poems that comment in typically modernist manner against the proliferation of mass culture might feasibly be understood as criticizing the structures and conditions that bring the war into being – the poems of Richard Aldington's *Images* (1915) are one such instance. Although wartime writing is not necessarily war writing, in detailing directly the impact of the current conflict, it certainly benefits from being read in the context of the war.

Wartime narratives, even those not predominantly about the conflict, are shaped differently from post-war or peacetime narratives. As the war rumbled through its fourth and into its fifth year, and British and Entente actions, including the Third Battle of Ypres (Passchendaele), failed to provide long hoped-for breakthroughs, an end to the conflict seemed as far away as ever. Officials were planning several years ahead, and authors were caught between the difficulty of imagining the war's end and the necessity of believing that it could happen: an ending seemed perpetually deferred. In June 1917 the Imagist poet F. S. Flint wrote

to the French poet André Spire, concluding with this forceful paragraph: ‘And will this war ever finish? What a wretched state of affairs. Everybody, both the soldiers and the leaders, are sick of it, and it cannot end, since the will of the people is stronger than them and the rest of us.

Eventually the poor world will get out of it and make up its accounts. Perhaps it will find the means to settle them. I fear not. . .’<sup>12</sup> Flint’s rhetorical question gives a sense of the widely felt enervation at this stage of the war. Soldiers battled physical and mental exhaustion using, as recent research has shown, potent cocktails of alcohol and narcotics, the latter often provided in handy hampers by the finest department stores.<sup>13</sup> Worries about friends and family drained those in support roles and those who were not fighting at the front, including fears about whether combatant acquaintances would return, and how they would be changed by the experience.

These concerns were expressed in wartime fiction, notably in Rebecca West’s *The Return of the Soldier* (1918), and this trope continues into post-war fiction in the figure of the intrusive shell-shocked veteran – Joe in Arnold Bennett’s *Riceyman Steps* (1923) is just one example.<sup>14</sup>

Civilians were also faced by a new set of worries as it became possible to conduct war from new angles and greater distances: the impact of the new war in the air was profound. F. S. Flint, Ford Madox Ford, and Violet Hunt were among many writers to comment on the giant, fearful spectres of the Zeppelins in the night sky and the experience of waiting for them to pass.<sup>15</sup> Many struggled to cope with the unpredictability and constant danger of total war, as civilians were made vulnerable in previously unimaginable ways, and combatant agency was increasingly attenuated by structural issues of modernity such as bureaucracy and technology.

A significant body of recent scholarship is engaged in recuperating the immediate experience of being at war. Intimate and emotional histories have begun to proliferate, led by Joanna Bourke’s trailblazing *An Intimate History of Killing* (1999), which followed her excellent

*Dismembering the Male* (1996).<sup>16</sup> Michael Roper's *The Secret Battle* (2009) examines the connections between soldiers on the Western Front and their families, particularly their mothers, while Jason Crouthamel provides a more theoretical account of soldiering masculinity in *An Intimate History of the Front* (2014).<sup>17</sup> In a similar vein, Peter England's *The Beauty and the Sorrow: An Intimate History of the First World War* (2011) was a notable popular success, even though it had its academic detractors, Bourke among them.<sup>18</sup> In his note to the reader he writes about the value of recognizing the difficulty faced in parsing war experience by those confronting its violence: 'This is a book about the First World War. It is not, however, a book about what it *was* – that is, about its causes, course, conclusion and consequences – but a book about what it was *like*. In this volume the reader will meet not so much factors as people, not so much events and processes as feelings, impressions, experiences and moods.'<sup>19</sup> England implicitly highlights the development of a strand of historiography from below that looks beyond the military and political. In her formidably wide-ranging *Authoring War* (2011), which cuts a swathe through the last 3500 years of war literature, Kate McLoughlin argues that 'Wartime in modernity refers not to a single temporal mode – the time of war. Rather it houses many temporalities, each one, as we will see, a structure of feeling with its own affective qualities, its own expressivity, its own silences.'<sup>20</sup> It is, of course, true that wartime is experienced radically differently by those who participate in it in a range of ways, and who experience widely varying amounts of agency. The use of Raymond Williams's notoriously flexible notion of structures of feeling, which he discusses in *The Long Revolution* (1961) and *Marxism and Literature* (1977), testifies to the febrile and manifold quality of time in war. The difficulty of reclaiming the ripples and cross-currents of any historical moment that Williams expresses in his discussion of these terms is even more pronounced in wartime, where officially sanctioned narratives are

skewed by war aims, and personal narratives can be affected dramatically by the overriding desire for resolution to the uncertainty created by the conflict.

Several influential recent studies have started to bring the moment of wartime into focus, particularly from the post-9/11 USA: current writing on war – and writing on current wars – also informs new understandings of the First World War. Mary A. Favret makes the case that affect is important in histories of wartime in her compelling *War at a Distance* (2010): ‘If we take wartime less as an object of cognition bounded by dates – a period – and more as an affecting experience which resonates beyond the here and now, then wartime literature becomes an attempt to trace and give shape to such affect, to register its wayward power.’<sup>21</sup> Favret links the affective experience of wartime particularly to waiting for the delivery of news, emphasizing that the experience of wartime is one of anxiety and anticipation. Paul K. Saint-Amour goes further, in his wide-ranging *Tense Future: Modernism, Total War, Encyclopedic Form* (2015), in arguing that ‘the memory of one world war was already joined to the spectre of a second, future one, framing the period in real time as an *interwar* era whose terminus in global conflict seemed, to many, foreordained.’<sup>22</sup> While it is important to learn lessons from history, we must not slip into seeing the First World War only as a teaching moment. Assuming a superior decision-making ability to those involved posits the ability to see and resist the work of ideology: to look directly at the moment of major events shows us the pernicious ways in which ideologies take hold.

War impacts on narrative shape: there is an insistent looking towards the end. In her study of *War-Time* (2012), Mary L. Dudziak puts it plainly: ‘Built into the concept of wartime is the assumption of an inevitable endpoint.’<sup>23</sup> However, this is paradoxically achieved by looking to the past, rolling back to the last good configuration, to borrow from the language of computing. Dudziak goes on: ‘To imagine the future requires an understanding of the past. In

wartime thinking, the future is a place beyond war, a time when exceptional measures can be put to rest, and regular life resumed. The future is, in essence, the return to a time that war had suspended.’<sup>24</sup> It is often the case that First World War literature looks forward by looking back, although this is not always by means of nostalgic idealism. For writers as different as Gilbert Frankau and D. H. Lawrence, the end of the war offers the opportunity, respectively, for modernisation and improvement.<sup>25</sup>

Sarah Cole’s essay opens this issue, furthering the critical debate about wartime in her discussion of ‘H. G. Wells and the Wartime Imagination’. Cole highlights the peril of the civilian in the mechanical war of modernity, moving from Wells’s invasion literature, focusing on *The War in the Air* (1908), to his wartime writing, in the form of *Mr. Britling Sees It Through* (1916). In the former, the Cockney savant Bert Smallways is thrust into the maelstrom of total war by an unlikely series of coincidences, while Cole insistently returns us to wartime in discussing *Mr. Britling Sees It Through*, whose very title speaks to the mood I have outlined above: the necessity of persevering and continuing in the face of doubts about whether and how the war should continue. Wells was always worried about the prospect of war, and the ability of new technologies to affect the way that it was conducted. Even before the Wright Brothers had flown in December 1903, Wells was anticipating the deleterious impact of aerial warfare, writing in his successful non-fiction *Anticipations of the Reaction of Mechanical and Scientific Progress Upon Human Life and Thought* (1901), usually more concisely known as *Anticipations*, that ‘the nature of the things that will ultimately fight in the sky is a matter for curious speculation’.<sup>26</sup> He continued to make remarkable predictions throughout his career. While *The War in the Air* is entertaining, and eerily prescient given subsequent events in the Second World War, *Mr. Britling Sees it Through* is perhaps the greater achievement, showing the journey of a typical Briton – the



significance of the name is inescapable – from support of the conflict in its opening phases to support without illusion in the later stages as the conflict endured. Cole’s contribution reminds us just how remarkable such a novel was as a popular success at that moment, and her essay identifies wider links with the development of narratives about total war.

The First World War was also notable for the military impact on scientific and technological developments. The war stimulated the development of air warfare, as Cole has already shown us and Brett Holman has illuminated more widely; Trudi Tate has discussed the impact of the tank.<sup>27</sup> While modernist artistic production was usually a countercultural concern, in some notable instances it came to engage directly with mechanisation and mass culture.<sup>28</sup> The First World War stimulated some remarkable developments in art. The 2016 exhibition *Truth and Memory: British Art of the First World War* at the York Art Gallery demonstrated, in the largest presentation of First World War Art since the Royal Academy’s *The Nation’s War Paintings* (1919), the breadth of production during the war, but also its striking vividness. The artistic practices that led to the development of dazzle camouflage, which Eric White discusses here, can be seen in such paintings as Wyndham Lewis’s Vorticist *Officers and Signallers* (1918) and his powerful, vast *A Battery Shelled* (1919), parts of which regularly feature on modernist book covers, but which is rarely seen as a whole. Dazzle camouflage is not camouflage *per se*, but works to disrupt the possibility for sensory enhancement offered by modern technologies, demonstrating the clear links between modernist art and military technique. White sees the development of dazzle camouflage as central to technicities of sensory augmentation. He takes us back to the shift in the position of *Blast* between the first issue, mostly completed in late 1913 and published in June 1914, and the second issue, the War Number: ‘technicities were alternatively presented as heroically aggressive (usually in the work of Lewis), but elsewhere,

increasingly defensive, a process driven by a sense of the body and the city's vulnerability to attack'. Building on work by the Italian Futurists, White posits that Dismorr and Saunders perform a type of poetic dazzle camouflage, seeing the full range of cultural production by artists and authors affiliated with Vorticism on the same continuum. In thinking about the way in which this none-more-outsider art form was co-opted into national service, White notes the oppositional position of Edward Wadsworth, the key figure in the development of dazzle camouflage, within the journal and movement from which it came.

While this collection endeavours to look beyond the usual modernist literary suspects, two essays discuss canonical authors using distinctive approaches. Gemma Moss's essay on music and the sound of war in Ford Madox Ford's *Parade's End* tetralogy (1924-1928) contributes to a developing body of work on music and literature. The existing scholarship has often focused on music's links with poetry, particularly the work of Ivor Gurney, and musical forms of remembrance, although Glenn Watkins has offered a wider ranging survey in the North American context.<sup>29</sup> Here, Moss continues the work of Emma Sutton in discussing representations of music in war fiction.<sup>30</sup> Building on recent works by these critics, and by Daniel Albright, Brad Bucknell, and Josh Epstein, Moss furthers the burgeoning interdisciplinary critical discourse for talking about literary representations of music. The work of these critics, which primarily discusses classical composers, is elsewhere augmented by interdisciplinary studies of popular music, including John Mullen's monograph on popular song in First World War Britain and Peter Grant's admirably wide-ranging analysis of representations of the First World War in popular song from *chansons* to heavy metal.<sup>31</sup> Moss situates Ford as acutely conscious of the musical sphere, as a result of his father Franz Hüffer's position as a literary critic, Ford's childhood in Pre-Raphaelite circles, and his own love of music hall and association

with early twentieth-century cultural figures. The case is made clearly for the changing role of music in understanding the world. Even famously epic and complex music such as Wagner cannot fully describe the new experiences of the First World War.

Modernist Studies has one of the most wide-ranging archives of personal correspondence. Letters between authors, and between authors and official bodies, offer a valuable window into their lives beyond their published literary works. While we are all wary of the biographical fallacy, this work is valuable in allowing us to detect issues of tone more clearly, and to develop our understanding of the relative endorsement of characters' viewpoints. Official correspondence can tell us much about the everyday life of modernism. Personal correspondence, however, offers us a view of writers in off-guard moments, moments in which they are writing for an audience of one, and often an intimate or otherwise familiar singular audience. While there were of course censorship restrictions during the war, these archives offer us real insight into the day-to-day lives of both combatants and civilians (the former subject to greater censorship). Alice Kelly discusses one such archive in her essay, in which she analyses Katherine Mansfield's wartime correspondence. Her detailed and attentive reading of Mansfield's letters, mostly to her soon-to-be husband John Middleton Murry, demonstrates how the language of the front was, as Kelly puts it, mobilized in response to the war. The language of the war permeated widely and continues to do so, as recent studies of the enduring representations of the war in literature and culture by Dan Todman, Michael Paris, and Jessica Meyer have demonstrated.<sup>32</sup> Kelly argues that Mansfield's letters show a particular 'political Mansfield' that is not so explicitly put forward in her subtle, evocative short stories. This essay also makes clear that there is work to be done on a theory of correspondence. This will have particular value for modernist studies as we continue to engage with the recent collected editions of key modernist authors such as T. S. Eliot

and Samuel Beckett, and it will give us the critical tools to reassess already published author archives such as those of D. H. Lawrence and Virginia Woolf. Work continues apace on editions of the correspondence of other authors, such as Ford Madox Ford and Dorothy Richardson. Kelly's work illustrates the significance of correspondence in both modernist and war studies.

The final two essays of the issue examine non-canonical authors and unfamiliar fronts. Mark Morrisson's essay on esoteric modernism takes as its key text the occultist Aleister Crowley's *Moonchild*, written in 1917 but not published until 1929. Crowley was on the fringes of modernist circles, like many notable London literary and cultural figures of the time. At the moment of modernism's incipience, his involvement may have been greater: he wrote to F. S. Flint in 1909, for example, asking him to contribute to Crowley's journal *Equinox*, but Flint seems, perhaps wisely, to have declined.<sup>33</sup> Morrisson builds on earlier important work by Alex Owen and discussions of occult practices by W. B. Yeats and Arthur Conan Doyle in staking a claim for the particular importance of attempts to contact the dead in wartime.<sup>34</sup> Spiritual ceremonies were, for Morrisson, an act of resistance against technological warfare which threatened to become a permanent state of affairs. Crowley's practices offered the potential for consolation by the ability to contact loved ones. A large and visible part of the population seemed perpetually to occupy a space between life and death, lending Crowley's efforts to communicate across worlds a tangible sense of immediacy. The loss of soldiers was often felt as something ghostly, a disappearance – final leave-taking would perhaps be done many times, as soldiers came to and from the front, each time uncertain whether they would return. This is movingly depicted in H.D.'s *Bid Me to Live*, begun in 1918 and rewritten in the late nineteen twenties, the late nineteen forties, and the late nineteen fifties, before it was finally published by the Grove Press in 1960. Crowley's gatherings often had the benefit that the cup of libation that

was passed around actually consisted of strong opiate narcotics, another, if more rudimentary, way of numbing the pain of wartime existence and loss. For Morrison, Crowley's writings represent a crucial way of understanding the need to find respite from the uncertainty of war.

Morrison's essay is a reminder that there is much work to be done still on non-canonical war literature. In his focus on Crowley's novel, Morrison points to an archive that is underused by scholars of modernism. It is salutary to remind ourselves that the most popular novel of the First World War through the nineteen twenties was not one of the familiar texts, but Ernest Raymond's *Tell England* (1922), an improving public schoolboy tale.<sup>35</sup> To ignore the enduring power of such texts to provide consolation is to misread culture in the nineteen tens and twenties, and to forget that modernism's importance is in its influence and the particular readership it attained, rather than its popular appeal. If modernism is a response to and, often, a disavowal of mass cultural practices, then a greater engagement with a wider range of these sorts of texts should be explored. While critics such as Nicola Humble, Kate Macdonald, and Tom Perrin have explored the middlebrow novel, little work has been done on popular modernisms.<sup>36</sup> This is of particular importance for First World War literature. We receive and recycle a skewed version of the war that does no favours to the texts we read for the often narrow version that we put across. Too often figures such as Sassoon and Owen are reduced to their anti-war texts when, in reality, their poetry shows clear marks of a journey towards that viewpoint. Sassoon's and Graves's early poetry is in many cases enthused by the prospect of military service, even if not unquestioningly. Owen's '1914' wraps his critique of 'The foul tornado, centred at Berlin, / Is all over the width of Europe whirled' in a language so highfalutin that it seems impossibly archaic compared to his later criticisms of the war and attenuates the message. Sassoon's 'France', with its 'they are fortunate, who fight', and Graves's 'The Shadow of Death', with its egregiously

clunky ‘To fight and kill is wrong – / To stay at home wronger’, show a more active approbation for military service at the outset.<sup>37</sup>

Along with the effort to look at non-canonical texts in particular national contexts, a corresponding recent direction in modernist studies has been the increasing focus on the global, as we shift our focus away from the Anglophone canon. Recent collections by Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough, and Stephen Ross and Allana C. Lindgren compile work from across the globe, while John Brannigan’s work on *Archipelagic Modernism* (2014) and Susan Stanford Friedmann’s on *Planetary Modernisms* (2015) (reviewed in the present issue of *Modernist Cultures*) suggest an enduring need to connect modernisms across local, regional, national, and international boundaries.<sup>38</sup> In terms of First World War Studies, scholarship is increasingly working to recuperate the experiences of marginalized groups during the conflict. Santanu Das continues to work extensively on Indian experience during the conflict, while other scholars have examined Caribbean soldiers and Britain’s war in South America.<sup>39</sup> There is still much more to be learnt about experiences of the conflict around the globe – the world in the world war. Considering the central role of European nations in conflict and unity over the past hundred years once again seems urgent.<sup>40</sup>

Here, Bjarne S. Bendtsen’s essay keeps us closer to home, but on a neglected front of the conflict: the Northern Front. Bendtsen focuses on the Danish modernist author Emil Bønnelycke, particularly his remarkable war novel *Spartanerne* (*The Spartans*, 1919). Bønnelycke’s writing has striking points of intersection with Anglophone modernist practice, from his diachronic novel structure, which was used to similarly powerful effect by H.D. in *Palimpsest* (1926), to his concrete poetry. Bendtsen’s essay translates parts of the novel into English for the first time. He discusses its contribution to a narrative of the war that is unique to its national context and

simultaneously shows striking similarities with better-known modernist forms and texts.

Bendtsen makes it clear that Bønnelycke is a major European modernist author who deserves translation to reach a wider audience.

Concluding with Morrisson's and Bendtsen's essays points towards a multiplicity of future directions that are available at the intersection of the New Modernist Studies and First World War Studies. Modernist Studies remains vibrant and industrious, as the work on editing the collected works of a number of key authors suggests, and there is much more to read and analyse beyond, or in conjunction with, the authors that remain most familiar. The material culture of the war remains a fascinating exercise in modern archaeology, as White points out here; elsewhere Ross Wilson and Nicholas J. Saunders have done valuable work on this topic.<sup>41</sup> Canonical modernist authors can still be productively seen anew, as Moss and Kelly illustrate. Morrisson and Cole both pay detailed attention to familiar names with many unfamiliar texts – H. G. Wells is perhaps particularly neglected in analyses of the war – and Bendtsen's essay reminds us of the world beyond most of our knowledge, rendered inaccessible by language and accessible only through important scholarship such as this.

To look at the immediate experience of conflict seems timelier than ever. I write the final paragraph of this introduction on Remembrance weekend, in the shadow of the 2016 US election. As nations turn inward and the binds of collectivity that arose from the global conflicts of the early twentieth century are threatened, it is vital to return to those wars to remind ourselves why such measures were taken. Living now in the post-memory of the First World War, where it is experienced through myth and abstraction, it is important to remember actively: remembering, not only remembrance.<sup>42</sup> Venerating those who fought must come with looking squarely in the face the brutalising experience of doing so, and the official and quasi-official narratives that

made this seem, for many if not most, a duty. It is also necessary to remember the other side. Some enjoy violence, and revel in enacting it. The conditions that lead to this attitude and behaviour must be understood, but not condoned. It has become axiomatic that to fail to understand history's mistakes is to repeat them. To read previous wars using new theories and methodologies gives us fresh insights into the processes that accompany historical events; to be cognisant of that developing understanding gives us the chance to resist and arrest the repetition of such tragic conflict as farce.

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, Metin Gürcan, *The Gallipoli Campaign: The Turkish Perspective* (London: Routledge, 2016); Innes McCartney, *Jutland 1916: The Archaeology of a Naval Battlefield* (London: Conway, 2016).

<sup>2</sup> Allyson Booth, *Postcards from the Trenches: Negotiating the Space between Modernism & the First World War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996); Angela K. Smith, *The Second Battlefield: Women, Modernism and the First World War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000); Vincent Sherry, *The Great War and the Language of Modernism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Trudi Tate, *Modernism, History and the First World War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998).

<sup>3</sup> Sara Haslam, 'The "moaning of the world" and the "words that bring me peace": Modernism and the First World War', in *The Edinburgh Companion to Twentieth-Century British and American War Literature*, ed. by Adam Piette and Mark Rawlinson (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), pp. 47-57.



---

<sup>4</sup> Ann-Marie Einhaus, 'Modernism, Truth, and the Canon of First World War Literature', *Modernist Cultures*, 6 (2011), 296-314.

<sup>5</sup> Lorraine Sim, 'A different War Landscape: Lee Miller's war photography and the ethics of seeing', *Modernist Cultures*, 4 (2009), 48-66.

<sup>6</sup> 'Wars', ed. by Robert L. Caserio, special issue of *Journal of Modern Literature*, 37.3 (2014); 'Writing Wars, Writing Lives', ed. by Kate McLoughlin, Lara Feigel and Nancy Martin, special issue of *Textual Practice*, 29 (2015); 'The Great War: Centenary Perspectives', ed. by Mark D. Larabee, special issue of *The Space Between: Literature and Culture, 1914-1945*, 10 (2014).

<sup>7</sup> See Sarah Cole, 'Dynamite Violence and Literary Culture', *Modernism/modernity*, 16 (2009), 301-28; Jan Mieszkowski, 'Great War, Cold War, Total War', *Modernism/modernity*, 16 (2009), 211-28; Mark Antliff, 'Henri Gaudier-Brzeska's *Guerre Sociale*: Art, Anarchism and Anti-Militarism in Paris and London 1910-1915', *Modernism/modernity*, 17:1 (2010), 135-69; Seamus O'Malley, 'Listening for Class in Ford Madox Ford's *Parade's End*', *Modernism/modernity*, 21:4 (2014), 689-714; Austin Riede, "'Artificial Guts": Labor and the Body in David Jones's *In Parenthesis*', *Modernism/modernity*, 22:4 (2015), 691-711.

<sup>8</sup> In addition to the present issue of *Modernist Cultures*, see also the journal's forthcoming issue on 'Ireland and the First World War' (*Modernist Cultures* Vol. 12. No. 3, Autumn 2017), guest-edited by Mark S. Quigley.

<sup>9</sup> *The Literature of the Great War: Beyond Modern Memory*, ed. by Patrick J. Quinn and Steven Trout (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001); Paul Fussell, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975); *Great War Modernism: Artistic Response in the Context of War, 1914-1918*, ed. by Nanette Norris (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2016).

---

<sup>10</sup> Michael North, *Reading 1922: A Return to the Scene of the Modern* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

<sup>11</sup> Santanu Das, 'Reframing First World War Poetry: An Introduction', *The Cambridge Companion to the Poetry of the First World War*, ed. by Santanu Das (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 3-34 (p. 9).

<sup>12</sup> F. S. Flint to André Spire, 7 June 1917, in *Imagist Dialogues: Letters between Aldington, Flint and Others*, ed. by Michael Copp (Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2009), p. 210. The original is in French; the translation is Copp's.

<sup>13</sup> See, for example, Virginia Berridge, 'Drugs, alcohol and the First World War', *The Lancet*, 384: 9957 (2014), 1840-1; Sara Haslam, 'A literary intervention: writing alcohol in British Literature 1915-1930', *First World War Studies*, 4:2 (2013), 219-39.

<sup>14</sup> Arnold Bennett, *Riceyman Steps* (1923; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 38, pp. 51-3, for example.

<sup>15</sup> F. S. Flint, 'Zeppelins', in *Some Imagist Poets, 1917: An Annual Anthology*, ed. by Amy Lowell (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1917), pp. 57-9; Ford Madox Ford and Violet Hunt, *Zeppelin Nights: A London Entertainment* (London: John Lane, 1916). On the latter, see Vincent J. Cheng, 'The *Zeppelin Nights* of Ford Madox Ford', *Journal of Modern Literature*, 15:4 (1989), 595-7.

<sup>16</sup> Joanna Bourke, *Dismembering the Male: Men's Bodies, Britain and the Great War* (London: Reaktion, 1996); Joanna Bourke, *An Intimate History of Killing: Face-to-Face Killing in Twentieth-Century Warfare* (London: Granta, 1999). See also, *Emotions and War: Medieval to Romantic Literature*, ed. by Stephanie Downes, Andrew Lynch and Katrina O'Loughlin (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).

---

<sup>17</sup> Michael Roper, *The Secret Battle: Emotional Survival in the Great War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009); Jason Crouthamel, *An Intimate History of the Front: Masculinity, Sexuality, and German Soldiers in the First World War* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).

<sup>18</sup> Joanna Bourke, 'Pity and War Histories', *Times Literary Supplement*, 30 November 2011. <<http://www.the-tls.co.uk/articles/public/pity-and-war-histories/>> [accessed 28 October 2016].

<sup>19</sup> Peter Englund, *The Beauty and the Sorrow: An Intimate History of the First World War* (London: Vintage, 2011), p. ix.

<sup>20</sup> Kate McLoughlin, *Authoring War: The Literary Representation of War from the Iliad to Iraq* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), p. 49.

<sup>21</sup> Mary A. Favret, *War at a Distance: Romanticism and the Making of Modern Wartime* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), p. 11.

<sup>22</sup> Paul K. Saint-Amour, *Tense Future: Modernism, Total War, Encyclopedic Form* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), p. 8.

<sup>23</sup> Mary L. Dudziak, *War-Time: An Idea, Its History, Its Consequences* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 15.

<sup>24</sup> Dudziak, *War-Time*, p. 22.

<sup>25</sup> See Andrew Frayn, *Writing Disenchantment: British First World War Prose, 1914-30* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014), pp. 79-86, 120-36.

<sup>26</sup> Wells, *Anticipations*, p. 191.

<sup>27</sup> Trudi Tate, *Modernism, History and the First World War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1998), ch. 5; Brett Holman, *The Next War in the Air: Britain's Fear of the Bomber, 1908-1941* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

---

<sup>28</sup> For another example of the military application of artistic practice, see Marjorie Gehrhardt and Suzanne Steele, 'Frederick Coates: First World War "facial architect"', *Journal of War and Culture Studies*, 10 (2017), <<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17526272.2016.1238564>> [accessed 14 November 2016].

<sup>29</sup> Kate Kennedy, 'Ambivalent Englishness: Ivor Gurney's song cycle *Ludlow and Teme*', *First World War Studies*, 2:1 (2011), 41–64; Glenn Watkins, *Proof through the Night: Music and the Great War* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003).

<sup>30</sup> See 'Literature and Music of the First World War', ed. by Kate Kennedy and Trudi Tate, special issue of *First World War Studies*, 2:1 (2011), particularly Emma Sutton, 'Shell shock and hysterical fugue, or why Mrs Dalloway likes Bach', 17–26.

<sup>31</sup> John Mullen, *The Show Must Go On! Popular Song in Britain During the First World War* (London: Routledge, 2016); Peter Grant, *National Myth and the First World War in Popular Music* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). See also Don Tyler on US popular *Music of the First World War* (Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood, 2016).

<sup>32</sup> Dan Todman, *The Great War: Myth and Memory* (Hambledon: Continuum, 2005); Michael Paris, *Over the Top: The Great War and Juvenile Literature in Britain* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2004); *The First World War and Popular Cinema: 1914 to the Present*, ed. by Michael Paris (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999); *British Popular Culture and the First World War*, ed. by Jessica Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>33</sup> *Imagist Dialogues*, pp. 5-6.

<sup>34</sup> Alex Owen, *The Place of Enchantment: British Occultism and the Culture of the Modern* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004).

<sup>35</sup> Todman, *The Great War*, pp. 133, 156; Frayn, *Writing Disenchantment*, pp. 105-9.

---

<sup>36</sup> Nicola Humble, *The Feminine Middlebrow Novel, 1920s to 1950s: Class, Domesticity, and Bohemianism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001); *The Masculine Middlebrow, 1880-1950: What Mr Miniver Read*, ed. by Kate Macdonald (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); *Transitions in Middlebrow Writing, 1880-1930*, ed. by Kate Macdonald and Christoph Singer (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); *British Popular Culture and the First World War*, ed. by Jessica Meyer (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

<sup>37</sup> Wilfred Owen, '1914', in *The Poems of Wilfred Owen*, ed. by Jon Stallworthy (London: Chatto & Windus, 1985), p. 93; Siegfried Sassoon, 'France', in *Collected Poems 1908-1956* (London: Faber & Faber, 1984), pp. 12-13; Robert Graves, 'The Shadow of Death', lines 13-14, *Complete Poems*, I, p. 13.

<sup>38</sup> Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Stephen Ross and Allana C. Lindgren (eds), *The Modernist World* (London: Routledge, 2015); John Brannigan, *Archipelagic Modernism: Literature in the Irish and British Isles, 1890-1970* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014); Susan Stanford Friedman, *Planetary Modernisms: Provocations on Modernity Across Time* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015).

<sup>39</sup> Santanu Das, *India, Empire and the First World War: Words, Objects, Images and Music* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, forthcoming), and his edited *Race, Empire and First World War Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); Ian Cardozo, *The Bravest of the Brave: the Extraordinary Story of Indian VCs of World War I* (London: Bloomsbury India, 2016); Richard Smith, *Jamaican Volunteers in the First World War* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009); Phillip A. Dehne, *On the Far Western Front: Britain's First World War in South America* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2009).

---

<sup>40</sup> See, for example, *A Civil War of Words: The Cultural Impact of the Great War in Catalonia, Spain, Europe, and a glance at Latin America*, ed. by Xavier Pla, Maximiliano Fuentes, and Frances Montero (Oxford: Peter Lang, 2016).

<sup>41</sup> Ross Wilson, *Landscapes of the Western Front: the Materiality of the Great War* (London: Routledge, 2011); Nicholas J. Saunders, *Killing Time: Archaeology and the First World War* (Stroud: Sutton, 2007); Saunders, *Trench Art: A Brief History and Guide*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn (Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2011).

<sup>42</sup> On the idea of post-memory see Marianne Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory: Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).