



Breeding Superman

*Nietzsche, Race and Eugenics in
Edwardian and Interwar Britain*

DAN STONE

LIVERPOOL UNIVERSITY PRESS

CHAPTER ONE

Oscar Levy: A Nietzschean Vision

... it was the Jews who started the slave revolt in morals; a revolt with two millennia of history behind it, which we have lost sight of today simply because it has triumphed so completely ... Let us face facts: the people have triumphed – or the slaves, the mob, the herd, whatever you wish to call them – and if the Jews brought it about, then no nation ever had a more universal mission on this earth.

Friedrich Nietzsche, *The Genealogy of Morals*, 1887, I: vii, ix

Surely it is not every one who is chosen to combat a religion or a morality of two thousand years' standing, first within and then without himself.

Oscar Levy, 'Editorial Note' to *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*, Vol. I, 1909, p. ix.

A book on Nietzsche, race and eugenics in Britain has no choice but to begin with Oscar Levy.¹ The editor of the first complete English edition of Nietzsche's *Collected Works* (1909–1913), he was a Jew and a German (both withholding and juxtaposing the two will be seen to be important) who in 1894 abandoned his father's banking business in Wiesbaden for the life of the mind, settling in London as a physician. Levy not only drove forward the reception of Nietzsche in Britain in the face of widespread indifference (though on the basis of the earlier efforts of others), but also wrote much and contributed more to the intellectual development of a whole 'school' of thinkers, centred mainly around A. R. Orage and the avant-garde weekly journal, the *New Age*.² His diagnoses of civilisation, penetrating and controversial, not only landed him in trouble with the authorities in the wake of the anti-alien backlash of the post-First World War period, but are still worthy of consideration for their early

insights into the coming European cataclysm. Although many of his claims, stemming as they do from his belief in the need to overthrow decadent Judeo-Christian values and replace them with an aristocratic conception of society, are inimical to today's mainstream beliefs, they are consistent, compelling, and not easily dismissed. That they also led Levy into the arms of some of Britain's most eccentric extremists, notably George Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, is only one of the conundra that I hope to address in this analysis of one of the most talented, committed and 'untimely' of British intellectuals.

Shortly after arriving in London, where he set up a doctor's practice, Levy had a 'moment of realization' during one of his trips to the British Museum, a moment described in his autobiography as follows:

I have the sudden thought that Monotheism etc. may not be 'Progress' after all, as I had been taught in school and life under the (unconscious) influence of Hegel. My Damascus: 'But then the Jews were wrong!?' The Chosen People not chosen for Beauty like the Greeks? Only for Morality, and what a Morality: the curses of J.C.! I have never recovered from my 'Damascus', and today at the age of 75, I hold it even with more fervour than 50 years ago.³

Once the influence of Nietzsche – who was recommended to him by an unknown female patient – is added to this self-description, one has a complete picture of the themes that would haunt Levy throughout his life: the role of religious ideas in history; the relationship of Judaism, Christianity and western civilisation; and the need for beauty and nobility in the realm of morality – all seen through Nietzschean lenses.

The history of Nietzsche's reception in England has already been written, so I will not reiterate it here.⁴ Suffice it to say that when Levy stated – as he often did – that to interest the English in Nietzsche was an uphill struggle, he was hardly exaggerating. Suffice it also to say that Levy eventually succeeded because, apart from practical considerations such as finance (which was taken care of by his father's money), he took the task on with a fervour that was nothing short of religious. In the editor's note to the first volume of the *Collected Works*, Levy wrote that 'this Cause is a somewhat holy one to the Editor himself'; in the introduction to the same volume, he spoke of Nietzsche's works in the same way a missionary talks of the 'Good News'; and in his 1932 introduction to the Everyman edition of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, Levy wrote of his earlier 'conversion' to Nietzscheanism.⁵ Furthermore, he succeeded in a way that would have delighted Nietzsche himself, confirming his claim that his notoriety would come from being misunderstood: the outbreak of war in 1914, and the general identification of Nietzsche with German

militarism and barbarism, despite Levy's valiant efforts to disprove the connection, probably did more for Nietzsche's (and Levy's) reputation in England than any essays by Havelock Ellis, lectures by Anthony Ludovici, or articles and letters to the press by Levy himself could ever hope to achieve. Levy, though he headed the Nietzsche movement in Britain, was atypical of it, in that he followed Nietzsche to the letter, especially concerning the role of the Jews in western history.

What was it then that Levy found so irresistible in Nietzsche? A good answer may be found in Levy's first book, *The Revival of Aristocracy* (1906). Although this book postdates Levy's discovery of Nietzsche, and although he later claimed to be somewhat embarrassed by it, the book adumbrates all the matters that were to preoccupy Levy all his life. Like so many cultural critics and scientists of the *fin-de-siècle*, Levy was drawn to the theory of degeneration, arguing that philanthropy, extended to the benefit of 'the feeble, commonplace, pitiable, unsound, and helpless' to the exclusion of the 'best', had led to the point at which, by the late nineteenth century, 'only a harmless flock of sheep was left surviving, mutually innocuous and useless'.⁶ Levy believed that a way out of this dangerous situation could be found in the teachings of Nietzsche: 'man might be regenerated; conceivably might a new shepherd be found for this straying herd of waifs; an aristocracy might be established to counterbalance that equalized and contemptible *rudis indigestaque moles*'.⁷ No doubt it was because of this note of optimism that Levy later distanced himself from this book, but his diagnosis of society remained unchanged.

Surprisingly, perhaps, the person who took most notice of *The Revival of Aristocracy* was A. R. Orage, the editor of the *New Age*. Orage was wide-ranging, and published writers of all political views. He had himself advocated an aristocratic understanding of Nietzsche's '*Übermensch*'.⁸ On reading Levy's book, he contacted Levy asking for twenty-five copies to sell through the pages of the *New Age*. Since this was a supposedly socialist paper, Levy's Nietzschean colleagues Ludovici and G. T. Wrench objected, but he persuaded them otherwise, and soon both were themselves regular contributors. Ludovici in fact made his name as an art critic in Orage's journal, with his bi-weekly column in the years 1913–1914. Later on, Levy had this to say about the *New Age*:

It was, on the whole, not a Socialist but a reactionary paper (which is the same). So reactionary, that most of its contributors were Medievalists – or of that Christian Secularist, such as Shaw . . . They lived in the past, to which they were frightened back by threatening chaos. They wished to put the clock back, as Chesterton once said, but they had not the Chesterton courage to confess it.⁹

Thanks to Orage, Levy found an audience, however small, for his views. Most importantly, he had found the most suitable outlet for airing his views on Nietzsche, from which base he could gather around him others committed to the Nietzsche cause.

The most important of these was Anthony Ludovici. Having been Rodin's private secretary for a year in 1906 and having then spent a year in Germany studying Nietzsche, to (some of) whose ideas he subsequently devoted himself, Ludovici was an ideal candidate for involvement with the Nietzsche movement. He quickly became Levy's protégé, 'one of the best disciples', was the main translator for the *Collected Works*, and gained some literary fame as a lecturer and publisher on Nietzsche.¹⁰ The two men were, at first, inseparable, being nicknamed 'The Lion and the Jackal' by the other readers in the British Library. Levy even paid for Ludovici to accompany him on a tour of Germany ('where AML enchants my sister'), Italy, Greece, Turkey and Palestine. Ludovici returned the favour by basing Dr Melhado – one of the main protagonists of his first novel *Mansel Fellowes* (1918) – on Levy.¹¹ Later on, when Ludovici became involved with the proto-fascist group the English Mystery, wrote articles in the *English Review* praising the Third Reich, turned to anti-semitism, and even travelled to Nuremberg to attend a rally, the relationship between the two men took a turn for the worse.¹² But with typical tolerance of his friends and disregard for women, Levy could never bring himself to break completely with Ludovici, and he blamed their differences less on Ludovici's political mistakes than on Ludovici's wife Elsie Buckley who, Levy believed, was aggrieved that she had earlier been spurned by him. According to Levy, after their marriage, 'Seven offensive letters followed from London, Ludo reproaching me for "coming from a decadent stock" etc., and apparently "leading him astray". I very much suspect, that it was all her game.'¹³

Levy's influence on Ludovici was enormous, and in the years of their close collaboration they shared a common interpretation of Nietzsche. This interpretation, popular among British Nietzscheans, saw Nietzsche as the herald of a 'transvaluation of values', in which the effete 'slave morality' of western civilisation would be replaced by a pagan, aristocratic, manly set of values. The emasculated condition of society was summed up in several pithy sentences by Levy in his introductions to the eighteenth and last volume of Nietzsche's *Collected Works* and to Gobineau's *The Renaissance*. Today, he wrote, we are faced with 'millions of slaves, many of whom are beyond any care and help, many whose propagation even threatens our society with an ignoble death from suffocation by its own refuse'. How did this come about? The answer lay in the type of values which had been propagated for the last two thousand years: '. . . our moral values, the values of Democracy, Socialism, Liberalism,

Christianity, lead to the survival of a type of man who has no right to survive, or who ought only to survive on an inferior plane'.¹⁴

The important difference that developed between Ludovici and Levy was on the response to this shared diagnosis. Where Levy stressed the role of moral ideas, Ludovici – like other Nietzsche scholars such as Maximilian Mügge or Paul Carus – gradually came to place more and more emphasis on breeding and race, on 'the impossibility of securing the preservation of the nation's identity (which includes its character, culture and institutions), except by preserving its ethnic type'.¹⁵ Levy was by no means immune to the latter theme. Indeed, while he excoriated Houston Stewart Chamberlain's *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* (1899) for its vulgar, *déclassé* antisemitism, which made the mish-mash of German peoples into the proud bearers of a pure Aryan heritage, Levy celebrated Gobineau as the discoverer of the all-importance of race. This meant, quite clearly for Levy, a 'refutation of the democratic idea that by means of an improvement in environment a healthy and noble person could be produced out of a rotten stock'.¹⁶ Levy often also cited Disraeli in order to defend his claim (indeed his admiration for Disraeli led him to translate *Tancred* and *Contarini Fleming* into German¹⁷). But Levy's notion of 'stock' was not a racialised one, as it was for Ludovici and Mügge, who argued for the necessity of racial homogeneity. Rather, for Levy 'stock' meant above all 'breeding' in the sense of class position; a biological aristocracy.¹⁸ Thus although Levy praised 'that young and promising Eugenic Party', he also noted that 'the successful "breeding" of men can only be brought about by religious or philosophic faith', and that therefore one needed Nietzsche more than Galton.¹⁹ And hence he felt able to laud Gobineau in rather expansive terms:

Gobineau's [unlike Chamberlain's] was an honest Antisemitism, it was, like Nietzsche's, an historical Antisemitism: it had nothing whatever to do with modern Antisemitism, that movement born from fear, envy, and impotence . . . [i]t is an upright, a genuine, a gentlemanly Antisemitism, it is the Antisemitism of the aristocrat, who sees his very blood threatened by revolutionary religions. Both Nietzsche's and Gobineau's Antisemitism, therefore, included of course Christianity.²⁰

The mention of Christianity in this context is revealing. As a Jew, Levy felt more obliged to take the position on breeding that he did than he otherwise might have done, although he never had any qualms about publicly advertising his delight in 'Christian baiting'.²¹ His aristocratic vision led him to stress class above race, but there is a certain tension involved in his doing so. When he discusses that obsession of the British degeneration theorists, the disintegration of

Empire, he contradicts his invocation of Disraeli's and Gobineau's dictum that 'all is race', arguing that 'It was intermarriage with the non-race, with the people, that led to the ruin of Rome: it was the mixture of different classes much more than the mixtures of different races that produced that decadent and servile chaos of the later Roman Empire'.²²

The racial element that remained, however, is what lends to Levy's thesis its frisson. For although the power of the Roman Empire had not simply undergone racial degeneration, but had 'been 'sapped' by an uncongenial and poisonous code of values',²³ this poisonous code had been propounded by the Jews. On the one hand, then, Levy shies away from arguments that proceed from the belief that modern Europe can only be rescued from degeneration by the creation of racial homogeneity through eugenic measures, arguing instead for a kind of pre-nationalist aristocratic vision of a pan-European ruling caste;²⁴ on the other hand he accepts Nietzsche's claim, primarily expounded in the *Genealogy of Morals*, that the people who have led Europe to the moral abyss which has sought equality at the expense of health, vigour and achievement are the Jews.

Like Nietzsche, Levy was consistent in this claim, seeing Christianity as the child of Judaism, and its more successful continuer of the slave morality in ethics. This is the reason why Levy attacked Chamberlain so fiercely, but lionised Gobineau: since the Germans claimed to be Christians, a religion which historically neglected the body in favour of the spirit, their claim for racial superiority was disingenuous: 'What cannot and must not be tolerated is the confusion of these two contradictory values – Race and Christianity'.²⁵ While Levy was not alone in this period in arguing for an aristocratic revivalism,²⁶ his arguments are more original than most because they do one thing that the others do not: they explain European civilisation through a consistent methodological insistence on the history of moral ideas as the driving force of history. His argument runs something like this: modern European society is degenerating because it is bound to an effete moral value system; these effete values derive from Judaism, from that Judaism which developed when the 'early white Semites mixed their blood with lower races and thus degenerated';²⁷ this Jewish ethic was taken a step further by Christianity, which is a 'Super-Semitism'; Luther, the Reformation and Puritanism took Europe even further away from its manly origins; modern revolutionary movements such as led the French and Russian revolutions, though they believe themselves to be atheist, are in fact continuing to further the causes of Judeo-Christianity by their insistence on a utopian vision of equality and their contempt for the 'strong'; the archetypal example of this barbarism masquerading as civilised values is Germany; only an aristocratic revival – based on the attitude of the ancient

Jews – which scorns Christianity, the weak and feeble can save Europe from terminal decline.

*

This theory may have been sweeping, but in the first half of 1914, when the atmosphere was already darkening, it helped Levy make prescient claims about the fate of Europe. On the subject of individual liberty, he noted that

What in reality such liberty may lead to, the history of Germany with its two centuries of barbarism after the proclamation of liberty [by Luther] will teach us; a barbarism, by the way, which is only half painted over, and which no commercial success of modern Germany will ever hide from the eyes of the more cultured observers of Europe.²⁸

And in correspondence with George Chatterton-Hill, who wrote from Freiburg that he had ‘never known a nation so brutally chauvinistic’, Levy agreed:

There is no doubt about the hopeless state of culture in modern Germany – a state, all the more serious, as it is not felt by the Germans themselves, who, even when questioned about it only shrug their shoulders and say ‘Wir leben eben in einer Uebergangszeit’. If further pressed, where the ‘Uebergang’ leads to, they are silent, or order another glass of beer, beer being their anodyne against a bad conscience and a muddled mind.²⁹

This attack on the Germans was of course closely bound up with his own background. But in the event, he was proved correct, at least insofar as the outbreak of war confirmed his pessimistic assessment of the times. On the subject of the war, Levy was equally thoughtful. Although never having any inclination to become a naturalised Briton since, from his Nietzschean perspective, nationality was irrelevant, during the war he was at pains to stress how far removed he was from the ‘German temperament’. Even though he reluctantly returned with his wife Frieda and daughter Maud to Germany, in January 1915, on Frieda’s bidding (she could not stand the anti-German atmosphere in England), they soon moved on again to Switzerland. Throughout the rest of the war, Orage took the brave decision, in terms of popular opinion, to continue publishing Levy’s articles. These became increasingly devoted to defending Nietzsche’s reputation from the charge of being the muse of German militarism.³⁰

Thus Levy began to define himself using British political terminology: ‘I, as a Tory, object to Germany’s democracy and her democratic materialism and romanticism, which cultivate no virtues whatsoever and only lead to

uncleanliness in thought and action.’³¹ But neither this self-definition, nor Levy’s remarkable plea to the readers of the *New Age* on behalf of Germans who were being interned as enemy aliens in Britain,³² prevented Levy from continuing to appropriate Nietzsche’s position of the ‘good European’ as the position from which to criticise the whole European system. ‘It is idle,’ he wrote, ‘to think that this war will end wars: it will, on the contrary, only start a new Napoleonic Era of Wars. The gamble for the mastership of Europe has begun and it will not end until that mastership has been reached and Europe has become one and united.’³³ In his little book of *War Aphorisms* (1917), Levy warned: ‘If we do not re-educate ourselves in the matter of Christianity, then in a few decades the bloody religious dance of the national dervishes will begin again.’ But in a sign that he had lost some of the optimism of pre-war days, he ended the book with the claim that ‘the new, united Europe will be aristocratic or it will not be at all’.³⁴

This loss of optimism is confirmed in a series of articles which Levy produced for the *New Age*. Under the title ‘The German and the European’, Levy penned five imaginary conversations between the eponymous characters. The European attempts to convince the German that Christianity is the ultimate cause of the war, and that the unification of Europe under a ruling caste drawn from all nations is necessary, while the German sees only the immediate political causes, and retreats from the force of the European’s arguments – which he initially accepts – into appeals to Christianity and nationalism, and a vindication of Germany’s actions in the face of her isolation by the other great powers. They part unreconciled.³⁵

By the end of the war, Levy seemed to have lost any hope that the regeneration of Europe might be forthcoming. In another series of articles for the *New Age*, he made more dark predictions for the future. Asserting once again that “‘Down with the strong, long live the weak!’ is the secret watchword of every Christian and every democrat’, Levy went on to claim that this weakening did not make men less ready to go to war. On the contrary: ‘by weakening men we do not turn their thoughts towards peace, we make them quarrelsome and vindictive . . . Only the strong and healthy can remain at peace, provided they desire to do so; the weak and sickly, still more the impotent, cannot do so in any case, whether they want to or not.’³⁶ Hence the conclusion in 1919, which he headed ‘A Reflection for Optimists’, that ‘A war arising from mystic and moral motives cannot be ended by the application of social and economic nostrums. This does not mean that our diplomats will not conclude a peace; it only means that the peace they make cannot possibly be a lasting one.’³⁷ Levy’s writings after 1918, as before 1914, sought to explain in what these ‘mystic and moral motives’ consisted. For Levy the

explanation was straightforward, and in this straightforwardness lies the explanation's strength and its weakness.

★

On returning to London in April 1920 – an act which required some cunning manoeuvring around the Home Office, and gaining an entry visa from the Foreign Office – Levy found himself rather isolated, and the mood of the city changed. Even many of his earlier friends spurned him, as they could obviously not be seen to be acquainted with an 'enemy alien'. As a result, he moved to a hotel in Margate, where he could work undisturbed. In the move, however, he 'forgot' to mention his change of address to Bow Street police, a legal requirement for aliens. The hotel owner thoughtfully reported his presence to Margate police for him.³⁸

It was perhaps his lack of friends that made Levy's acquaintance with George Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers all the more explicable. But there is no need for psychological guesswork. Both men clearly shared to a remarkable degree their understanding of the world around them. This understanding was to drive Pitt-Rivers into the arms of Nazism, while Levy remained committed to his aristocratic international; but it was the same understanding nevertheless.

The two men met at the offices of the *New Age*, and exchanged ideas over lunch. Not only did Pitt-Rivers believe that the chief causes of the 'contemporary disasters' were spiritual, but more importantly he believed that 'The spirit which led this world into disaster and will continue to do so, unless stopped in time, is the spirit of your own race . . . the Semitic spirit'.³⁹ When Pitt-Rivers went on to explain to Levy that 'only the Jews can deliver us from the Jews', by which he meant that the comparative racial purity of the Jews could yet be a source of strength in overcoming the problem which they themselves had spawned, Levy was convinced. He had himself earlier declared, in a classic expression of 'honest antisemitism', that

The world still needs Israel, for the world has fallen a prey to democracy and needs the example of a people which has always acted contrary to democracy, which has always upheld the principle of race. The world still needs Israel, for terrible wars, of which the present one is only the beginning, are in store for it; and the world needs a race of good Europeans who stand above national bigotry and national hypocrisy, national mysticism and national blackguardism.⁴⁰

Undertaking the unlikely task of pre-emptively defending him from charges of antisemitism, Levy agreed to write a preface for Pitt-Rivers's pamphlet, *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution* (1920).

This remarkable piece of writing is easy to dismiss simply as Jewish self-hatred. Yet although Levy was certainly so deeply immersed in the current beliefs about Jews and Judaism that he accepted too readily many of the prevailing stereotypes,⁴¹ there was nevertheless a good reason for his approach. His Nietzschean critique of civilisation took as its starting point an attack on a value system supposedly introduced by the Jews, and continued by Christianity in both its religious and post-religious (modern, revolutionary) manifestations.

Beginning with a sweeping claim that chimes in exactly with what Pitt-Rivers had already said to him over lunch, Levy wrote:

There is scarcely an event in modern Europe that cannot be traced back to the Jews . . . all latter-day ideas and movements have originally sprung from a Jewish source, for the simple reason, that the Semitic idea has finally conquered and entirely subdued this *only apparently irreligious* universe of ours. It has conquered it through Christianity, which of course, as Disraeli pointed out long ago, is nothing but 'Judaism for the people'.⁴²

He then goes on, summarising Pitt-Rivers's argument, to assert that this history-of-ideas approach means that the author of the pamphlet can in no way be regarded as a vulgar antisemite. Since Levy believes that a certain type of antisemitism 'does the Jews more justice than any blind philo-semitism . . . that merely sentimental "Let-them-all-come-Liberalism", which is nothing but the Semitic Ideology over again' (pp. viii–ix), he has no qualms about naming himself an antisemite: 'If you are an anti-Semite, I, the Semite, am an anti-Semite too, and a much more fervent one than even you are . . . We have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred' (p. x).

In what, then, have the Jews erred? Levy accepts all of Pitt-Rivers's allegations: the Jews, whether consciously or not, have been the principal agents of economic and political misery in the world, through their dealings in international finance and their actions in promoting democracy and revolution; Bolshevism, as the bearer of an originally Jewish ideal of equality for the masses, was successful because it was opposed only by democracy, itself a product of the same forces. This argument, however, leads Levy into the realms of conspiracy theory, where he sounds more like Nesta Webster – the modern English originator of such theories – or Lady Birdwood – her latter-day successor⁴³ – than Nietzsche. Seeing nothing but the play of ideas in history, he asserts that 'There is a direct line from Savonarola to Luther, and from Luther to Robespierre, and from Robespierre to Lenin' (p. iii). Thus Bolshevism 'is a religion and a faith' (p. iv).

What is shocking in this piece is not merely Levy's summary of the effects of the Jewish morality in history:

We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we, who have even boasted of having given it 'the' Saviour, we are to-day nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners . . . We who have promised to lead you to a new Heaven, we have finally succeeded in landing you in to a new Hell. (pp. x-xi)

Levy also argues, and here his claims become more interesting, that the Jews, under the teachings of Nietzsche, can reverse the situation begun by their ancestors two thousand years before:

Yes, there is hope, my friend, for we are still here, our last word is not yet spoken, our last deed is not yet done, our last revolution is not yet made. This last Revolution, the Revolution that will crown our revolutionary work, will be the revolution against the revolutionaries . . . It will pass a judgment upon our ancient faith, and it will lay the foundation to a new religion. (p. xii)

The Jews, the underminers of western civilisation, are the only people able to rescue that civilisation from further deterioration. Self-hatred is yet self-aggrandisement.

The article caused something of a minor storm. Antisemites applauded – the same vulgar antisemites Levy believed himself to be combating – and Jewish groups were understandably horrified. Pitt-Rivers may have been charming, but he was nevertheless among the small number of truly committed extremists in Britain. Taken in by his superficial scholarship, Levy made the mistake of believing Pitt-Rivers to be truly interested in saving civilisation by, through criticising them, saving the Jews.⁴⁴

Here Levy's exceptionalism regarding the Jews becomes clear. Many Jewish commentators applauded Nietzsche's philosemitism, but omitted to mention his attack on the Jewish origin of the slave morality.⁴⁵ Some, such as the German scholars Maximilian Stein, Leo Berg and Auguste Steinberg, did not omit the awkward aspects of Nietzsche's thought, but left them 'muted or explained away'.⁴⁶ Levy, however, accepted and vociferously propounded them all.

Hence positive reviews of Levy's preface coming from the far right, including one from Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent*,⁴⁷ were decidedly not to Levy's liking. In contrast to the Jewish thinkers, they applauded the first half of Levy's argument, but failed to mention the second. As Levy later complained in *My Battle for Nietzsche in England* (the manuscript of which he sent to Pitt-Rivers for correction in 1926), they 'omitted to give my complaints about English Puritanism and its connection with capitalism, democracy and

plutocracy . . . [They] likewise skipped my remark about the inner and profound similarity of the Scotch, Jewish, American and English financiers.' And that, Levy protested, was essential to note if one was to understand 'the comprehensive anti-Semitic tendency of my preface, that was the anti-Jewish as well as the anti-Christian view point of my introduction'.⁴⁸ Levy's views on the Jews, though they may appear bizarre, were in fact consistent with Nietzsche's. Yet in the history of Nietzsche-reception in Britain, few thinkers – whether of left or right, Jewish or not – were willing to follow Nietzsche to the letter in his harsh assessment of the Jewish origins of modern western civilisation. As one scholar puts it, 'while many laid the axe to Jewish roots, Nietzsche sought to cut the fruit off the tree. Nietzsche did not seek to cut off the Jews, but rather to value their ancient roots and integrate their modern descendants into a new society'.⁴⁹ Levy likewise cut himself off from the mainstream of early twentieth-century political thought by insisting on the validity of the *whole* of Nietzsche's *Zivilisationskritik*. He may have shared some ideas with the social Darwinists, some with the eugenicists, the aristocratic revivalists, the antisemites, the Zionists and the Jewish philosophers, but Levy's exceptionalism lies in the fact that none of them could follow him consistently, for all of them would have found their ideas contradicted by doing so.

The only journal accurately to report what Levy wrote was *Plain English*, the vehemently antisemitic hate-sheet run by Lord Alfred Douglas, in his post-Oscar Wilde reincarnation as Catholic antisemite. Yet even he dismissed Levy's claims about the relationship of Christianity to Judaism as a 'trick' because the consequence of accepting the argument would necessarily have to be the de-Christianisation of Europe. Levy wrote to the paper, which he praised as 'the only review which takes questions of religion seriously', setting out in detail his position. Again stating the inextricable link between Christianity and Judaism, Levy argued that his antisemitism

includes, and very much so . . . the Christians. No Christian has a right to be an anti-Semite, for he is himself a Semite, nay a Super-Semite. No Christian must accuse Jews of revolutionary tendencies, for he is himself the follower of a God with revolutionary tendencies. No Christian must condemn Jews for their socialism and Bolshevism for these Jews are simply good Christians, and those who accuse them are knowingly or unknowingly repudiating their own God.

In the following issue, Douglas dismissed Levy's piece as 'mere Jewish raving'.⁵⁰

The publicity surrounding this piece provided the opportunity wanted by the Home Office to deal with Levy who, as the major promoter of Nietzsche (and hence of German militarism) in England, was already viewed with some suspicion. In the wake of the passing of the 1919 Aliens Act, Levy became a victim of official British xenophobia. He was deported in October 1921.

Levy's case became something of a *cause célèbre*. The press devoted considerable attention to it, most of it admonishing the government for its determination to 'make an example' out of Levy, citing its shameless rejection of his contribution to British cultural life over the previous twenty years as, as one commentator put it, 'a curious reflection on the civilisation which went to war in the cause of "liberation"'.⁵¹ More chilling undertones can be detected in Hilaire Belloc's contribution. Belloc maintained that Levy's expulsion was an outrage because of his unusual honesty: 'he had never hidden his true nationality nor changed his name, nor used any of those subterfuges which, even when excusable, are dangerous and contemptible in so many of his compatriots'.⁵² And the antisemitic newspaper *The Hidden Hand or Jewry Über Alles* lauded Levy as 'the most courageous and honest Jew living', applauded him for not having 'changed his name to Levin, or Lawson, or Livingstone, or Lawrence, or Lincoln, or any other of the *aliases* affected by weaker brethren of his name', and blamed the Home Secretary's decision to deport him on the secret machinations of the Learned Elders of Zion, of whom 'Mr Shortt is merely the tool'.⁵³

Levy himself discussed his expulsion publicly only in 1932, in his introduction to the Everyman edition of *Thus Spake Zarathustra*. He treats the subject lightly, yet it is clear that being forced to leave England had pained him greatly. He explains the reasons why he did not apply for naturalisation: 'I had only the battle "Culture against Barbarism" at heart; I was not interested in the fight "Nation against Nation", knowing very well that, whatever its results, it would only lead to more Barbarism.'⁵⁴ Despite his protests against the decision, he was informed that only those Germans 'who were "of definite benefit to British trade" were allowed to remain – alas! I was only the importer of a few new but very odd and doubtful ideas!' (p. 60). Yet he ends on a note of defiance, revelling in his literary achievements: 'Now the British Government could drive out the body of his apostle, but never the spirit which he had brought to these shores and far beyond these shores' (p. 61).

A year later, on the receipt of a Nansen passport for stateless people, Levy divided his time between Wiesbaden and the south of France. In 1924 he travelled to Italy to meet Mussolini, and he finally left Germany for good just before Hitler took power in 1933. He left France for England in 1938, on his

daughter's persuasion, returned to France, and then, being in England when the war broke out in 1939, he remained there until his death in 1946.

*

After 1921, Levy's ideas developed in response to the rise of fascism. After visiting Mussolini, he penned a panegyric which is naive to the extent that it is uncritically celebratory. Levy saw in Italian fascism the only serious attempt thus far to combat Bolshevism – which, being descended from Christianity, Levy saw as the greater threat – on its own terms, that is, spiritual ones. Since 'behind all modern political movements there are spiritual forces', only ideas, he believed, could fight ideas; fascism fitted the bill perfectly. Convinced by Mussolini that fascism was motivated by great spiritual forces, Levy concluded:

Fascism is not only an antidote, but likewise a remedy against Bolshevism. For Bolshevism is not so much a revolutionary as it is a reactionary creed. Bolshevism wishes to put the clock back to the old principles of the French Revolution: it even stands up most shamelessly for Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. These ideas, however, have decayed, nay, have become idols which are as good as dead: it is for the new fascistic movement to bury them altogether and to enthrone in their place other ideas and living aspirations for the guidance and progress of mankind.⁵⁵

What was it in his Nietzschean arsenal that persuaded Levy to support fascism? The literature on the subject of the links between Nietzsche's thought and fascism is large, and needs no introduction here.⁵⁶ Most of it deals with Nazism, and Levy's original response to that ideology will be dealt with shortly. But in the early 1920s, when many Italian Jews were joining the Fascist party, fascism was not primarily an antisemitic movement. On 26 May 1934 Mussolini declared himself to be a student of Nietzsche. And in the immediate aftermath of the March on Rome, it is hardly surprising that Levy felt drawn to Mussolini. For all the attempts to prove that the fascists, especially the Nazis, distorted Nietzsche, on a simplistic level the affiliations between Nietzsche and fascism are obvious and were behind Levy's initial enthusiasm: the language of strength, vitality and scorn for the weak, the idea of the Superman and the fascist 'new man', and race-regeneration. Levy also mistakenly believed that fascism was compatible with Nietzsche's aristocratic radicalism, and was therefore disappointed by its rabble-rousing.

Levy soon recanted when he realised what a terrible miscalculation he had made. As he wrote in his autobiography, recalling the time he met Pitt-Rivers

Anthony Mario Ludovici: A ‘Light-Weight Superman’

I prefer to be known by posterity as a writer of accurate and prophetic vision, rather than as a time-server and stooge of Philistinism who acquired ephemeral fame by toeing the conventional line marked out by his least enlightened contemporaries.

Anthony Ludovici, *Confessions of an Antifeminist*, 1969, p. 355

Who has ever seen an old man who did not praise former times and condemn the present, loading on to the world the weight of his own wretchedness and on to the manners of men his own melancholy!

Michel de Montaigne, ‘On Judging Someone Else’s Death’, *Essays*, II:13

In November–December 1908, at the age of 26, Anthony Mario Ludovici lectured at the University of London on the subject of Nietzsche’s philosophy. From the man who later translated Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche’s infamous biography of her brother, it comes as no surprise to find statements such as the following: ‘The strong *will* and must discharge their strength, and in doing so, the havoc they may make of other beings in their environment is purely incidental.’¹ In 1967, displaying a remarkable lifelong attachment to ideas that had long since become unfashionable, Ludovici claimed in his last book that ‘everywhere in Europe the mob, high and low, has been indoctrinated with the Liberal heresy that heredity plays no part in human breeding, and that therefore special endowments cannot be transmitted from one generation to another’.²

In this chapter I discuss the writings of Anthony Ludovici, a man who, despite his many publications (over fifty books and pamphlets, and numerous articles), has been almost totally forgotten.³ The interest of Ludovici’s extreme

ideology lies not in the fact that he was the only person to espouse the views he did – at least before 1939 – but in the fact that he continued to maintain his position until his death in 1971, entirely failing to modify his opinions. Furthermore, the peculiar *mélange* of ideas which went into making Ludovici's ideology cannot easily be labelled with any familiar term. I argue that we should not forget the 'extremes of Englishness' just because its ideas, here represented by Ludovici, did not ultimately inform policy.⁴

While it would be overstating the case to claim that Ludovici's writings were widely influential, he was well known as a public figure, whose ideas, particularly early on in his career, acquired some intellectual currency. But the Whiggish view of history which still dominates interpretations of British fascism – that its failure was a result of the inherent strength of British parliamentary institutions – means that he has long been ignored. Ludovici's idiosyncratic blend of Förster-Nietzscheanism, Lamarckianism, social Darwinism, anti-semitism, anti-feminism, monarchism and aristocratic conservatism was, however, not as ridiculous to Edwardian minds as it is to ours today; it is easy to dismiss Ludovici as a crank, and therefore miss the fact that many of his ideas chimed in with those being espoused by people on the left as well as on the right certainly before 1914, and even until 1939. I argue that reminding ourselves of the existence of men such as Ludovici – who was not as marginal as might at first appear – can help in dispelling the complacency which still surrounds the historiography of British fascism.

Studying Ludovici can also provide a wider context for the stormy intellectual milieu that witnessed the birth of modernism. W. B. Yeats, for example, was a mystical nationalist and eugenicist, and in *On the Boiler* (1939) his ideas – with the exception of antisemitism – were very close to those of Ludovici.⁵ And advocating eugenics, even if not of the extreme, 'negative' sort with its total dependence on hereditary factors,⁶ was as common on the left in the Edwardian and post-First World War period – Shaw, Ellis, the Webbs – as on the right. There is a certain contingency about the play of ideas in intellectual and political life that was especially marked in the inter-war period. This is not to say that one cannot divorce right from left, or liberal from conservative, but that extremes can be incorporated into the life of the nation where a willingness to do so exists. Perhaps if Ludovici had written good poetry instead of bad novels he may – like Pound – have later been celebrated.

Anthony Mario Ludovici was born in 1882, the son of a painter.⁷ Brought up in London in the age of the height of Empire and the first stirrings of British decline (he was fourteen when E. E. Williams's scaremongering tract *Made in Germany* was published), in 1906 he worked as private secretary to the

sculptor (and misogynist anti-Dreyfusard) Auguste Rodin, followed by a year in Germany spent reading Nietzsche, whom he then set about promoting. In 1914 he enlisted, was wounded, and made a captain. Early on captivated by Nietzsche's phrase 'transvaluation of all values', Ludovici believed he had found the key to society's problems; the rest of his life was spent trying to persuade others of the veracity of his interpretation of this phrase. He was among the translators of Oscar Levy's first English edition of Nietzsche's works, and his first books were exegeses of Nietzsche's ideas, particularly as they related to art.⁸ As he put it, he believed that 'the best and subtlest way of illustrating and advocating the Nietzschean *Weltanschauung* was to employ an indirect approach and to show through history and current events how the application of Nietzschean values would prove salutary'.⁹

The most concentrated outpouring of Ludovici's works occurred, however, during the 1920s and 1930s, when he was a member of the English Mystery. Here he found the perfect forum for expounding his theories of degeneration, birth control and race-breeding. The group is usually characterised as part of the 'muck and mysticism' side of the British right, which indeed it was, with its stress on rural values, the link between blood and soil, and service to the monarch. But that does not fully encompass its activities, nor adequately express its ideological underpinnings. It is easy to dismiss as harmless lunatics a group that believed that England could 'once again' become a rural paradise; it is far less easy to dismiss it when one also finds out about its founder's involvement with Arnold Leese's Imperial Fascist League, one of the few genuinely Nazi organisations in Britain,¹⁰ and when one sees that the rural nostalgia of the English Array (the breakaway successor to the English Mystery) was indissociable from its antisemitism.

In what follows I will trace in outline Ludovici's output from his early work on aristocracy and degeneration, through his involvement with the English Mystery, and on into the postwar period. Doing so reveals several things. First, unlike most studies in the history of ideas, there is little change over time to be observed in this case, Ludovici's exceptionalism leaving him relatively uninfluenced by the enormous shifts in the intellectual and political climate of the twentieth century. Second can be seen the importance of such extreme ideologies in their English context: English writers were just as capable of combining civilisation and barbarism as *Mitteleuropa*, at least on paper. Fascism in Britain was not merely a politics of imitation, it also derived from home-grown problems. Third, there was nothing inevitable about the extreme right's inability to gain power, and the ideological casserole represented by Ludovici contained enough variation to appeal to a fairly broad spectrum, had conditions been more 'favourable'. It was correct to claim, as did one of his contemporaries,

that Ludovici 'threatens to become the professional champion of lost causes'.¹¹ Nevertheless, until after the Second World War, Ludovici was not shunned by the wider community; thus he needs to be situated firmly in the context of the complex interplay of ideas in the Edwardian and interwar periods, an interplay where Nietzscheanism, race and eugenics come together.

*

In 1915, when Ludovici published his first major work not devoted solely to Nietzsche, *A Defence of Aristocracy: A Textbook for Tories*, the urgency of his message would have been felt by a fairly large section of political opinion. Many took seriously theories of degeneration and other social pathologies, seeing as evidence for them the decline of imperial power, the rise of Labour, and rapid constitutional and social changes. Before the outbreak of the war, only the right's own lack of leadership prevented it from taking power, having precipitated Balfour's fall in November 1911.¹²

Ludovici's Nietzsche-inspired ideas of struggle and power developed in a heated ideological context, in which the Diehard peers, centred around Lords Milner and Willoughby de Broke, fought the Liberal government and their own party over the 1911 Parliament Bill and (especially) over Irish Home Rule, an issue that had the potential to lead Britain into civil war. On 4 July 1911, Lord Farnham, for example, threatened that the Home Rule Bill would 'end in plunging a part of the United Kingdom into a state of turmoil, strife, and bloodshed, if not indeed an actual state of civil war'. And Willoughby de Broke set up the British League for the Support of Ulster and the Union in March 1912 in an attempt to make the government recognise the seriousness of the Diehards' resolve. In the *Morning Post* of 8 November 1913, the League actually went so far as to call men to arms.¹³

It was a period of ideological retrenchment on the right, but a retrenchment which was stated in the most aggressive of terms, demanding tariff reforms, substantial increases in military spending, especially on the navy, conscription, 'national efficiency', and anti-alien legislation. Many of their demands were in fact met, with the government's finally agreeing, for example, to spend money on Dreadnoughts, or the Aliens Acts of 1905 and 1919. Most of these ideas were promoted through the various nationalist 'leagues' that sprang up in the Edwardian period, the Navy League (founded 1895) and the National Service League (1902) being perhaps the most influential.¹⁴ While the Diehards never left the world of parliamentary politics, they were certainly gearing up to do so in 1914 over the issue of Ireland, and they made of illiberalism, extreme nationalism, militarism and racism a base from which home-grown fascist

ideas could develop in Britain.¹⁵ Most importantly, in the years before 1914 the ideas of the Diehards were by no means those of a lunatic fringe, but were a powerful current in Unionist politics; indeed, one scholar suggests that their views 'were those of the mainstream rather than of a minority in Unionist ranks'.¹⁶ In this context Ludovici's writings do not look so unusual as they would do by the 1960s.

Thus Ludovici's claim that democracy bred weakness by ceding power to the masses was as familiar a refrain as was his assertion that true leadership could only be undertaken by an aristocracy set apart from the rest of the people. This was an argument that had been put forward by other thinkers attempting to revive Tory thinking. Willoughby de Broke, for example, wrote in 1913 of his conception of 'National Toryism', one which 'aims at the establishment of an aristocracy, not of birth, or of brains, but of instinct and of character . . . The national revival will follow on the great appeal to the national instinct'.¹⁷

Other, more philosophically minded thinkers were engaged in similar projects. T. E. Hulme, for example, whom we will encounter again below, wrote his *A Tory Philosophy* in 1912, in which he argued from 'the conviction that the nature of man is absolutely fixed and unalterable, and that any scheme of social regeneration which presupposes that he can alter is doomed to bring about nothing but disaster'.¹⁸ Most importantly, a 'revival of aristocracy' had been proposed in 1906 by Oscar Levy, as we have seen in Chapter 1. His 1906 book adumbrated many of the concerns with which Ludovici was to preoccupy himself for the rest of his writing career: degeneration, miscegenation, 'sickly modernity', 'sensible marriages', and 'an aristocracy . . . to counterbalance that equalized and contemptible *rudis indigestaque moles*'.¹⁹ Importantly, both Levy and Ludovici explicitly did not mean the existing British aristocracy, for they had betrayed the interests of the people, unlike their medieval forebears who had understood the meaning of *noblesse oblige*.²⁰

After 1918, this haughtiness, deliberately cultivated to be reminiscent of Nietzsche's 'aristocratic radicalism',²¹ contrived to keep Ludovici apart from the BUF, despite their shared racism. His political isolation was, however, by no means matched by social exclusion. Among other things he debated with Sylvia Pankhurst in the Oxford Union debating chamber (29 January 1936), and argued in print with Dora Russell, who correctly called Ludovici 'one of the most inveterate anti-feminists'.²² Ludovici was also discussed by guild socialists, at least those of a more organicist persuasion, who agreed with his aspirations – a revival of authority – but took exception to the means – the revival of aristocracy. Arthur Penty, for example, discussing Ludovici, fully sympathised with the desire to initiate 'measures for the public good'; he questioned, however, the

plausibility of Ludovici's suggestions, proposing instead of the 'authority of persons' the authority 'of *ideas* or *things*'.²³

Even before the First World War Ludovici had established a reputation for himself through his bi-weekly art column in the *New Age*, a column which gave rise to lively debate. When, for example, Ludovici attacked the sculptor Jacob Epstein, whose work was on display in the Twenty-One Gallery in London, T. E. Hulme responded by ridiculing Ludovici, calling him a charlatan, and 'a little bantam' with 'a little Cockney intellect'. Obviously having offended his taste for modernism, Ludovici was to feel the full weight of Hulme's withering vituperation. Most revealing here, however, is that in the pages of the *New Age* there were other people who had read Nietzsche; Hulme turned Ludovici's ideology against him, claiming that only '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'.²⁴ In response, Ludovici claimed that he was only trying to fight against 'anarchy in art', a claim which sufficiently annoyed Wyndham Lewis for him to become involved; in typical Lewisian style, he condemned Ludovici as 'obviously a fool' who wrote only 'dismal shoddy rubbish'.²⁵ In this small vignette Ludovici, far from being unknown, emerges as a minor player in the debates that surrounded the emergence of modernism, today's better-known players (Hulme and Lewis) becoming so aggravated mainly because they could not admit just how close in fact they were to Ludovici's way of thinking on most matters.

Notes

Notes to introduction

1. Harold W. H. Helby, letter to the *New Age*, XXXVI.2, 6 November 1924, pp. 21–22.
2. John Stevenson, 'Great Britain', in *Fascists and Conservatives: The Radical Right and the Establishment in Twentieth-Century Europe*, ed. Martin Blinkhorn, London: Unwin Hyman, 1990, pp. 268, 275.
3. Richard Thurlow, *Fascism in Britain: From Oswald Mosley's Blackshirts to the National Front*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2nd edn, 1998, p. 283.
4. Stanley G. Payne, *A History of Fascism 1914–1945*, London: UCL Press, 1995, pp. 303, 304.
5. Cited in John D. Brewer, 'The British Union of Fascists and Anti-Semitism in Birmingham', *Midland History*, 9, 1984, p. 109.
6. Roger Griffin, *The Nature of Fascism*, London: Routledge, 1991, p. 26.
7. Roger Eatwell, 'On Defining the "Fascist Minimum": The Centrality of Ideology', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 1.3, 1996, p. 313.
8. Dave Renton, *Fascism: Theory and Practice*, London: Pluto Press, 1999. But see Roger Griffin's response to Renton, 'Fascism is More Than Reaction', *Searchlight*, 291, September 1999, pp. 24–26.
9. Robert O. Paxton, 'The Five Stages of Fascism', *Journal of Modern History*, 70.1, 1998, pp. 1–23.
10. Peter Clarke, *Hope and Glory: Britain 1900–1990*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1997, p. 68.
11. Richard Griffiths, *An Intelligent Person's Guide to Fascism: Studies in Spokespersonship*, London: Duckworth, 2000.
12. Dick Pels, *The Intellectual as Stranger*, London: Routledge, 2000, pp. 110–55. See also the essays in *The Intellectual Revolt Against Liberal Democracy 1870–1945*, ed. Ze'ev Sternhell, Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1996, and in *The Pen and the Sword: Right-wing Politics and Literary Innovation in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Richard Griffiths, London: King's College London, 2000.
13. See T. E. Hulme, *Selected Writings*, ed. Patrick McGuinness, Manchester: Carcanet, 1998.
14. Maria Sophia Quine, *Population Politics in Twentieth-Century Europe: Fascist Dictatorships and Liberal Democracies*, London: Routledge, 1996, p. 134. The work of Giorgio Agamben should be mentioned in this context; see his remarkable book *Homo*

Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998, for a discussion of the origins of 'bio-power'.

15. Dorothy Porter, "Enemies of the Race": Biologism, Environmentalism, and Public Health in Edwardian England', *Victorian Studies*, 34.2, 1991, pp. 159–78.

16. See Bryan Cheyette, *Constructions of 'the Jew' in English Literature and Society: Racial Representations, 1875–1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, pp. 94–149. I will develop this theme in Chapter 5.

17. On Germany see, among many others, Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870–1945*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. On the USA see Daniel Kevles, *In the Name of Eugenics: Genetics and the Uses of Human Heredity*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2nd edn, 1995. On Scandinavia see Gunnar Broberg and Nils Roll-Hansen, eds, *Eugenics and the Welfare State: Sterilization Policy in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Finland*, East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1996.

18. Tom Segev, *One Palestine, Complete*, London: Little, Brown, 2001.

19. Georges Bataille, 'Nietzsche and the Fascists', in *Visions of Excess: Selected Writings, 1927–1939*, ed. Allan Stoekl, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1985, pp. 182–96; Julien Benda, *The Treason of the Intellectuals*, New York: W. W. Norton, 1969; Max Nordau, *Degeneration*, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1993, pp. 415–72.

20. See Chapter 1.

21. Weaver Santaniello, *Nietzsche, God, and the Jews: His Critique of Judeo-Christianity in Relation to the Nazi Myth*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994.

22. This is a point well made by Patrick McGuinness in his introduction to Hulme, *Selected Writings*, p. x. It applies no less to poets such as Basil Bunting and Mina Loy than to political and cultural critics.

23. R. G. Collingwood, *An Autobiography*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978, pp. 96–97ff. See also *idem.*, *The Idea of History*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1946, pp. 269–82.

Notes to chapter one

1. The only published article directly devoted to Levy is Uschi Nussbaumer-Benz, 'Oscar Levys nietzscheanische Visionen', in *Jüdischer Nietzscheanismus*, ed. Werner Stegmaier and Daniel Krochmalnik, Monographien und Texte zur Nietzsche-Forschung, Vol. 36, Berlin/New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1997, pp. 188–208, which relies heavily on Albi Rosenthal's unpublished paper, 'Die Nietzsche Rezeption in England bis zum Jahr 1914', delivered at the Nietzsche-Kolloquium, Sils-Maria, 29 September 1994. See also Albi Rosenthal, 'Betrachtungen über eine Nietzsche-Sammlung in England', *Nietzsche-Studien*, 19, 1990, pp. 479–87.

2. As Steven E. Aschheim has noted, 'Inasmuch as the early academic reception of Nietzsche was both hostile and slow, there may have been an initial grain of truth to the observation that Nietzsche tended to attract more marginal and "bohemian" elements.' See *The Nietzsche Legacy in Germany 1890–1990*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992, p. 36. This was the case for Britain, as the *Nation* complained in 'The Will to Power', 2 January 1909, and as Thomas Common noted in his 'Introduction to the Translation' to Friedrich Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future*, trans. Helen Zimmern, London: George Allen & Unwin, 4th edn, 1967 [1907], p. xv.

3. Oscar Levy, *Autobiography*, unpublished MS in the possession of Maud and Albi Rosenthal, p. 58.

4. David S. Thatcher, *Nietzsche in England 1890–1914: The Growth of a Reputation*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970; Patrick Bridgwater, *Nietzsche in Anglosaxony: A Study of Nietzsche's Impact on English and American Literature*, Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1972.

5. Oscar Levy, 'Editorial Note' and 'Nietzsche in England: An Introductory Essay by the Editor', in *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*. Vol. 1: *Thoughts out of Season, Part One*, ed. Oscar Levy, trans. Anthony M. Ludovici, Edinburgh/London: T. N. Foulis, 1909, pp. viii, xxvi; *idem.*, 'Introduction' to Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra: A Book for All and None*, trans. Thomas Common, rev. Oscar Levy and John L. Beevers, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1967 [second impression of 6th edn of 1932], p. 24.

6. Oscar Levy, *The Revival of Aristocracy*, trans. Leonard A. Magnus, London: Probsthain and Co., 1906, pp. 5–6, 39. Originally published in German under the less revealing title *Das neunzehnte Jahrhundert*, Dresden: E. Pierson's Verlag, 1904.

7. Levy, *The Revival of Aristocracy*, p. 52. The phrase 'rudis indigestaque moles' means 'rough, unordered mass', and is used by Ovid in *Metamorphoses* (I:7) to describe the chaos at the beginning of the world. Its use by Levy to describe people is therefore somewhat inappropriate. My thanks to Ben Tipping for this information.

8. A. R. Orage, *Friedrich Nietzsche: The Dionysian Spirit of the Age*, London/Edinburgh: T. N. Foulis, 1906; *idem.*, *Nietzsche in Outline and Aphorism*, Edinburgh/London: T. N. Foulis, 1907, especially pp. 165–75. See also Florence Farr, 'Superman Consciousness', *New Age*, 1.6, 6 June 1907, p. 92 for a review of Orage.

9. Levy, *Autobiography*, pp. 121–22.

10. Ludovici's lectures at the University of London at the end of 1908 and start of 1909 were published as *Who is to be Master of the World? An Introduction to the Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*, London: T. N. Foulis, 1909, with an introduction by Levy. He also published *Nietzsche: His Life and Works*, London: Constable and Co., 1910, and *Nietzsche and Art*, London: Constable and Co., 1911, as well as a number of articles in the *New Age*, *T.P.'s Weekly*, and elsewhere.

11. Anthony M. Ludovici, *Mansel Fellowes*, London: Grant Richards, 1918. Melhado is described (p. 11) as having a 'refined Jewish face', and he is later on made to proclaim (p. 220) that 'it must obviously be our duty to promote the best, the strongest and the most beautiful on earth . . .'

12. Anthony M. Ludovici, 'Hitler and the Third Reich', *English Review*, 63.1, July 1936, pp. 35–41; 63.2, August 1936, pp. 147–53; 63.3, September 1936, pp. 231–39. For more on Ludovici see Chapter 2.

13. Levy, *Autobiography*, pp. 126, 183–84. For Ludovici's version of the break see Chapter 2.

14. Oscar Levy, 'The Nietzsche Movement in England: A Retrospect, a Confession, and a Prospect', in *The Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche*. Vol. 18: *Index to the Complete Works*, ed. Oscar Levy, London/Edinburgh: T. N. Foulis, 1913, p. xvii. *Idem.*, 'The Life, Work and Influence of Count Arthur de Gobineau: An Introductory Essay by Dr Oscar Levy', in Arthur de Gobineau, *The Renaissance: Savonarola – Cesare Borgia – Julius II – Leo X – Michael Angelo*, trans. Paul V. Cohn, ed. Oscar Levy, London: William Heinemann, 1913, p. xvii.

15. Anthony M. Ludovici, *A Defence of Conservatism: A Further Textbook for Tories*, London: Faber and Gwyer, 1927, p. 117. See also Maximilian A. Mügge, *Friedrich Nietzsche: His Life and Work*, London/Leipzig: T. Fisher Unwin, 1909; *idem.*, 'Eugenics and the Superman: A Racial Science, and a Racial Religion', *Eugenics Review*, 1.3, 1909, pp. 184–93; Paul Carus, *Nietzsche and Other Exponents of Individualism*, Chicago/London: The Open Court Publishing Company, 1914. See Chapter 3.

16. Levy, 'Introduction' to Gobineau, *The Renaissance*, p. xv.

17. Lord Beaconsfield (Benjamin Disraeli), *Contarini Fleming: Ein psychologischer Roman*, trans. Oscar Levy, Berlin: Oesterheld and Co., 1909; *idem.*, *Tancred oder der neue Kreuzzug*, trans. Oscar Levy, Munich/Berlin: Georg Müller, 1914.

18. For a discussion of what is meant by 'biological aristocracy', see David Spitz, *Patterns of Anti-Democratic Thought: An Analysis and a Criticism, with Special Reference to the American Political Mind in Recent Times*, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949.

19. Levy, 'Introduction' to Gobineau, *The Renaissance*, pp. xxix, xxx, xxxv. Here Levy differed from the views of the Oxford philosopher and eugenicist F. C. S. Schiller, who believed that 'Nietzsche's preference for an aristocracy is biologically justified, because progress everywhere depends on the few who are capable of creating novelties'. See 'The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche', *Quarterly Review*, January 1913, p. 159, and Chapter 3 below.

20. Levy, 'Introduction' to Gobineau, *The Renaissance*, p. xlv. Cf. Henri Lichtenberger, *The Gospel of Superman: The Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*, trans. J. M. Kennedy, Edinburgh/London: T. N. Foulis, 1910, pp. 138–39; and, for dissent, L. H. Green, 'Nietzsche, Eugenics and Christianity', *The Commonwealth*, XIX.218, 1914, pp. 50–53, 81–83, 111–15, 147–48.

21. Levy, 'Nietzsche in England', p. xxv.

22. Levy, 'Introduction' to Gobineau, *The Renaissance*, pp. xviii–xix.

23. Oscar Levy, 'Nietzsche and the Jews', *New Age*, XVI.7, 17 December 1914, p. 170.

24. Cf. Oscar Levy, 'Introduction' to Leo G. Sera, *On the Tracks of Life: The Immorality of Morality*, trans. J. M. Kennedy, London: John Lane the Bodley Head, 1909, p. x.

25. Levy, 'Introduction' to Gobineau, *The Renaissance*, p. xlvi.

26. Cf., for example, J. M. Kennedy, *Tory Democracy*, London: Stephen Swift and Co., 1911; Lord Willoughby de Broke, 'Introduction' to Anon [Arthur Bountwood], *National Revival: A Re-Statement of Tory Principles*, London: Herbert Jenkins, 1913; Anthony M. Ludovici, *A Defence of Aristocracy: A Textbook for Tories*, London: Constable and Co., 1915; George Chatterton-Hill, *The Philosophy of Nietzsche: An Exposition and an Appreciation*, London: John Ouseley, n.d. [1913?], pp. 257–59; Thomas Common, 'The New Outlook', *Notes for Good Europeans*, 1.1, 1903, pp. 1–11, and 'Defects of Popular Secularism', *Notes for Good Europeans*, 1.2, 1903–1904, pp. 41–52.

27. Levy, 'Introduction' to Gobineau, *The Renaissance*, p. xviii.

28. Oscar Levy, 'A Book on Nietzsche', *New Age*, XV.4, 28 May 1914, pp. 89–90.

29. George Chatterton-Hill to Oscar Levy, 30 November 1913; Levy to Chatterton-Hill, 28 November 1913. Correspondence cited is in the possession of Maud and Albi Rosenthal.

30. See, for example, Edmund McClure, *Germany's War-Inspired: Nietzsche and Treitschke*, London: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1914; William Cross, *Nietzsche & the War*, Singapore: Methodist Publishing House, 1915; Herbert Leslie Stewart, *Nietzsche and the Ideals of Modern Germany*, London: Edward Arnold, 1915. This charge against Nietzsche was also made in France; see Douglas Smith, *Transvaluations: Nietzsche in France, 1872–1972*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996, pp. 62–63.

31. Oscar Levy, 'Gobineau and Chamberlain', *New Age*, XVI.10, 7 January 1915, p. 242.

32. Oscar Levy, 'Germans in England: An Appeal', *New Age*, XV.21, 1 October 1914, pp. 532–33.

33. Levy, 'Gobineau and Chamberlain', p. 242.

34. Oscar Levy, *Kriegsaphorismen für Europäer oder solche, die es werden wollen. Ein*

Versuch zur geistigen Mobilisierung, Bern/Biel/Zürich: Verlag von Ernst Kuhn, 1917, #97 (p. 80), #114 (p. 90).

35. Oscar Levy, 'The German and the European', Part I, *New Age*, XVII.8, 24 June 1915, pp. 176–79; Part II, XVII.12, 22 July 1915, pp. 270–72; Part III, XVII.17, 26 August 1915, pp. 399–402; Part IV, XVII.23, 7 October 1915, pp. 541–44; Part V, XVII.26, 28 October 1915, pp. 614–17.

36. Oscar Levy, 'The Idolatry of Words', Part I, *New Age*, XXIV.10, 9 January 1919, p. 161.

37. Oscar Levy, 'The Idolatry of Words', Part IV, *New Age*, XXIV.16, 20 February 1919, p. 261.

38. These details come from Oscar Levy, *My Battle for Nietzsche in England*, unpublished MS in the possession of Maud and Albi Rosenthal, pp. 10–11, 33–34. On the atmosphere in Britain in this period regarding 'aliens', see Tony Kushner and Katharine Knox, *Refugees in an Age of Genocide: Global, National and Local Perspectives during the Twentieth Century*, London: Frank Cass, 1999, pp. 64–100; William J. Fishman, *East End Jewish Radicals 1875–1914*, London: Duckworth, 1975, pp. 61–93; and, for the background, Bernard Gainer, *The Alien Invasion: The Origins of the Aliens Act 1905*, London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1972.

39. Levy, *My Battle for Nietzsche in England*, p. 15.

40. Oscar Levy, 'Nietzsche and the Jews', Part II, *New Age*, XVI.8, 24 December 1914, p. 195.

41. Cf. Ritchie Robertson, *The 'Jewish Question' in German Literature, 1749–1939: Emancipation and its Discontents*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999, p. 287, on Theodor Lessing's internalisation of and dependence on antisemitic stereotypes in his analysis of Jewish self-hatred.

42. Oscar Levy, 'Prefatory Letter' to George Pitt-Rivers, *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1920, p. vi. Further references in the text.

43. See Susan Cohen, 'In Step with Arnold Leese: The Case of Lady Birdwood', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 28.2, 1994, pp. 61–75; see also, following Birdwood's death in June 2000, Nick Lowles, 'A Very English Extremist', *Searchlight*, 302, 2000, pp. 17–21.

44. On Pitt-Rivers, see Richard Griffiths, *Fellow Travellers of the Right: British Enthusiasts for Nazi Germany 1933–39*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980, pp. 323–24; A. W. Brian Simpson, *In the Highest Degree Odious: Detention Without Trial in Wartime Britain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, pp. 217–18. Pitt-Rivers, 'somewhere between eccentric and dotty', was a cousin of Churchill's, and 'an appalling bore, with academic pretensions, who mixed in far-right circles, held racialist views, and was, understandably, thought to be pro-Nazi' (Simpson, *In the Highest Degree Odious*, p. 217). In *The Czech Conspiracy: A Phase in the World-War Plot*, London: The Boswell Publishing Co., 1938, Pitt-Rivers committed himself entirely to conspiracy theory. See also Elazar Barkan, *The Retreat of Scientific Racism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992, p. 288–95.

45. See Gert Matenkloft, 'Nietzsche dans les revues culturelles juives de langue allemande, de 1900 à 1938' and Bruce E. Ellerin, 'Nietzsche et les sionistes: Tableau d'un reception', both in *De Sils-Maria à Jerusalem. Nietzsche et le judaïsme. Les intellectuels juifs et Nietzsche*, ed. Dominique Bourel and Jacques Le Rider, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1991, pp. 93–109 and 111–19; David Ohana, 'Zarathustra in Jerusalem: Nietzsche and the "New Hebrews"', in *The Shaping of Israeli Identity: Myth, Memory, Trauma*, ed. Robert Wistrich and David Ohana, London: Frank Cass, 1995, pp. 38–60.

46. Aschheim, *The Nietzsche Legacy*, p. 95.

47. 'Dr. Levy, a Jew, Admits His People's Error', *Dearborn Independent*, 30 April 1921, reprinted in *The Jewish Question: A Selection of the Articles (1920–22) Published by*

Mr. Henry Ford's Paper The Dearborn Independent and Reprinted Later under the General Title of The International Jew, London: The Britons Publishing Society, n.d., pp. 211–21. Levy's preface was also praised by J. H. Clarke, author of *England Under the Heel of the Jew*, London: Britons, 1921, in his preface to the third edition of Harold Sherwood Spencer, *Democracy or Shylocracy?*, London: Britons, 1922, p. vii.

48. Levy, *My Battle for Nietzsche in England*, p. 36.

49. Weaver Santaniello, *Nietzsche, God, and the Jews: His Critique of Judeo-Christianity in Relation to the Nazi Myth*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1994, p. 134. See also Michael F. Duffy and Willard Mittelman, 'Nietzsche's Attitude Toward the Jews', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 49.2, 1988, pp. 301–17; Delphine Bechtel, 'Nietzsche et le dialectique de l'histoire juive', in *De Sils-Maria à Jerusalem*, ed. Bourel and Le Rider, pp. 67–79; Jacob Golomb, ed., *Nietzsche and Jewish Culture*, London: Routledge, 1997, Part I: 'Nietzsche's Relations to Jews, Judaism and Jewish Culture'.

50. Lord Alfred Douglas, 'The Levities of Mr. Oscar Levy', *Plain English*, II.51, 25 June 1921, p. 507.

51. 'The Expulsion of Dr. Oscar Levy', *English Review*, 33.5, November 1921, p. 429.

52. Levy, *Autobiography*, pp. 199, 200. Hilaire Belloc, *The Jews*, London: Constable and Co., 1922, p. 252.

53. 'Notes of the Month: Dr. Oscar Levy', *The Hidden Hand or Jewry Über Alles*, 2.9, October 1921, p. 2.

54. Levy, 'Introduction' to Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, p. 60. Further references in the text.

55. Oscar Levy, 'The Spiritual Basis of Fascism', *New Age*, XXXV.26, 23 October 1924, pp. 306–07.

56. See, for example, D. Gawronsky, *Friedrich Nietzsche und das Dritte Reich*, Bern: Verlag Herbert Lang & Cie., 1935; Richard Maximilian Lonsbach, *Friedrich Nietzsche und die Juden: Ein Versuch*, Stockholm: Bermann-Fischer Verlag, 1939; Crane Brinton, 'The National Socialists' Use of Nietzsche', *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 1.2, 1940, pp. 131–50; Konrad Algermissen, *Nietzsche und das Dritte Reich*, Celle: Verlag Joseph Giesel, 1947; Bernard H. F. Taureck, *Nietzsche und der Faschismus: Eine Studie über Nietzsches politische Philosophie und ihre Folgen*, Hamburg: Junius, 1989; Aschheim, *The Nietzsche Legacy in Germany*; Santaniello, *Nietzsche, God, and the Jews*; Martha Zapata Galindo, *Triumph des Willens zur Macht: Zur Nietzsche-Rezeption im NS-Staat*, Hamburg: Argument Verlag, 1995.

57. Levy, *Autobiography*, p. 251.

58. Though not entirely absent. See Gene Bernardini, 'The Origins and Development of Racial Anti-Semitism in Fascist Italy', *Journal of Modern History*, 49.3, 1977, pp. 431–53.

59. Oscar Levy, 'The Spirit of Israel', *Review of Nations*, March 1927, pp. 94–95.

60. Levy, 'Introduction' to *Thus Spake Zarathustra*, pp. 26, 28.

61. Heinrich Härtle, *Nietzsche und der Nationalsozialismus*, Munich: Zentralverlag der NSDAP, 1937, p. 54.

62. Oscar Levy, letter to the *New English Weekly*, 16 November 1933. See also Marius-Paul Nicolas, *From Nietzsche Down to Hitler*, trans. E. G. Echlin, London/Edinburgh/Glasgow: William Hodge and Co., 1938, pp. 105–07.

63. Oscar Levy, letter to the *Tablet*, 5 August 1939.

64. *Evening Telegraph and Post* (Dundee), 19 May 1934.

65. Oscar Levy, letter to the *Jewish Chronicle*, 8 July 1938. This was just one letter in a vigorous campaign of writing to newspapers and journals all over the world. For example, to the *Commonweal* in New York, Levy wrote (15 May 1936): '... dynamite,

as Nietzsche once called his message, may be excellent for blasting hard rocks and opening new roads, but in the hands of clumsy bunglers it may only too easily lead to disaster. If the Nazi experiment should bring this about, I beg to warn American readers, not to hold Nietzsche responsible, but his self-styled "Aryan" interpreters of the Fatherland.' To the *Birmingham Post* he wrote (6 May 1936): 'If, therefore, disaster should ensue from this utter falsification of a noble message, I beg to ask the thinking world of England not to hold Nietzsche's creed responsible, but its "Aryan" Ministers in the Fatherland.' To *The Scotsman* he wrote (31 August 1939): 'National-Socialism is really National-Bolshevism, and even Inter-National-Bolshevism. The Nazintern are as dangerous as the Comintern. Karl Marx is the patron saint of both the Bolshie and the Nazi Revolution. Against Karl Marx, however, there is only one antidote: Friedrich Nietzsche.' On the eve of the German invasion of Poland, this was an important message for readers of *The Scotsman*, which had been something of a platform for the pro-Nazi views of Captain Ramsay; see Richard Griffiths, *Patriotism Perverted: Captain Ramsay, the Right Club, and British Anti-Semitism 1939-40*, London: Constable, 1998, pp. 90-97.

66. The most important article in which was 'Das Zeitalter der Religionen' (October 1936), in which he argued for the need for a theology of National Socialism. 'Blood', 'Race', 'Soil', and 'Nation' [*Völkheit*] are the dogmas of Nazism; 'Reich, Volk und Führer' its trinity; and the idea of chosenness its form of predestination.

67. Oscar Levy, letter to the *Natal Mercury* (Durban), 16 September 1936.

68. Levy, *Autobiography*, p. 32.

69. Levy, *Autobiography*, p. 114.

70. Letter from Norman Douglas to Oscar Levy, 1 November 1936.

71. Norman Douglas, *How about Europe? Some Footnotes on East and West*, privately printed, 1929, pp. 136, 148, 175.

72. Oscar Levy, *The Idiocy of Idealism*, London/Edinburgh/Glasgow: William Hodge and Co., 1940, p. 34. Further references in the text.

73. Levy, *Autobiography*, p. 103.

74. John Llewelyn, 'sElection', in *Postmodernism and the Holocaust*, ed. Alan Milchman and Alan Rosenberg, Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi, 1998, pp. 191-92. For the argument that the only explanation for Nazism is religion cf. Michael Ley, *Genozid und Heilserwartung: Zum nationalsozialistischen Mord am europäischen Judentum*, Vienna: Picus Verlag, 1993; and *idem.*, 'Auschwitz: Ein historischer Essay', in *Auschwitz: Versuche einer Annäherung*, ed. Charlotte Kohn-Ley and Michael Ley, Vienna: Verlag für Gesellschaftskritik, 1996, pp. 96, 123.

75. See Ivan Hannaford, *Race: The History of an Idea in the West*, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996, for the argument that race-thinking is absent from classical texts.

76. See, for example, Keith Ansell-Pearson, *An Introduction to Nietzsche as Political Thinker*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, and, especially, Daniel Conway, *Nietzsche and the Political*, London: Routledge, 1997. For a corrective see Luc Ferry and Alain Renaut, eds, *Why We Are Not Nietzscheans*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997; and especially Fredrick Appel, *Nietzsche Contra Democracy*, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999.

77. See, for example, R. G. Collingwood, 'Notes on Historiography' (1939), in *The Principles of History*, ed. W. H. Dray and W. J. van der Dussen, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999, p. 237: 'Modern Germany thus stands officially committed to the same error which infected ancient Jewish thought, and which Paul exploded - the error of regarding a given community's historical function as bound up with its biological character, i.e. with the common pedigree of its members - and thus persecutes the Jews because it agrees with them. Intellectually, the Jew is the victor in the present-day

conflict (if you can call it that) in Germany. He has succeeded in imposing his idea of a chosen people (in the biological sense of the word people) on modern Germany: and this may explain why the victims of this persecution take it so calmly.'

Notes to chapter two

1. Anthony M. Ludovici, *Who is to be Master of the World? An Introduction to the Philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche*, London: T. N. Foulis, 1909, p. 43. Elisabeth Förster-Nietzsche, *The Young Nietzsche*, London: William Heinemann, 1912.

2. Anthony M. Ludovici, *The Specious Origins of Liberalism: The Genesis of a Delusion*, London: Britons Publishing Co., 1967, p. 133.

3. Very few books mention Ludovici. I have found references in the following: George Thayer, *The British Political Fringe: A Profile*, London: Anthony Blond, 1965; Richard Griffiths, *Fellow Travellers of the Right: British Enthusiasts for Nazi Germany 1933-39*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980; G. C. Webber, *The Ideology of the British Right 1918-1939*, London: Croom Helm, 1986; Patrick Wright, *The Village that Died for England: The Strange Story of Tyneham*, London: Jonathan Cape, 1995; Richard Griffiths, *Patriotism Perverted: Captain Ramsay, the Right Club and British Anti-Semitism 1939-40*, London: Constable, 1998. Passing references can occasionally be found elsewhere.

4. Cf. Tony Kushner's point about political antisemitism in Britain: 'Although a sense of proportion is vital in this matter, it is possible to trace the impact that extremist anti-semitism has made in Britain, both as an innovative and as a reinforcing factor in hostility to Jews in the period 1918 to 1945.' Tony Kushner, 'The Impact of British Anti-semitism, 1918-1945', in *The Making of Modern Anglo-Jewry*, ed. David Cesarani, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990, p. 194.

5. See David Bradshaw, 'The Eugenics Movement in the 1930s and the Emergence of *On the Boiler*', *Yeats Annual*, 9, 1992, pp. 189-215. Bradshaw says that with *On the Boiler*, 'momentarily at least, Yeats construed an idiosyncratic fascism as one means of checking the multiplication of the unfit' (p. 207). See W. B. Yeats, *On the Boiler*, Dublin: The Cuala Press, 1939, for confirmation of this claim.

6. For an example, see Raymond B. Cattell, *The Fight for Our National Intelligence*, London: P. S. King and Son, 1937.

7. See Albert Ludovici, *An Artist's Life in London and Paris 1870-1925*, London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1926.

8. As well as *Who is to be Master of the World?*, Ludovici also published *Nietzsche: His Life and Works*, London: Constable and Co., 1910, and *Nietzsche and Art*, London: Constable and Co., 1911 as well as several translations in Levy's edition of the collected works.

9. Anthony M. Ludovici, *The Confessions of an Antifeminist*, unpublished MS (1969), Edinburgh University Library, Special Collections, MS 3121, p. 220. Cited by courtesy of Edinburgh University Library (Special Collections Division).

10. See Arnold Spencer Leese, *Out of Step: Events in the Two Lives of an Anti-Jewish Camel-Doctor*, London: Carmac Press, 1951. For more on Leese, see John Morell, 'Arnold Leese and the Imperial Fascist League: The Impact of Racial Fascism', in *British Fascism: Essays on the Radical Right in Inter-War Britain*, ed. Kenneth Lunn and Richard C. Thurlow, London: Croom Helm, 1980, pp. 57-75.

11. J. M. Robertson, cited in Robert Bird Kerr, *Our Prophets*, Croydon: R. B. Kerr, 1932, p. 86.

12. J. R. Jones, 'England', in *The European Right: A Historical Profile*, ed. Hans Rogger and Eugen Weber, London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1965, pp. 29-70.

13. Gregory D. Phillips, *The Diehards: Aristocratic Society and Politics in Edwardian England*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1979, pp. 150-56.

14. See, for example, G. R. Searle, *The Quest for National Efficiency: A Study in British Politics and Political Thought, 1899–1914*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971; Frans Coetzee and Marilyn Shevin Coetzee, 'Rethinking the Radical Right in Germany and Britain before 1914', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 21.4, 1986, pp. 515–37; Anne Summers, 'The Character of Edwardian Nationalism: Three Popular Leagues', in *Nationalist and Racialist Movements in Britain and Germany before 1914*, ed. Paul Kennedy and Anthony Nicholls, London: Macmillan, 1981, pp. 68–87; Frans Coetzee, *For Party or Country: Nationalism and the Dilemmas of Popular Conservatism in Edwardian England*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.

15. Richard Thurlow, *Fascism in Britain: From Oswald Mosley's Blackshirts to the National Front*, London: I. B. Tauris, 2nd edn, 1998, pp. 1–13; Arnd Bauerkämper, *Die 'radikale Rechte' in Großbritannien: Nationalistische, antisemitische und faschistische Bewegungen vom späten 19. Jahrhundert bis 1945*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991, pp. 48, 89–92, 245. See also Phillips, *The Diehards*; G. R. Searle, 'Critics of Edwardian Society: The Case of the Radical Right', in *The Edwardian Age: Conflict and Stability 1900–1914*, ed. Alan O'Day, London: Macmillan, 1979, pp. 79–96; Geoffrey Searle, 'The "Revolt from the Right" in Edwardian Britain', in *Nationalist and Racialist Movements*, ed. Kennedy and Nicholls, pp. 21–39; Alan Sykes, 'The Radical Right and the Crisis of Conservatism before the First World War', *The Historical Journal*, 26.3, 1983, pp. 661–76. In *The Bolsheviks of Ancient History* by 'Apionus', London: Britons, 1924, p. 26, there is an explicit recognition of the debt owed to the Diehards by the interwar extreme right.

16. David Powell, *The Edwardian Crisis: Britain, 1901–1914*, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1996, p. 61. The journalism of Arnold White lends credence to Powell's views. See especially White's best-known book, *Efficiency and Empire*, London: Methuen and Co., 1901.

17. Lord Willoughby de Broke, 'Introduction' to *National Revival: A Re-Statement of Tory Principles*, London: Herbert Jenkins, 1913, pp. x–xi. For more on Willoughby de Broke, see Gregory D. Phillips, 'Lord Willoughby de Broke: Radicalism and Conservatism', in *Edwardian Conservatism: Five Studies in Adaptation*, ed. J. A. Thompson and Arthur Mejia, London: Croom Helm, 1988, pp. 77–104.

18. T. E. Hulme, 'A Tory Philosophy', in *Selected Writings*, ed. Patrick McGuinness, Manchester: Carcanet, 1998, p. 167.

19. Oscar Levy, *The Revival of Aristocracy*, trans. Leonard A. Magnus, London: Probsthain and Co., 1906, p. 52.

20. Anthony M. Ludovici, *A Defence of Aristocracy: A Textbook for Tories*, London: Constable and Co., 1915.

21. George Brandes, *Friedrich Nietzsche*, trans. A. G. Chater, London: William Heinemann, 1914, pp. 3–56: 'An Essay on Aristocratic Radicalism'.

22. Dora Russell, *Hypatia, or Woman and Knowledge*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1925, p. 8.

23. Arthur J. Pentey, *A Guildsman's Interpretation of History*, London: George Allen and Unwin, 1920, p. 187. On distinctions within guild socialist thought, see Marc Stears, 'Guild Socialism and Ideological Diversity on the British Left, 1914–1926', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, 3.3, 1998, pp. 289–306.

24. Anthony M. Ludovici, 'The Carfax, the Suffolk Street, and the Twenty-One Galleries', *New Age*, XIV.7, 18 December 1913, pp. 213–15; T. E. Hulme, 'Mr. Epstein and the Critics', *New Age*, XIV.8, 25 December 1913, pp. 251–53, here at pp. 252–53. I am grateful to Patrick McGuinness for these references.

25. Anthony M. Ludovici, 'An Open Letter to My Friends', *New Age*, XIV.9, 1 January 1914, pp. 278–81; letter from Wyndham Lewis, *New Age*, XIV.10, 8 January 1914, p. 319.

26. Anthony M. Ludovici, *Man's Descent from the Gods. Or, the Complete Case Against Prohibition*, London: William Heinemann, 1921, pp. 223–24.

27. Anthony M. Ludovici, *The False Assumptions of 'Democracy'*, London: Heath Cranton, 1921, pp. 15, 25, 32–33.

28. Ludovici, *False Assumptions*, p. 214.

29. Anthony M. Ludovici, *Man: An Indictment*, London: Constable and Co., 1927, p. 304.

30. Ludovici, *Man: An Indictment*, p. 306.

31. George Lane-Fox Pitt-Rivers, *The Clash of Culture and the Contact of Races: An Anthropological and Psychological Study of the Laws of Racial Adaptability, with Special Reference to the Depopulation of the Pacific and the Government of Subject Races*, London: George Routledge and Sons, 1927, p. 6. See also George Stocking, *After Taylor: British Social Anthropology 1888–1954*, London: The Athlone Press, 1995, pp. 393–94.

32. White, *Efficiency and Empire*, p. 73; Arthur Bryant, *Unfinished Victory*, London: Macmillan and Co., 1940, p. 200. For more on Bryant, see Andrew Roberts, *Eminent Churchillians*, London: Phoenix, 1995, pp. 287–322; A. K. Chesterton, *Empire or Eclipse: Grim Realities of the Mid-Twentieth Century*, London: Candour Publishing Co., 1965, p. 7.

33. Ludovici, *False Assumptions*, p. 84.

34. Anthony M. Ludovici, *A Defence of Conservatism: A Further Textbook for Tories*, London: Faber and Gwyer, 1927, pp. 157 and 19.

35. James Marchant, *Social Hygienics: A New Crusade*, London: Swan Sonnenschein, 1909, pp. 54 and 75–76.

36. See, for example, William D. Rubinstein, 'Henry Page Croft and the National Party 1917–22', *Journal of Contemporary History*, 9.1, 1974, pp. 129–48; Richard C. Thurlow, 'Satan and Sambo: the Image of the Immigrant in English Racial Populist Thought since the First World War', in *Hosts, Immigrants and Minorities: Historical Responses to Newcomers in British Society 1870–1914*, ed. Kenneth Lunn, Folkestone: Dawson, 1980, pp. 39–63; Shmuel Almog, 'Antisemitism as a Dynamic Phenomenon: The "Jewish Question" in England at the End of the First World War', *Patterns of Prejudice*, 21.4, 1987, pp. 3–18; David Cesarani, 'Anti-Alienism in England after the First World War', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 6.1, 1987, pp. 5–29; David Cesarani, 'An Embattled Minority? The Jews in Britain during the First World War', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 8.1–2, 1989, pp. 61–81; Tony Kushner, 'Beyond the Pale? British Reactions to Nazi Anti-Semitism, 1933–39', *Immigrants and Minorities*, 8.1–2, 1989, pp. 143–60; David Cesarani, 'An Alien Concept? The Continuity of Anti-Alienism in British Society before 1940', in *The Internment of Aliens in Twentieth Century Britain*, ed. David Cesarani and Tony Kushner, London: Frank Cass, 1993, pp. 25–52.

37. Ludovici, *Man: An Indictment*, p. xvi.

38. Anthony M. Ludovici, *Lysistrata, or Woman's Future and Future Woman*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1925, p. 83.

39. Cf. T. Dundas Pillans, *Plain Truths about Woman Suffrage*, London: Watts and Co., 1909.

40. Ludovici, *Man's Descent from the Gods*, p. 222.

41. Anthony M. Ludovici, *Woman: A Vindication*, London: Constable and Co., 1923, p. 72.

42. Anthony M. Ludovici, *The Future of Woman*, London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1936, pp. 27–28.

43. Ludovici, *The Future of Woman*, pp. 59–60.

44. Anthony M. Ludovici, *The Night-Hoers, or The Case Against Birth-Control and an Alternative*, London: Herbert Jenkins, 1928, p. 51. Their advocacy of birth control