

401A

Files - kept  
401A

Union of Birmingham  
Literary awards

DEC 21 1950

# TO THE AID OF THE WRITER



## ATLANTIC AWARDS IN LITERATURE

# ATLANTIC AWARDS IN LITERATURE

## *Trustees*

The University of Birmingham

## *Adjudicating Committee*

ALLARDYCE NICOLL (*Chairman*)

JAMES BRIDIE

IVOR BROWN

BONAMY DOBRÉE

B. IFOR EVANS

LOUIS MACNEICE

A. E. MORGAN

CHARLES MORGAN

V. S. PRITCHETT

## *Secretary*

H. A. SMITH

# TO THE AID OF THE WRITER

A brief review of the aims and achievements of  
the Atlantic Awards Scheme during the years  
1946 to 1948



ATLANTIC AWARDS IN LITERATURE

## ATLANTIC AWARDS IN LITERATURE

### *Objectives*

IN THE CHEERLESS ACCOUNTANCY FOLLOWING THE WAR, when we are reckoning up our scars and finding them obstinately slow to heal, it is easy to lose sight of the more immaterial losses. Less computable than the casualty lists, less obvious than the shattered cities, less immediately ominous than the shrinking bank balance and the lost investments, the insidious corrosives working upon the powers of thought, feeling and imagination tend to be ignored or wearily dismissed. The more general dangers, stressed by Victor Gollancz in *Our Threatened Values* or by Leslie Paul (an Atlantic Award winner) in *The Annihilation of Man*, lie outside the scope of this short survey. But the mere practical obstructions imperilling the survival of these values are serious enough. When the economic situation is precarious and the struggle for subsistence involves more strain and effort than it did in the past, the immaterial is liable to be subdued by the material; insecurity, or the fear of it, imposes caution, and the freedom of the mind is constricted. This was one of the many problems facing the young writer at the end of the war.

In some respects the war no doubt brought a new stimulus to the creative arts and new opportunities to the artist. Theatres presenting serious plays were crowded; the music and drama brought by C.E.M.A. to new audiences were often enthusiastically welcomed; there was a surprisingly widespread hunger for good books as well as the predictable craving for narcotics. The literary artist was thus provided, apparently, with a wider and more intelligently responsive public to write for, and the war also gave him many new themes to write about. As often as not he was violently uprooted from his familiar environment; new scenes, new faces, and new hazards inevitably broadened his experience. And even for those who remained at home, life was lived at its extremes; it was more arduous, exacting, dramatic and exciting, and the artist could see, in T. S. Eliot's phrase, "the boredom, and the horror, and the glory," all strained to their highest pitch.

But the cost was heavy. The sense of waste, the sickening spectacle of bloodshed, destruction and barbarous imbecility, the anxiety and the mere physical exhaustion, the heartache and the thousand natural shocks inescapable in wartime—all these were bound to oppress any sensitive mind. The writer had his full share of them, but he had his own problems too. His new experiences, whatever their value, were thrust upon him; the time and place were not of his choosing, and in the balance against them he had to place anything up to six years—much of them, perhaps, frittered away in uncongenial drudgery—which might have been spent in learning and practising his craft. On his return to the uneasy conditions of peace he needed, above all, the precious gift of leisure; his brain might be saturated with new experiences and teeming with new ideas, but only a period of calm could enable him to see them in perspective and to reduce the chaos of impressions to order. The natural way for him to earn this leisure was by the use of his pen—to write, in fact, before he was ready to write, in order to win the freedom to write—and he found himself, therefore, in a vicious circle. If he were one of the more fortunate ones and had been able to complete a book during his war service, he would not necessarily find the outlook much more promising. He would fall a victim to the paper shortage, or he would find that

the publishers, facing their own problems of meagre resources and rising costs, would be unwilling to gamble on the unknown. And even if he did achieve publication, he would find himself confronted with the familiar problems of post-war living—high rents, steeply mounting prices, and heavy taxation. His period of leisure, then, if secured at all, was likely to be short and anxious.

It was to go some way to meet these difficulties that the Atlantic Awards scheme was designed in 1945, and it is an indication of the far-sightedness of the Rockefeller Trustees that the plan was conceived before hostilities were finally over. Its object was simple—to provide a breathing-space for young British writers whose literary careers had been interrupted by the war and who had been denied the opportunity to establish themselves. The liberality which led to the inception of the scheme was to be seen also in the conditions governing it. It was recognised that total war makes heavy claims not only upon the actual combatants but upon the community as a whole; the awards therefore were not limited to members of the forces but were made available to all young writers who had been fully engaged in any of the essential services—in industry, on the land, or in Government departments—which required the sacrifice of individual interests to the common need. Since the specific object of the scheme was to give the promising writer a year's respite in which to develop his powers, free from financial worry or the distraction of other duties, the recipient of an award was required to undertake no salaried employment during the period of tenure. But the way in which he used his freedom was left entirely to his own discretion. Most of the successful candidates were, in fact, only too happy to devote all their energies to writing, and, as the list at the end of this report shows, many of them were able to achieve publication. But they were under no obligation to have something to show for their award, and they had full liberty, if they were so inclined, either to regiment themselves like Trollope or to cultivate a Wordsworthian wise passiveness. Again, to satisfy the aims of the scheme it was necessary that writers of mature years or established reputation should be excluded. But this condition, too, was liberally interpreted; it was acknowledged that both inward ripeness and outward recognition come more slowly to some deserving writers than to others, and impediments such as defective schooling and limited opportunities for writing were taken into account. All the boundaries marking the scheme, then, were imposed solely to ensure that it fulfilled its proper purpose, and this purpose was clear enough: to find those young writers with genuinely creative gifts who, in the peculiar post-war conditions, would most benefit by some material encouragement, and to help them to the limit of the fund's resources while subjecting them to the fewest possible restrictions. The great problem, of course, was to find, among so many new writers, those who were most deserving of help and who could be expected to make the best use of it, and the manner in which the scheme was organised can be regarded, very largely, as an attempt to find a satisfactory solution to this problem.

### *Organisation*

AN UNUSUAL ALTHOUGH VERY HAPPY FEATURE of the scheme was that it was the fruit of American generosity but its beneficiaries were to be entirely British. In establishing the fund it was the express wish of the Rockefeller Foundation that the awards should not be

made in its name and that the administration should be wholly in British hands. An envoy had therefore to be chosen, and one was found in the person of Professor Allardyce Nicoll, who had recently been appointed to the Chair of English at the University of Birmingham after having served for ten years as head of the Department of Drama at Yale. Professor Nicoll was invited to discuss the project with the Directors of the Humanities Division of the Foundation, and he proposed that the awards should be made by a small adjudicating committee composed of eminent British writers and critics, and that the University of Birmingham should be requested to act as Trustee. The University was to be responsible for the financial arrangements of the scheme, and the constitution of the Committee was to be approved by its Arts Faculty, but apart from this the administration of the awards was to rest entirely with the Committee.

Professor Nicoll returned to England in the late summer of 1945, and before the end of the year he was able to report that the scheme was ready for launching. Six distinguished men of letters had agreed to give their services on the Adjudicating Board under his chairmanship, and the University of Birmingham had gladly assumed the authority delegated to it. In December the trustees of the Rockefeller Foundation approved a grant of \$56,000 to the University, to be spent over a period of three years; \$50,000 was to be available for awards and up to \$6000 for administrative expenses. The Committee, whose original members were James Bridie, Ivor Brown, Bonamy Dobrée, B. Ifor Evans, Louis MacNeice, A. E. Morgan and Allardyce Nicoll, met for the first time on 31st January, 1946. Mr. V. S. Pritchett joined the Committee in June 1946, and Mr. Charles Morgan in November 1947; and although Mr. Ivor Brown was obliged to resign from active membership at the end of 1947 he maintained his interest in the Committee's work. In determining the composition of the Committee at least four qualifications were borne in mind. The first and most obvious requisite was that its members should be equipped, by their special gifts, interests and training, to recognise high literary merit and to distinguish, as far as human fallibility allows, between the genuinely good and the merely competent. Secondly, it was necessary to have a well-informed understanding of the problems of the contemporary writer, and of the particular difficulties, ranging from the psychological to the economic, which were likely to assail him in the period immediately following the war. Thirdly, since all forms of creative literature came within the terms of the scheme, expert judgment had to be available in the various fields of poetry, drama, fiction and criticism. And finally, since the awards were open not only to English writers but to all who possessed British citizenship, it was an advantage if some of these diverse national strains could be represented, and while the Committee could claim no Maoris or Zulus among its members, it could at least speak for Ireland, Scotland and Wales. But more important was the authority with which the various members could speak in their own fields of literary activity, whether as practitioners or critics. The Committee included a poet, a dramatist, two novelists, a newspaper editor, and four past or present Professors of English Literature. If the academic representation seems to be high, it is perhaps worth recalling that Professors of English, apart from their obvious fitness to assess literary ability, are in day-to-day contact with returning ex-servicemen whose special interest is the arts. One of the professors had himself served in both wars and had therefore an intimate knowledge of the

serviceman's problems. Further, all four had shown by their publications that their interests were not confined to the literature of the past. Contributions to modern criticism had also been made by almost every other member of the Committee. The poet had published two books on modern poetry; the newspaper editor was dramatic critic of his journal and had written widely on stylistic problems; one of the novelists had been for many years Drama Critic of *The Times*, and the other was Literary Editor of *The New Statesman*.

Most members of the Committee, too, could claim wide administrative experience. Six of them were actively associated with the Arts Council, the British Council, or the Council of the Society of Authors; two had served on more than one of these bodies. One was founder and director of the Glasgow Citizens' Theatre, and another had been Director of Drama for C.E.M.A. from 1940 to 1942. A third, as well as being Principal of Queen Mary College in the University of London, was a Governor of the Old Vic. and the British Film Institute, and was Educational Director of the British Council from 1940 to 1944. He was succeeded in this last post by a fourth member of the Committee, whose lifelong interest in the problems of youth had earlier found practical expression in his work for the King George V Trust, and who, before the war, had been Principal, first of University College, Hull, and then of McGill University, Montreal. A fifth member, as producer and feature-writer for the B.B.C., was officially connected with an organisation which provided not only new opportunities for the writer but a new medium, and a sixth, who had always shown a keen concern for everything affecting the writer's welfare, had taken part in the administration of other schemes of awards.

Such was the Committee which was responsible for ensuring that the generous grant made by the Rockefeller Foundation was put to its best use, and the original members who met at the beginning of 1946 found themselves faced with a variety of problems. The newly born scheme had first to be named, and the title "Atlantic Awards" was adopted, a little diffidently, because it recognised, however obliquely, the source of the gift and acknowledged it gratefully as a bond of goodwill between America and Britain. The next problem was to settle the amount of the award, and this involved a major issue of policy. Should the method be one of diffusion or concentration? Should a liberal grant be given to a few promising writers or a more moderate one to a larger number? The Committee decided upon the latter course, and since a ruling had been obtained from the Inland Revenue authorities that the awards would not be subject to income tax, it was agreed that a sum ranging between £250 and £300 (with occasional variations to suit particular circumstances) would be sufficient to free the successful candidate from financial anxiety and to allow him to live modestly for a year. The decisive test was to be that of literary merit, and there was no question of giving a dole to an inferior writer merely because he was in financial straits. But, while no rigorous means test was to be applied, it seemed just to ask the fortunate writer who had ample means or a firm publisher's contract to give way to those who were in greater need.

The most fundamental problem had then to be confronted—how to devise a satisfactory method of selecting the most suitable candidates and assessing their merits. The members of the Committee were too familiar with the fickleness of reputation and the

elusiveness of genius to uphold their verdicts with absolute assurance in a court where even the voice of posterity sometimes falters. And, in any case, the rare bird genius was not the immediate quarry; if it came along, needing help to become fully fledged, well and good; but the Committee was content with a more modest aim—to find definite talent, and to nurture the genuine creative gift which had not yet reached maturity. The promise might sometimes be more apparent than real, and even if real it might not always come to fruition, but, as the Chairman pointed out in an article introducing the scheme in *The Observer*, “not every artist supported by princely patronage in the past became a master, yet the wide encouragement given to young talent was not wasted. Because all seeds do not germinate there is no reason to refrain from sowing.”

It was originally proposed that the initiative in finding the candidates should come entirely from the Committee and a group of chosen helpers. The helpers—men and women well known for their interest in literature and well qualified to judge the claims of young writers—were to form an advisory panel, and this was to be as widely representative as possible, both of different branches of literary activity and of different areas of the country. The members of the panel were to recommend suitable candidates, and the final arbitrament was to rest with the Committee. This method had some obvious practical advantages. The members of the Committee would have been spared the influx of poor or indifferent manuscripts, they would have saved a good deal of time—a not inconsiderable point for men whose time was precious and who were giving their services freely—and they would have had to weigh the claims only of those writers who in the opinion of responsible judges were worthy of an award. But it was equally obvious that some deserving writers would inevitably be left in ignorance of the project. The Committee decided, therefore, at the cost of much extra labour to itself, that the only fair method was to make the benefits of the scheme available to all who were qualified to receive them. The original proposal was not abandoned; the advisory panel was formed, and its members rendered valuable service in a variety of ways—by recommending candidates, being available for consultation, and offering fruitful suggestions which contributed to the smooth working of the scheme. But although the panel was responsible for nominating rather more than a quarter of the recipients of awards, the great majority of the candidates made themselves known to the Committee through the direct channel of personal application.

### *The Scheme in Action*

THE COMMITTEE'S FIRST MEETING on 31st January, 1946, was followed by a public announcement of the scheme in the press on 12th February, and a few days later the office in Birmingham was bombarded with enquiries and applications. As was to be expected, a considerable number of these earlier applications came from candidates who were obviously unsuitable or ineligible. Crusaders, revolutionaries, chasers after chimeras and lone fighters for lost causes all wrote to ask for a share in the bounty, and there was also the inevitable quota of hard-luck stories which, however genuine or moving, could not in themselves constitute a claim to an award. But this strange, often pathetic flotsam brought in on the first wave of publicity soon disappeared almost completely,

and the members of the Committee found that one of their main problems was to sift out the work of outstanding quality from the great mass of material which, although mediocre in both intention and performance, nevertheless maintained a surprisingly high level of literary competence. The number of applications naturally declined sharply after the first year; 437 arrived in 1946, 94 in 1947, and 72 in 1948. (These figures include only applications actually submitted, and ignore the numerous preliminary enquiries and exploratory letters.)

The procedure adopted to deal with this flood of applications was relatively simple, but it was designed to give every candidate a full opportunity to state his claims and to have his work fairly considered. Each applicant was asked in the first place to complete a form submitting details of his age, employment, war service, education, publications or dramatic productions, and literary plans. He (or she) was also free to give the names of referees, and these references were, whenever necessary, followed up. If, after a perusal of the form, it was found that he satisfied the conditions of the scheme, he was invited to submit published work or manuscripts, and the author who had not yet achieved publication was at no disadvantage. The books and manuscripts were then distributed among the members of the Committee, and sufficient time was allowed (usually not less than a month) to enable them to be examined at leisure. No writer was judged on a mere synopsis or an odd chapter, and if the quantity of work submitted seemed too slight or insufficiently representative, he was asked to send more. It was impossible for every member of the Committee to see every manuscript, but in all doubtful cases a second or third opinion was asked for, and it was most unlikely that any candidate worthy of serious consideration should be rejected on the basis of one judgment alone. Every applicant's claims were then considered by the Committee in full session, and to avoid merely impressionistic judgments, written reports were submitted which often took the form of a detailed critique. No award was made, and no application finally rejected, until the Committee had reached a unanimous decision. The machinery worked, perhaps, a little slowly, and the patience of the Committee no doubt occasionally exceeded that of the applicant, but at least he could be sure that the result, whether favourable or unfavourable, was not arrived at without serious reflection and discussion.

After the first three months or so the great majority of the candidates were found to be eligible under the terms of the scheme, and almost all of them were invited to submit manuscripts or published work for the Committee's consideration. Nineteen awards were made in 1946, seventeen in 1947 (several of these went to candidates deferred from the previous year), and eleven in 1948. In spite of the steep fall in the number of applications in the second and third years the Committee did not find that the task of selection was greatly simplified, since the standard of work submitted remained high, and it was frequently found necessary to reject candidates who were certainly able writers but whose work did not seem to promise any advance beyond a sound and quite reputable level of literary ability. The applicants varied enormously, of course, not only in their literary attainments but in their backgrounds and the nature of their literary pursuits, and a brief statistical analysis applied to those who were successful in gaining awards yields several interesting, and a few surprising, results. With regard, first, to war service, 27 of the 47

recipients had served in the armed forces, six in industry, five in Government Departments, and four on the land, while of the various other wartime occupations represented, one had been in the N.F.S., another had been a miner, and a third—a woman—had been a bargee on the Grand Union Canal. (It is perhaps worth recording, although it is of no particular significance, that of those in the armed forces eighteen had been in the Army, six in the Navy, and three in the R.A.F.) Only two of the awards made up to the end of 1948 went to women writers; this was certainly not due to any anti-feminist bias on the part of the Committee, and no explanation can be offered apart from the fact (which explains nothing) that far fewer women submitted applications than men. With regard to employment, a high proportion—34 out of the 47—had no salaried occupation at the time when they applied for an award, and most of these described themselves simply as “writers.” It might seem from these figures that the Committee was naturally predisposed to favour the professional, or at least to encourage those who had already taken the leap and decided to devote their whole time to writing. This was, however, no part of the Committee’s conscious or deliberate policy, although it was sometimes felt that if an author was in a job which seemed to offer him reasonable freedom to write it might be unwise to tempt him away from it. The proportion of applicants without salaried employment would no doubt have been smaller but for the fact that some of them had been unable to enter upon a career before beginning their war service, while others were very recently demobilised and had had no time to return to their peacetime occupations. With regard to education, nineteen of the successful candidates had attended a secondary school and a further nineteen had also been to a university, and of these seven were public school men who had proceeded to Oxford or Cambridge. The remaining nine—quite a considerable number—had had no regular schooling beyond the primary grade, although several of them had attended evening classes and two had spent a short period at a residential college for adult education. As a rule, the Committee only took the educational qualification into account in order to ensure that the writer whose training had been deficient should suffer no disadvantage, or that the writer who had been expensively educated should not receive an award if he possessed comfortable private means. It is perhaps appropriate to add here that, although the Committee was in a position to institute fairly full enquiries, no case came to light of a writer applying for an award who could not reasonably claim that he needed it, and it is also pleasant to record that some four or five candidates whose income was unexpectedly augmented—as a result of some literary success or through other means—after making their original application, wrote to refuse the award when it was offered to them.

In reviewing the actual literary forms practised by the recipients of awards, the Committee itself experienced some surprises and disappointments. Several of the successful candidates had of course experimented in various forms, and at least one could claim to be novelist, dramatist, poet and critic. But taking in each case the candidate’s predominant literary pursuit, twenty-seven awards were given to novelists or short-story writers (or both), seventeen to poets, and only three to dramatists. The Committee could certainly not be accused of any lack of interest in the drama; three of its members had written plays, two were distinguished dramatic critics and one was a specialist in dramatic studies; three

others had written books on the drama. They were naturally, therefore, disappointed to find that out of 600 applicants only three dramatists (or, if we include all the successful candidates who submitted plays, six) were deemed worthy of an award. This paucity of playwrights was no doubt partly due to the fact that the good dramatist requires not only mature experience but considerable technical training and equipment, and that the young writer, while painfully progressing towards the first, could hardly hope to acquire the second when his only taste of the theatre was often a camp show or an occasional visit while on leave. But quite apart from the special difficulties of the returning ex-serviceman, playwriting is the most economically hazardous of all forms of literary activity and the one which offers the least financial incentive to experiment. The unknown dramatist, even if his play follows a well-trying and popular recipe, is fortunate if he breaks down the ingrained caution of the harassed theatre manager, while an experimental play is hardly likely to be produced at all except perhaps in a small theatre catering for a specialised audience, where it might, at most, pay its way without paying its author. It is not surprising, therefore, if the frustrated dramatist turns to the more lucrative forms of the novel and the short story, and the high proportion of short-story writers among the successful candidates is no doubt to be largely explained by two factors: that the short story, demanding neither the scope and complexity of the novel nor the concentration and verbal felicity of the poem, is one of the easiest of all forms to write, and that it is also the most readily marketable and the most immediately rewarding.

The Committee would also have liked to encourage a much higher proportion of good critics. Original critical work of a high order was even scarcer than good drama, and while about six of the successful candidates submitted some critical writing, not one was given an award on the basis of his literary criticism alone. The unsettlement of the times, the confusion of values, and the absence of critical landmarks and signposts following a world-wide upheaval no doubt went some way to explain this, and original criticism, too, demands a maturity of mind to which few of the young writers applying for an award could lay claim. But the Committee felt that very much more could be done in both of these fields, and that, even if it did no more than encourage new dramatists and new critics, there would be sufficient justification for continuing the scheme, or one similar to it, when the immediate emergency which called it into being was over.

### *First-fruits*

ANY ESTIMATE OF THE ACHIEVEMENTS of the scheme must necessarily be tentative and incomplete, since so many of the benefits which it conferred are intangible and incalculable. It cannot even be assumed that the award was always a blessing. It is sometimes argued that some spur of anxiety, an occasional cold breath of fear, is needed to urge the unregenerate human animal to produce his best work. The point is debatable, and not everyone would agree that it is applicable even to the humbler forms of manual labour. But it is surely inapplicable to the work of a man who is writing not only in order to live but to produce something of permanent value. Freedom from distraction, worry, and the temptation to turn out something superficial and ill-digested, leisure to ponder, to absorb,

and to concentrate, time to shape his experience into its appropriate form, must surely be of inestimable advantage to such a man, and if he is an artist worthy of the name it ought to be accorded to him as his right. But while freedom from anxiety must be a benefit, freedom from regular occupation may be the reverse. As Dr. Johnson was never tired of pointing out, "the safe and general antidote against sorrow is employment," and to a sensitive mind prone to *accidie*, self-absorption, and the less profitable forms of introspection, a long period of unaccustomed leisure might be merely a burden. All that can be said on this point is that the members of the Committee were aware of the danger, but they felt that the risk was worth taking because it was counterpoised by so many obvious and indubitable advantages.

The most measurable result of the scheme is no doubt to be found in the volume of new work actually published or accepted for publication. In computing this, two provisos must be borne in mind. First, the successful candidates were under no pressure to rush into publication, and since many of the awards were made quite recently, much excellent work may be in preparation which is not yet ready for the public eye. And secondly, to judge whether the scheme has really fulfilled its purpose, the purely quantitative assessment would have to be supplemented by one of quality. But since the natural goal of every writer must be to achieve publication, it is some measure of the success of the scheme that twenty-eight of the recipients have had at least one book published or accepted by a publisher (or have had a play produced) since they were given the award. It would be invidious to single out the achievement of any one of these writers for special praise, but an examination of the list at the end of this review will show that several of them are building up for themselves a high reputation. How much the award contributed to this success cannot of course be estimated, but that it did provide both an opportunity and an incentive is not to be doubted, and on this point it is best to allow the recipients to speak for themselves. Many letters of cordial appreciation have been received; only a few extracts can be given here. This letter, for instance, from a poet, indicates the kind of service which the award could perform: "My talent is primarily lyrical, intense preoccupation over a short period. Having published three volumes of lyrics I wished to attempt to retain the intensity of the lyric within the form of a major work of about a thousand lines. This was quite impossible with a job that kept me busy, on average, about twelve hours a day. The award enabled me to encompass my design in a 1500-line poem which I hope will be published within the next eighteen months—quite apart from a large amount of other work, some good, some bad, some indifferent. My main object, however, was attained and I am most grateful to the Committee for giving me the opportunity." The poem has since been published. The next four letters were from novelists who, at the time they received the award, had not published a full-length work. Two of them wrote to let us know that their first novels had been accepted for publication. The one said: "This is very encouraging, especially since, as you know, the novel is experimental in form. And I feel more deeply indebted than ever to the Committee for providing me with the means to write it. I am now well into my second novel." And the other: "You will see that I have good reason for being grateful for the award. Without it, I am quite convinced that my novel would not have been finished with such care and would not have satisfied me nearly

so much. . . . I am now hoping to work on something better." The third novelist could claim quite practical benefits: "The book which the Atlantic Award enabled me to write has been published in America and is about to be published over here. It secured me a contract from my English publishers which gives me financial freedom to write for another two years. So that if I am not now able to devote myself to a literary career it will be due to my own inadequacy and not to any practical difficulties." The fourth, who was able to report that he had published five short stories and eight articles, and had had his first novel accepted by an American firm, added: "Quite apart from the practical value, it was stimulating to feel that a committee of established writers saw some merit in my work. Before receiving the award most of my work was written in a hurry and I was restricted to short pieces. I should never have undertaken the writing of a novel had it not been for the award. . . . It has enabled me to approach my work seriously; given me the time I needed to find my bearings as a writer, and allowed me to apply a higher standard of craftsmanship. I believe it has been a year well spent. Creatively, I was able to indulge myself, writing in all some 300,000 words. A little under two-thirds of that will not see the light of day—in its present form—but it enabled me to learn my job in the only possible way, by practice."

Not all the recipients were so fortunate as to have their books accepted (although many of them published poems, articles and short stories) and not all of them sought immediate publication. But they found, none the less, that the award gave them the breathing space they needed. One candidate, for instance, wrote to report on a year which was very fruitful if not financially remunerative: "I have made considerable progress, written two radio plays, nearly finished my long poem and written one or two more, I think better than anything else I have done. One of these appears in the May issue of *Windmill*. I have also a novel under way, and have written short stories and critical work, all of which I could not have attempted without the assistance of the award." Many other writers laid particular stress upon the stimulus and encouragement which the award had given them. One, who could claim a very considerable degree of success—one novel published and well received, and another novel and a volume of short stories accepted by both an English and an American publisher—found that the chief value of the award for him was that it gave him real confidence in his work for the first time. He wrote: "At the risk of sounding naïve, which I'm not, I have to tell you that I don't think there's been a day since I got the news that I haven't taken the award out of the back of my mind and marvelled at it. I am prouder of it than of anything that has ever happened to me, and in my dark writing moments—and I have many—it's right alongside, holding my hand. The money was very nice, but it is the fact of the award and not the money which has altered my whole writing life. If ever I write anything that is worth while, and I shall try all my life, it will be, in part, because of the confidence and encouragement that the Atlantic Award has given me." Many more letters could be quoted, but these few extracts provide, in themselves, conclusive evidence that the scheme supplied a genuine need, conferred practical benefits, and gave timely encouragement to several writers of merit who, while they would not have ceased writing, would not otherwise have written so much or so well.

### *The Future*

THIS REPORT HAS SO FAR FOLLOWED THE PROGRESS of the scheme from 1946 to 1948. By November of that year the original fund was exhausted, but the Rockefeller Foundation, which had been approached some six months earlier, most generously made a supplementary grant of \$15,000, which was to be spent over a period of two years. The scheme was thus given a new lease of life until 1950, but candidates worthy of serious consideration have continued to come forward in greater numbers than the Committee's financial resources can cope with, and the spring, in spite of its very welcome replenishment, will soon be dry. The Committee has therefore for some time been seeking an answer to three questions. What is the justification for continuing the scheme after the present grant has been spent? How is it to be modified to suit changing conditions? And thirdly—the question upon which everything else depends—how is it to be financed?

At its inception the scheme required no apology. The young writer had lost so much ground, and faced so many urgent problems, that not even those who cared little for writing could deny him his share in any benefits that might be offered to him. But, it might be argued, the circumstances are very different now. The publishers have more paper and the bookshops are full of books, and although after five years of "peace" we are still living in conditions resembling those of a long-term siege, at least the individual life is not subject to such disruption as it was during the war years. May not the writer, then, be left to fend for himself? The Committee had no doubt at all about its answer to this question, but since there may be some doubters, the evidence which can be brought forward in support of its view is perhaps worth presenting in some detail. The present situation is very clearly described in an article by the editor of *The Bookseller*, Edmond Segrave, in the current edition of *The Author's and Writer's Who's Who*, an article which is so strictly relevant, and written with such authority, that it deserves to be quoted at length. After commenting on the "unimagined prosperity" of the publishing trade in the years immediately following the war, Mr. Segrave goes on to say: "But every publisher knows that he cannot live for ever on his past, and that the back list of tomorrow depends on his successful judgment in publishing new books today. Here the situation is unsatisfactory, for it is the new books by new authors, particularly in the field of creative literature, that are not doing well today. This inflicts a further hardship upon the young author, who, in all conscience, has had a hard time during the past ten years. During the years of acute paper shortage he had great difficulty in getting published at all, at any rate by any publisher of standing, since such publishers were then at their wits' end to know how to spread their meagre material resources over their accumulated commitments. 'Nobody knows how much is lost because it may never come to light,' said a speaker during one of the House of Commons debates on book shortages; and a leading literary agent, writing with a lifetime's experience, declared in 1947: 'If a similar state of affairs had existed after the first world war, more than half the English authors who are now famous would never have become writers.'

"Now that the manufacturing position is a little easier the new author is getting his share of paper and print, only to find, in most cases, that the golden day has faded to chilly twilight. No longer does a book, just because it is a book, find a purchaser. . . . The

customer in the bookshop today, able to choose between the old proved favourites that have been out of print for years and untried newcomers, has no hesitation in making his choice. He puts his money . . . on the safer bet. It may be, of course, that the new books are not as good as they used to be; but then, like *Punch*, they never were. A common complaint heard today is that so few of the new books are 'outstanding,' but this is only another way of saying that they have not yet made a reputation. How can they? The space allotted to book reviews in today's attenuated newspapers is severely restricted, and reviewers, compelled to be selective, are naturally inclined to devote such space as they have to those books which they judge to be the most important ones. Advertising space is equally limited, and the new author is unusually favoured who receives for his work more than a modest announcement, in one newspaper, once. This lack of publicity is one of the features of the contemporary literary scene that are causing publishers most concern today."

This article emphasises the urgency and gravity of the situation for the young writer, but it tells only part of the story. With their increased paper allocation publishers will accept *some* books by new authors, but even then the author will have little opportunity of becoming widely known. This is bad enough, but a more serious problem lurks behind. The publisher's resources are still relatively meagre, and his production costs have risen steeply and are not likely to fall. In these circumstances, however much he may care for good literature, and however anxious he may be to encourage young talent, the *kind* of new books which he can publish is likely to be determined by economic considerations, and he will find it difficult not to plump for the type of better-class mediocrity which is assured of a ready sale. An illuminating but disturbing analysis of this problem is to be found in an editorial article in the Spring, 1949, number of *The Author*. According to this, poetry is the first casualty; poetry, in fact, "is nearly unpublishable." (This judgment is confirmed in an article in the succeeding number of the same journal by Kathleen Raine. Miss Raine points out that sales of poetry, which were exceptionally good during the war, have declined sharply since, and that even the most distinguished and well-established poets cannot hope to make a living by their verse.) Nor is the novel in much better case: "Even the novel, the interpreter of contemporary life, is beginning to conform to the code of the Johnson Office under the same pressure which has made havoc of American publishing, and is coming to be regarded as primarily 'the book of the film'." The plight of the dramatist has been alluded to earlier, and just as the serious novelist must yield to the best-seller, so must the original playwright be squeezed off the boards by the practised gauger of the popular taste who can turn out the familiar mixture of farce, melodrama or surface-psychology.

There is the danger, then, that the writer with the genuinely creative gift will either not achieve publication at all or his work will be submerged in the morass of undistinguished print. A large public exists which is literate enough to read but not discerning enough to read the best, and at the same time a host of capable but mediocre writers have sprung up who are fitted, by their very limitations, to cater for the general taste. The self-respecting publisher may wish to encourage the better writer—and before the war he was to some extent able to do this—but he is now compelled by economic pressure to stake his survival on the inferior.

Now it may be argued that all this paints the picture in too sombre hues. Even now, it may be said, there *are* publishers who will give a chance to the writer of first-rate talent and who will encourage experiment, and there is also a discriminating section of the public, sufficiently large to ensure for serious creative writing a reasonable sale. Let us acknowledge this, and let us imagine that our young writer has had his book accepted for publication. What then will be his position? It is well summed up in a comment on the Atlantic Awards scheme submitted by one of the successful candidates: "The very great value of the award—and I am sincerely grateful for it, despite what I am about to say—must be, in some measure, vitiated by the enormous delays in publishing and the general rise in prices. In my case this has not been so important, since I was lucky enough to get under weigh at once. But supposing that you enable a writer younger than myself to have his free year in which to write; and suppose that, after say three-quarters of that year are past and he has an MS. to offer; then, supposing that MS. to be accepted, what is his position? He will receive, say, £100. He will then have to wait about eighteen months, even two years, for publication and further funds. True, he may write another book in the meantime, or even two, if he is a fast worker. But the chances of these MSS. being placed before his first book is in print are not very good." The writer, then, must try to spread out his meagre hundred pounds over a period of many months, and even if, in spite of the dearth and brevity of reviews and the restricted publicity, the book achieves some reputation and a fair sale, his final remuneration is likely to be modest, and insufficient, at the present cost of living, to tide him over until his next book appears. To revert to the editorial in *The Author* which has been quoted already: "Creative writing is a luxury which needs a settled income. A young writer can no longer rent a room or an unused cottage for a few shillings a week and live, for a valuable year or two, on next to nothing but the joys and hardships of creation." He is compelled therefore either to dilute his standards and to try to cash in on the popular market, or to accept some form of employment which forces him to dissipate his energies and to relax his creative efforts.

Even then if we resist the gloomier jeremiads and view the situation in its most favourable light, the position of the younger writer is clearly critical, and the case seems to be well established for some form of literary patronage on a generous scale. Grateful though the struggling author must be for them, the existing schemes of prizes and awards are quite insufficient to fill the need. They are few in number—perhaps about twenty in all; only two or three of them can offer grants exceeding £100, and almost all of them assist only one author each year. None of them can take the place of the Atlantic Awards scheme, which has been able to make about sixty awards, all offering a modest but reasonably adequate subsistence allowance, over a period of five years. The members of the Committee feel, therefore, that it would be highly unfortunate if it should come to an end at a time when the need for it is obviously as great as ever.

The Committee does not propose that the scheme should be continued in the precise form in which it exists at present. The Rockefeller Foundation made its generous grant in order to accomplish a specific purpose—to assist young writers whose literary careers had been interrupted by the war—and now that the war has been over for five years, the war-service condition could be dropped, and the applicant would be judged merely on his

merits and his needs. The members of the Committee believe, too, that while there is still a case for helping the new writer, the present precarious situation demands that consideration should also be given to the author who has published two or three books, and who may even be fairly well known, but who has not been able to achieve economic security. This would have the additional value of ensuring that assistance was being given to the genuine writer, as distinguished from the man or woman who can occasionally write well. The Committee has never been content to make its assessment on a few pages, but there was always the danger that the unknown applicant might have poured into his manuscript everything that he had in him, and that his first book might be his last. The qualities which go to make a writer are infinitely difficult to define, and some of them may be possessed by sensitive and intelligent people who are nevertheless not cut out for a literary career. A discriminating sensibility, a wide awareness and a ready and subtle power of response, a sense of phrase and the gift of organisation and control (Coleridge's "more than usual state of emotion with more than usual order")—all these are clearly necessary. But the congenital writer needs something more as well: he must have his own particular kind of creative energy. Not only toughness and industry, and certainly not mere fluency and facility, which the second-rate author often possesses in abundance, but an imaginative vitality which continues to flow, even though intermittently, with a current strong enough to overcome all obstructions whether from within or from without. No doubt a writer with these gifts would continue to write whether he received financial support or not, but the important thing is that he should be enabled to write at his best, and that he should not always be finding himself on the brink of insolvency. It is this kind of writer, possessing both distinction and staying power, that the Committee would now primarily choose to encourage.

Springing also from the Committee's experience is the conviction that a greater degree of flexibility might well be adopted in settling both the amount and the duration of the awards. A good many of the recipients wrote to say that the award would have been more valuable to them if it could have been extended to two years and if the grant could have been rather larger, and while the Committee had no wish to encourage the type of mentality which leans comfortably on external aids, it had to acknowledge the force of some of the arguments put forward. The case for extending the period of tenure was put in a letter already quoted; it rests mainly upon the delays in publication and the long time which it takes nowadays to achieve financial stability. Opinions as to the amount of the award naturally varied. One candidate found "five pounds a week the exact figure on which to live," and another, by living in a remote spot two miles from the nearest bus stop, and writing by the light of an oil-lamp, hoped to make his award last for eighteen months. A third, however, found that with the high cost of living (especially in London) the amount was insufficient to give him the freedom from financial anxiety which the award aimed to provide, and he suggested that £400 would be a more realistic figure. "It would save one from having to divert one's attention occasionally from what one wanted to write in order to think about ways of writing that might earn more money." A fourth, who was a married man also living in London, wrote in much the same terms: "£300 is an awkward amount. It is enough to live on, but not enough to remove the temptation to

waste one's time and energy on articles, short pieces, journalistic work, and what not—all of which are the Devil, as far as the writer is concerned. I must admit that the way I spent my year was this: nine months went in living in London, writing articles busily, and turning to the job of writing a novel when my mind was tired and full of other things, with the result that I made two false starts and scrapped them both; then the final three months I spent in the country and actually wrote a novel." The Committee's answer to this problem would not be to make an automatic grant of £400 or £500, but to decide the value and the availability of the award after consultation with the candidate and a consideration of his individual needs. This would probably mean that fewer awards would be made than in the past. But while it seemed right, in the years immediately following the war when so many young writers were struggling for recognition, to distribute the available benefits as widely as possible within the prescribed limits, the Committee believes that its wisest policy now would be to select certain writers who can show not only promise but some degree of performance, and to enable them to share for a time some of the advantages enjoyed by their more successful but less gifted contemporaries, who can draw comfortable dividends from the popular markets. This would not only go some way to redress the balance and ensure that the most deserving are not always the least rewarded, but it should also render a permanent service to literature, since it would enable these writers to give of their best.

These brief suggestions are by no means to be taken as a declaration of the Committee's proposed policy, which is in any case still tentative, and they are included only to indicate that its members are very clearly aware of the writer's present predicament, and that they have been trying to diagnose the malady and to decide which are the most urgent cases and how best to help them. The remedy, if it is to be found, will need money, and a considerable amount of money. The Rockefeller Foundation has played its part with its customary blending of munificence and wisdom, and the Committee must now be able to draw upon British liberality if it is to continue its work. The need has been established, and the means surely exist. There are Trusts and Funds which aim to devote at least part of their resources to cultural ends. There are industrial and commercial organisations which, in this time of high production and full employment, must be sufficiently prosperous to have something to spare. There are successful authors who were fortunate enough to make their names before the war and who may now be in a position to give generous help, as one or two have done already, to their more needy fellows. There are individuals—a diminishing number, no doubt, but still a few—who might be glad to see some of the wealth which now disappears into the gulf of taxation directed into a channel whose course they could follow and whose aim they could approve. Individual benevolence is no doubt restricted, but so too is the pool into which it used to flow, and if the ills of the body are now provided for, something may be available for those who are suffering from the ills of the body politic.

This is no mere rhetorical statement. The *malaise* is clearly perceptible; and, for many people at least, it does not spring merely from the fear of another war or of economic collapse. It springs from an uneasy sense that the human values which make for harmonious living are in constant danger of being submerged. The danger is not, of course, a new

one. Increasing material resources have for a long time been making us increasingly dependent upon them. The decline in the authority of established beliefs, although inevitable and in some ways welcome, has left behind a torpid vacuity in which no positive beliefs can flourish. This, again, is not new. But added to these is the special danger of our own generation: one totalitarian enemy has been defeated, but the totalitarian temper still thrives and spreads. Everything, therefore, which can preserve, elucidate, or give new authority to the threatened values needs to be supported; and the writer, with his special power to represent and interpret every shade of human experience, is one of their chief custodians. But his status, which was already challenged before the war, is even more uncertain now. For at least three generations the still, small cultivated voice of the artist, demanding a disciplined response, has run the danger of being drowned by the cries of the market-place or by the loud, comfortable, unexacting voice of popular journalism. But before the war there was some margin of safety, even if it was no more than the cheap cottage in the country or the modest lodging in town. Now the writer's position is infinitely more precarious, and he deserves help, not only because of his own needs, but because the community particularly needs him. In Milton's familiar words, "As good almost kill a man as kill a good book; who kills a man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroys a good book, kills reason itself, kills the Image of God as it were in the eye." The war killed many men, and with them, no doubt, many good books. That loss is irretrievable; but help can be given, in time of peace, to those young writers who are threatened by inimical forces which, if less immediately apparent and less tangible, are as likely as war itself to stultify and ultimately to destroy their talents.

H. A. SMITH (*Secretary*)

*March 1950*

## RECIPIENTS OF AWARDS: 1946-1948

The following is a list of the successful candidates, together with their principal publications or dramatic productions. Candidates who have received awards in 1949 and 1950 are not included. Publications are classified under two headings: (a) books published before, and (b) books published after the receipt of the award. (In a few instances the book was wholly or partly written before the award was received, and published subsequently.) Only published volumes or volumes accepted for publication are listed; very many of the candidates have also contributed articles, poems and short stories to periodicals. While it would have been impracticable to attempt a detailed survey of these, it should be remembered that poets and short-story writers frequently publish much of their work in periodicals before collecting it into a volume. In the case of dramatic productions one representative example is cited, although the play may have been performed at a number of theatres.

The date given with the name of each candidate is that at which he began the tenure of his award.

JACK AISTROP, Novelist June 1948

- (a) *Backstage with Joe* (novel). Dennis Dobson, 1945
- The Lights are Low* (novel). Farrar, Straus, 1947
- (b) *Pretend I am a Stranger*. Dennis Dobson, 1949

JOHN F. BURKE, Novelist and short-story writer November 1947

- (b) *Swift Summer* (novel). T. Werner Laurie, 1949
- Another Chorus*. Laurie, 1949

JOHN BUXTON, Poet June 1946

- (a) *The Pilgrimage* (poems). Blackwell, 1936
- Judas*. Blackwell, 1938
- Westward*. Cape, 1942
- Such Liberty*. Macmillan, 1944
- Atropos and Other Poems*. Macmillan, 1946
- (b) *A Marriage Song for Princess Elizabeth*. Macmillan, 1947

ROBERT CALDWELL, Novelist and short-story writer June 1947

MAURICE CARPENTER, Poet, dramatist and critic October 1947

- (b) *The Story of Orpheus* (play). Broadcast 1950

SID CHAPLIN, Novelist and short-story writer January 1947

- (a) *The Leaping Lad* (short stories). Phoenix House, 1946
- (b) *My Fate Cries Out* (novel). Phoenix House, 1949

- JACK R. CLEMO, Novelist August 1948  
 (a) *Wilding Graft* (novel). Chatto and Windus, 1948  
 (b) *Confessions of a Rebel* (autobiography). Chatto and Windus, 1949
- MICHAEL CORLEY, Short-story writer and dramatist April 1947
- PATRIC DICKINSON, Poet and Dramatist June 1948  
 (a) *The Seven Days of Jericho*. Dakers, 1944  
*Theseus and the Minotaur, and Poems*. Cape, 1946  
*The Wall of Troy* (poetic drama). Produced by the B.B.C. 1946  
*Stone in the Midst and Poems*. Methuen, 1948  
 (b) *The Angels of the Creators*. Produced by the B.B.C. 1949  
*Pseudolus*. Produced by the B.B.C. 1949
- W. F. DUDLEY, Short-story writer August 1946
- HAROLD ELVIN, Novelist April 1947  
 (b) *The Story at Canons*. Peter Garnett, forthcoming 1950  
*Fandango for a Crown of Thorns*. Peter Garnett, forthcoming Autumn, 1950
- EDWARD GAITENS, Novelist and short-story writer August 1946  
 (a) *Growing Up and Other Stories*. Cape, 1942  
 (b) *Dance of the Apprentices* (novel). MacLellan, 1948
- DAVID GASCOYNE, Poet, novelist and philosophical writer December 1946  
 (a) *Opening Day* (novel). Cobden-Sanderson, 1933  
*A Short Survey of Surrealism*. Cobden-Sanderson, 1935  
*Holderlin's Madness*. Salloch, 1938  
*Poems 1937-42*. Nicholson, 1944
- WILLIAM GLYNNE-JONES, Novelist and short-story writer December 1946  
 (b) *Farewell Innocence* (novel). T. Werner Laurie, 1950  
 (Mr. Glynn-Jones has also published a number of children's and educational books.)
- WILLIAM S. GRAHAM, Poet June 1947  
 (a) *Seven Journeys*. MacLellan, 1944  
*Cage Without Grievance*. Parton Press, 1945  
*Second Poems*. Nicholson and Watson, 1945  
 (b) *White Threshold*. Faber, 1949

- JAMES F. HENDRY, Poet and novelist January 1948
- (a) *The White Horseman*, Routledge, 1939
  - The Bombed Happiness* (poems). Routledge, 1941
  - The Orchestral Mountain* (poems). Routledge, 1943
  - The Blackbird of Ospo* (stories). MacLellan, 1944
  - (b) *Fernie Brae* (novel). MacLellan, 1948
  - The Ruins of Time* (essays). MacLellan, forthcoming 1950
  - The Bridal Tree* (poems). MacLellan, forthcoming, probably 1951
- EDWARD HYAMS, Novelist August 1946
- (a) *Wings of the Morning*. Duckworth, 1938
  - A Time to Cast Away*. Methuen, 1939
  - To Sea in a Bowl*. Methuen, 1941
  - (b) *William Medium*. Bodley Head, 1947
  - Blood Money*. Bodley Head, 1948
  - Not in Our Stars*. Longmans, Green, 1949
  - The Grape Vine in England*. (A history and practice of viticulture in England). Bodley Head, 1949
  - The Astrologer*. Longmans, Green, forthcoming May 1950
  - Out of Waste Land* (autobiographical). Turnstile Press, forthcoming November 1950
- LEONARD IRWIN, Dramatist August 1948
- (a) *The Rolling-Stone*. Produced at Playhouse, Shaw, Oldham 1945
  - A Question of Status*. Produced by Rep. Co. at Theatre Royal, Huddersfield, 1945
  - (b) *The Land of the Living*. Produced at the Library Theatre, Manchester, 1949
  - The Circling Dove*. David Lewis Theatre, Liverpool, 1950
- JOSEPH JACOBS, Novelist January 1949
- MERVYN JONES, Novelist and short-story writer August 1948
- ROBERT KEE, Novelist June 1946
- (b) *A Crowd is not Company*. Doubleday, U.S.A., 1947; Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1948
  - The Young Pretenders* (novel translated from German). Putnam, 1948
  - The Impossible Shore*. Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1949
- RICHARD G. KITTO, Short-story writer June 1947
- LAURIE LEE, Poet March 1948
- (a) *The Sun My Monument*. New Hogarth Library, 1944
  - The Bloom of Candles*. Lehmann, 1947
  - Voyage of Magellan* (dramatic chronicle for radio). Lehmann, 1948

JOHN MAURICE LINDSAY, Poet and novelist May 1947

- (a) *The Enemies of Love* (poems). MacLellan, 1946
- (b) *Hurlygush* (poems in Scots). Serif Books, Edinburgh, 1948
- Fingal and Comala* (dramatic poem in Scots for broadcasting),  
B.B.C. Scottish Home Service, 1949
- At the Wood's Edge* (poems in Scots and English). Serif  
Books, Edinburgh, 1950

LAURENCE S. LITTLE, Poet June 1947

THOMAS J. D. MACDONALD (FIONN MACCOLLA), Novelist  
September 1947

- (a) *The Albannach*. Unicorn Press, 1932
- And the Cock Crew*. MacLellan, 1945

BRYAN MORGAN, Novelist June 1947

- (a) *Vain Citadels*. Heinemann, London, 1947; Little, Boston,  
U.S.A., 1948
- (b) *Rosa*. Hodder and Stoughton, 1950

COLIN MORRIS, Dramatist June 1946

- (a) *Desert Rats*. Produced at Adelphi, London
- Missing, Believed Married*. Produced at Alexandra, Birmingham
- Army of Preoccupation*. Produced at Alexandra, Birmingham
- An Italian Love Story*. Produced at Wolverhampton 1946

✓ P. H. NEWBY, Novelist August 1946

- (a) *A Journey to the Interior*. Cape, 1945
- (b) *Agents and Witnesses*. Cape, 1947
- Mariner Dances*. Cape, 1948
- Snow Pasture*. Cape, 1948
- The Young May Moon*. Cape, 1950

MICHAEL ST. JOHN PACKE, Novelist February 1948

- (b) *First Airborne*. Secker and Warburg, 1948

J. NEIL PATERSON, Novelist and short-story writer August 1946

- (b) *The China Run* (novel). Hodder and Stoughton, 1948
- Behold Thy Daughter* (novel). Random House, U.S.A., 1950
- And Delilah* (short stories). Hodder and Stoughton, forthcoming

DAVID PAUL, Poet and critic January 1949

- X LESLIE A. PAUL, Novelist and philosophical writer June 1946  
 (a) *Fugitive Morning* (novel). Search Publications, 1932  
*Periwake* (novel). Archer, 1934  
*Co-operation in the U.S.S.R.* Gollancz, 1934  
*Republic of Children.* Allen, 1938  
*Annihilation of Man.* Faber, 1945  
*The Living Hedge* (autobiography). Faber, 1946  
 (b) *The Meaning of Human Existence.* Faber, 1947  
*Heron Lake.* Batchworth Press, 1948
- JOHN PRICHARD, Poet and short-story writer June 1947
- PETER RATAZZI, Novelist and short-story writer January 1948
- X ALAN ROSS, Poet and critic September 1946  
 (b) *The Derelict Day.* Lehmann, 1947  
*Time Was Away* (with J. Minton). Lehmann, 1948
- DEREK S. SAVAGE, Poet and critic December 1946  
 (a) *The Autumn World* (poems). Fortune, 1938  
*Don Quixote and Other Poems.* Right Review, 1939  
*A Time to Mourn* (poems). Routledge, 1943  
*The Personal Principle* (criticism). Routledge, 1944  
 (b) *Mysticism and Aldous Huxley.* Alicat. (U.S.A.), 1947  
*The Withered Branch* (critical studies). Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1950  
*The Underground Man* (critical study). Forthcoming
- X GEORGE SCOTT-MONCRIEFF, Novelist, dramatist, poet and critic June 1946  
 (a) *Café Bar.* Wishart, 1932  
*Tinkers' Wind.* Wishart, 1933  
*Book of Uncommon Prayer* (verse). Methuen, 1937  
*Lowlands of Scotland.* Batsford, 1939  
*The Fiddler Calls the Tune.* Produced at the Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh, 1945  
 (b) *Death's Bright Shadow* (novel). Allan Wingate, 1948  
*Edinburgh.* Batsford, 1947
- JOHN SINGER, Poet January 1949  
 (a) *The Fury of the Living* (poems). MacLellan, 1942  
*Storm and Monument* (poems 1944-6). MacLellan, 1948
- EMMA SMITH, Novelist and short-story writer April 1948  
 (b) *Maidens' Trip* (novel). Putnam, 1948  
*The Far Cry* (novel). MacGibbon and Kee, 1949

SYDNEY GOODSIR SMITH, Poet September 1946

- (a) *Skail Wind* (poems in Scots and English). Chalmers Press,  
1941  
*The Wanderer and Other Poems*. Oliver and Boyd, 1943  
*The Deevil's Waltz*. MacLellan, 1946
- (b) *Selected Poems*. Oliver and Boyd, 1947  
*The First Four Fitts of Carotid Cornucopius*. Caledonian Press,  
1947  
*Under the Eilden Tree* (poem). Serif Books, 1948

ARTHUR TEECE, Short-story writer August 1946

C. A. M. WEST, Short-story writer August 1946

✓ LAURENCE WHISTLER, Poet June 1946

- (a) *Four Walls* (awarded the King's Gold Medal), Heinemann,  
1934  
*Emperor Heart*. Heinemann, 1936  
*Sir John Vanbrugh, Architect and Dramatist*. Cobden, 1938  
*Who Live in Unity*. Heinemann, 1944
- (b) *The English Festivals*. Heinemann, 1947  
*Rex Whistler, his Life and his Drawings*. Art and Technics,  
1948  
*The World's Room* (collected poems). Heinemann, 1949

MARGARET WILLY, Poet and Critic June 1946

- (a) *The Invisible Sun*, 1946
- (b) *Life was their Cry* (Studies in biography). Evans Brothers,  
1950.

✕ PETER YATES, Poet and dramatist January 1949

- (a) *The Expanding Mirror* (poems). Chatto and Windus, 1942  
*The Motionless Dancer* (poems). Chatto and Windus, 1945  
*The Assassin* (drama in verse). Produced at Lyric Theatre,  
Hammersmith, 1946  
*The Burning Mask* (drama in verse). Chatto and Windus,  
1948

CHRISTOPHER YOUD, Novelist May 1947

- (b) *The Winter Swan*. Dennis Dobson, 1949