



current issue

Issue Four

Interdisciplinarity of Origin: Modernism, Psychoanalysis and Imperialism

kylie valentine

Imperialism has been identified as a central and significant element within the field of British modernism. A number of writers foreground imperialism as a prerequisite of modernist production. Edward Said, for example, writes that all metropolitan politics and art movements were constituted, during the modernist movement, by their location in the imperialist economy: "Eurocentrism penetrated to the core of the workers' movement, the women's movement, the avant-garde arts movement, leaving no one of significance untouched." (1) Fredric Jameson's analysis of E. M. Forster and Virginia Woolf is animated by an argument that "the structure of imperialism also makes its mark on the inner forms and structures of that new mutation in literary and artistic language to which the term modernism is loosely applied." (2) Other arguments engage with the ways modernism can be understood as a response to the conditions of imperialism. Kathy Phillips's *Virginia Woolf Against Empire* argues, as the title suggests, that Woolf both specifically castigated imperialism and made complaints against "Empire" as an inclusive term, encompassing economics, gender relations, and war making, as these forces operate at home and abroad." (3) Bernard Smith's analysis of modernism in the visual arts argues that imperialism had a direct effect on the rejection of naturalism, "manifest in the desire to create a universal art with a European look, a formal art that might be globally negotiable among all the heterogeneous cultures of the world." (4) Gayatri Spivak has famously argued that: "It should not be possible to read nineteenth-century British literature without remembering that imperialism, understood as Britain's social mission, was a crucial part of the cultural representation of England to the English." (5) While this understanding of imperialism was certainly challenged at the hands of modernism, it is also true that imperialism remained *the* overarching condition of modernist possibility.

Also important to the field of cultural production during the modernist moment was the emergence of British psychoanalysis. The British Psycho-Analytic Association was founded in 1913; the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* published from 1920; during the 1920s and 1930s Freud's works were translated at an accelerating rate and a domestic and émigré psychoanalytic culture emerged and developed in England. The coincidence of British modernism's and British psychoanalysis' consolidation is noteworthy enough; as is well known, the connections between the two extend much further than contemporaneity. Elizabeth Abel and Dianne Chisholm have incisively explored the intertextual connections between psychoanalysis and, respectively, Virginia Woolf and H.D. (6) More basically, we can see that at the same moment that modernism and psychoanalysis were being established in Britain, the two were engaging with each other.

Some instances of the modernist reception of psychoanalysis are enthusiastic and optimistic. Jacques Riviere's "Notes on a Possible Generalisation of the Theory of Freud," published in T.S. Eliot's *Criterion* in 1923, argues that psychoanalysis offers literature a scientifically grounded rationale and framework for the expansion of the artist's field:

The novelist hitherto ... has been careful to keep in mind, for his own guidance, the social situation, the material conditions, and the parentage of each of his characters. It seems impossible to me, after Freud, that he can neglect to imagine ... the sexual situation of his characters and its relation ... from the sexual point of view, with the rest. (7)

Other writers were more cautious. Surrealist enthusiasm for psychoanalysis was one of the issues isolated by Ezra Pound in his attacks on that movement. Virginia Woolf's parodies of psychoanalysis in the 1920s form a striking juxtaposition with her and Leonard Woolf's decision to publish Freud through their Hogarth press from 1924:

Mr AB threw a bottle of red ink on the sheets of his marriage bed to excuse his impotence to the housemaid, but threw it in the wrong place, which unhinged his wife's mind. (8)

A patient who has never heard a canary sing without falling down in a fit can now walk through an avenue of cages without a twinge of emotion since he has faced the fact that his mother kissed him in his cradle. (9)

Djuna Barnes wrote to Emily Holmes Coleman in 1936:

I believe Freud, Jung, and the rest are of little importance because they now have a canned and labeled precept for every action, having, as it were, commercialised the findings of the intuitive artists, like Dostoyevski. (10)

The reasons for the hostility with which some modernist practitioners regarded psychoanalysis are varied and complex, but a partial explanation for this hostility is surely to be found in the violence done to literary texts by psychoanalysis in the 1920s. The *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* throughout that decade is dotted with titles like "Anal-Erotic Traits in Shylock," and psychoanalytic texts of the time mobilised obviously mechanical readings of symbols and metaphors, readings that neglect the role and intentions of writers and artists in producing those works under scrutiny. As Emmanuel Berman points out, classical psychoanalysis is characterised by a reading practice that consistently treats "literary characters as patients seeking treatment" while ignoring the "literary traditions and genres in which novels and stories arose." (11) If Virginia Woolf was doing little justice to Freud in the 1920s, then psychoanalytic practitioners at the same moment were doing little or no justice to literature.

The modernist moment, then, is constituted in part by, on the one hand, an increasingly complex engagement between modernism and imperialism and, on the other, increasingly involved engagements between modernism and psychoanalysis. Yet if the importance of imperialism to modernism has been subject to rich analysis, the importance of imperialism to British psychoanalysis is more oblique and more neglected. My concern in this article is to examine the relationship between British modernism, imperialism and psychoanalysis. However, rather than examining the *direct* impact of imperialism on modernism and psychoanalysis, or the *direct* influence of modernism and psychoanalysis on imperialism, I want instead to explore these relationships through an analysis of their interdisciplinarity. More particularly, I want to look at the interdisciplinarity of psychoanalysis, modernism, and the two cultural disciplines of imperialism, anthropology and archaeology. That is, rather than exploring any one of these fields in detail, I want to look at anthropology and archaeology as providing particular kinds of narrative tools for psychoanalysis and modernist literature.

The influence of imperialism on modernism can be detected across the fields of visual arts, literature and politics, but particularly in the constitution of archaeology and anthropology. Modernist fascination with the 'primitive' was enabled and authenticated by the emergence of anthropology as a mature discipline. The revival of Egyptology and interest in the archaic during the modernist moment was inflected by the new, modern science of archaeology. At the most basic level, both disciplines were made possible by imperialism, and the sites of anthropological and archaeological discovery between 1890 and 1920 resemble closely the maps of European empire. Both disciplines were based on an expansionist, superior gaze and the assumption that evolution had

reached its high-point in the civilisations of the west. Anthropology in particular connects directly to the ideology of imperialism: 'primitives' "needed to be civilised, and the Europeans believed that a natural component of that civilising was extending European markets to colonised populations." (12) However, neither anthropology nor archaeology, nor indeed the fascination with the ancient and exotic that fuelled their emergence and popularity, can be reduced to the imperialist project. Just as modernist art and literature cannot be explained wholly by reference to the ideological exigencies of imperialism, neither can these two disciplines be understood simply as academic instruments of the imperialist project. My aim here is to focus on the impact both disciplines had on modernist literature and psychoanalysis, especially in their deployment of the figures of the archaic and the exotic.

If the level of mutual engagement between modernist and psychoanalytic practitioners is striking to contemporary eyes, so too is the transparent ambition and unabashed universalism of this engagement. Postmodernism, we are reminded constantly, can be distinguished from modernism through the later movement's disavowal of the universal; while psychoanalysis has been subject to feminist and other criticism for its phallogocentrism and insistence on Law for at least thirty years. I want to argue, though, that the often laughable ambition of both modernism and psychoanalysis can be located somewhere outside of the personal idiosyncrasies of practitioners. If the institutional sites and disciplinary scenes of both modernism and psychoanalysis are examined, it is apparent that both were subject to the kind of pressure that *required* the kind of grandstanding that serve as high modernist and psychoanalytic signatures.

In Britain, for example, the emergence of modernism is tied to the academicisation of literature and indeed all the arts. (13) This move to the academy is associated strongly with the work of F.R. Leavis and *Scrutiny*, an approach that codified the study of literature as a hyper-discipline. Terry Eagleton argues that Leavis was remarkably successful in presenting the study of literature as "less an academic subject than a spiritual examination coterminous with the fate of civilisation itself," (14) a representation we can note in passing is again finding purchase with some of the more proudly ahistorical promoters of the new discipline of media studies. (15) By the same token, psychoanalysis in Britain was established as a less medicalised profession than it was in the United States. Open to both women and non-medical practitioners, the British Association from the very beginning was concerned with the propagation of psychoanalysis as self-contained and irreducible to the arguments of other 'New Psychologies.' The real threat to British psychoanalysis came not from those who proclaimed its utter uselessness, sexual pervertedness and German-ness, but from those who wanted to adopt those parts of psychoanalytic doctrine they found helpful and ignore the rest. Ernest Jones's editorial in the first issue of the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* lamented the insidious developments in the American reception of psychoanalysis:

acquiescence in the new ideas on the condition that their value is discounted, the logical consequences not drawn from them, and their meaning diluted until it may be regarded as 'harmless' ... under all sorts of specious guises and by the aid of various seductive catchwords or principles entirely legitimate in themselves, such as 'resistance to dogma,' 'freedom of thought,' 'widening of vision' and so on. (16)

Within the institutional locations of both modernism and psychoanalysis, then, we can detect the strategic imperative for grand claim-making. The ambition displayed by both fields was the product, at least partially, of the material context of their emergence. Faced with the ascendancy of science, the expansion of the known world, and the emergence of new and competing fields, both needed to establish claims that extended beyond what we now understand as disciplinary boundaries, claims about the whole of humanity and its history. We can see also, in the location of both within their particular metropolitan milieu, the opportunities provided by the emergent and highly fashionable disciplines of anthropology and archaeology.

Uncovering the importance of anthropology to psychoanalysis requires no great

detection skills: *Totem and Taboo* (1912-13) has long held an important place in the psychoanalytic canon. Freud's explicit borrowing of contemporaneous anthropological discoveries, complete with large extracts from J. G. Frazer, signals the engagement with and importance of anthropology as a discipline emerging coincident with psychoanalysis, and a discipline with which psychoanalysis needed to engage. Meisel and Kendrick are probably right in their picture of the view from Bloomsbury and Berlin in 1924-5, a time when anthropology was

beginning to play a featured role in psychoanalysis ... Anthropology presented real problems and opportunities for psychoanalytic thinking ... Géza Róheim had already begun, among the [A]borigines of Australia, to demonstrate the validity of the theories Freud had put forward in *Totem and Taboo*. (17)

The 1924-5 letters between James and Alix Strachey are dotted with discussions of Malinowski and Frazer, and Alix's requests for more texts of the kind to be sent to her in Berlin. Similarly, the *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* takes up throughout the 1920s and 1930s the insights, and invades the epistemological grounds, of anthropology. There are contributions from anthropology practitioner Géza Róheim, and articles indicating that less anthropologically involved figures, including Ernest Jones, were not averse to the occasional ethnographical excursion. (18) James Strachey reports that when Jones read the paper that would become "Mother-Right and the Ignorance of Savages" at a meeting of the Society two "guests of honour" were present: Malinowski and Charles Seligman, author of a number of influential texts, including *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*:

Ernest was in fine fettle (fetal?) last night over the matriarchy. A full dress parade, with two guests of honour: Dr Seligmann [sic] and Dr Malinowsky [sic]. Jones was extremely clear, though as usual he seemed to peter out in the end. Dr S. is a rather unpleasant imbecile, and Dr M. a rather unpleasant intelligent. The latter is marvelously Polish and polished: with immense narcissism and (so far as I could see) a quite invincible lack of appreciation of the real point of psycho-analysis. However, on the surface all was serene. [Malinowski] gave Ernest a practically unlimited blessing. And Dr. S. groaned an Amen. Altogether, we felt, quite a historic occasion. (19)

Elizabeth Abel foregrounds the importance of gender in the constitution of anthropological as well as psychoanalytic narratives, arguing that the competing developmental narratives of Freud and Klein from the mid-1920s on recapitulate the "narrative contest that in 1861 had divided British social anthropologists into patriarchalists and matriarchalists." (20) Abel recounts a more troubled picture of the relationship between psychoanalysis and anthropology than Strachey's optimistic vision, arguing that the tensions within anthropology were mirrored within psychoanalysis, and that the psychoanalytic Oedipus complex required the erasure of a number of anthropological accounts to work.

If psychoanalysis invested energy in its relationship to anthropology, literature too was negotiating the metaphors and narratives that anthropology made visible. Jacques Riviere argued that "a first great discovery...must be placed to Freud's credit: it is that a considerable part of our psychic life takes place...outside us, and can only be disclosed and known by a patient and complicated labour of inference." (21) In allocating to psychoanalysis the task of journey and labour, Riviere is drawing both explicit parallels with the place of literature and an implicit analogy with the role of anthropology: a discipline positioned between the wars to tell the truth about civilisation with reference to that which is external to it. Anthropology was also concerned with the origins and sources of modern society, and tracing the repetition and duplication of rituals across different cultures. (22) The lesson Riviere learns from Freud is that the novelists must foreground the importance of the sources and origins of character, as well as admitting that those sources and origins are sexual.

Some of the connections between modernist literature and anthropology are direct. T.S. Eliot was both interested and well read in anthropology for most of his life. (23) Eliot's own "Notes on *The Waste Land*" acknowledge Frazer and Jessie Weston's *From Ritual*

to *Romance* as influences, while the poem itself is famously concerned with the evoking of ritual and myth in its representation of modern London. (24) *The Waste Land* depicts Londoners engaged in ritualistic behaviour that has been emptied of meaning as well as representing the city as literally deadening. Beyond the evocation of rituals as circulating and repetitive, however, the poem deploys a variety of images and different languages to set different belief systems in relation to one another, and to foreground the connections between 'primitive' ritual and modern sexual and social practices. The poem's concluding lines reveal Eliot's interest in Buddhism, but is more clearly indebted to the anthropology of Frazer and Durkheim, who argued for the sexualised inflection of ritual, and the ritualistic origins of Christianity and other religions.

Other modernist texts less obviously engaged with anthropology also reveal intertextual connections. Abel argues that Woolf "probably did not read Malinowski or Richards," although her works demonstrate her "recognition of anthropology's centrality to the current discussions of gender." Beyond this recognition, however, "Woolf participated in a discourse that foregrounded and replayed certain related oppositions: father/mother, sexuality/hunger, Oedipal/pre-Oedipal." (25) These oppositions were all central to the debates within British anthropology throughout the 1920s and '30s. Of Woolf's novels, *The Voyage Out* (1915) and *To the Lighthouse* (1927) probably reveal most clearly these oppositions, especially in their concern with the maternal and paternal. The earlier novel's "fantasmic representations of an archaic mother" in particular can be seen as a response to the mother goddess cults narrated in contemporaneous anthropological texts. (26) *To the Lighthouse* makes a brief, characteristically sarcastic reference to the fashionability of anthropology, (27) but is also centrally concerned with the passage from childhood to adulthood, and the subliminal violence animating that passage.

For both psychoanalysis and modernism, anthropology told a story of both origins and alterity, a story that served as both enabling metaphor and source of tension. Virginia Woolf's subtle and complex engagement with anthropology suggest both the importance of the discipline and the feminist appropriations of the discipline's concerns by some modernist literature. More generally, however, anthropology narrated an evolutionary tale, and foregrounded the exotically different and primitive, that which could be regarded as entirely *outside* modernity. In this sense anthropology is the modernist discipline making visible a figure that has been important to metropolitan art since the Enlightenment. Also important is the figure of the temporally distant but psychically proximate ancestor, an ancestor in whom similarity rather than difference is recognised. Bernard Smith argues that these two figures can be recognised in the ways in which naturalism was

countervailed by archaistic and primitivistic moves that increasingly invoke craft-based exemplars from beyond Europe: *archaistic*, when the source was *perceived* as belonging to one's own cultural past, as Europe perceived the art of Greece and Rome to be; *primitivistic*, when the source was perceived as exotic. (28)

If anthropology provided modernism and psychoanalysis with the tools to narrate the primitive, classicism made available the means of narrating the archaistic. Greek mythology especially provided Freud with the originary narratives that supported his claims to universality while anthropology and the figure of the 'primitive' (Ernest Jones's "savage") provided the image of infancy and immaturity. Classicism allowed for a story of continuity and longevity of the human psyche, while Africa and the Pacific produced and supported the breaks and discontinuities of development within the psychoanalytic economy. Primitivism provided psychoanalysis with the incest taboo as an *evolutionary* narrative, while the legend of Oedipus is the archaic but mature proof of the *continuity* of incestuous desire. The figure of the 'primitive,' borrowed from Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, reveals the emergence of the incest taboo by showing what happened before the incest taboo was in place. The legend of Oedipus, however, relies on a figure who is affected by the incest taboo and so recognisably not 'primitive'; a figure who would not be out of place in contemporary society.

For conservative modernists too, classicism was appropriated for the production of anti-

humanist doctrine. The appeal to an impersonal tradition operated as a means of nullifying "psychologism," with all of its connotations of reductionism, contamination and relativism." (29) The importance of classicism to conservative modernism can be detected in at least two ways. Classicism and the new science of archaeology lent scientific gravitas to the doctrine of impersonality expounded most obviously by T.S. Eliot, in texts like "Tradition and the Individual Talent" (1920) and Ezra Pound, in "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste" and "The Tradition" (both 1913). In appealing to an ancient, inaccessible tradition that Eliot asserted went back as far as cave drawings but which in practice was exemplified by Homer and the Melic poets, Eliot and Pound aspired to the legitimacy of science. They aspired also to an overarching, universal system of knowledge that would codify all extant art into an objective tradition, and provide the tools for adding to that tradition. Critic and poet T.E. Hulme, a strong influence on Eliot and other conservative modernists, argued for the superiority of Egyptian and Byzantine art on the basis of its impersonal abstraction. (30) Secondly, although connectedly, the appeal to an impersonal tradition was part of a broader project of asserting the masculinity of literature, especially poetry. The vitriolic misogyny of Wyndham Lewis, Eliot and Pound can be seen in the context of their efforts to exclude the feminine from tradition, both in the association of the feminine with the emotional and personal, and the more literal figure of the female writer. Virginia Woolf, for one, saw some connection between the insistence that access to the tradition required access to hieratic Greek and women's exclusion from precisely that knowledge. (31)

It is H.D., however, who read most astutely the intertexts of psychoanalysis, anthropology and archaeology, and it is through H.D. and Woolf that some of the most subtle and ingenious appropriations of those texts are produced. H.D., the co-founder of imagism and one of the few women allowed to figure in Pound's deeply conservative project played a mediating role between a particular strand of modernism and psychoanalysis, walking a subtle and deliberate path between Pound and Freud. The result of this negotiation is her own retelling of the collision and collusion between them. H.D.'s *Tribute to Freud* pays tribute to Freud for his parallel working of anthropology and archaeology:

he had opened up, among others, that particular field of the unconscious mind that the traits and tendencies of obscure aboriginal tribes, as well as the shape and substance of the rituals of vanished civilisation, were still inherent in the human mind – the human psyche, if you will. But according to his theories the soul existed explicitly, or showed its form and shape in and through the medium of the mind, and the body, as affected by the mind's ecstasies or disorders. (32)

Appearing at first blush to be a strict if lyrical account of what psychoanalysis is and does, this passage is actually comprised of a shift: from a proprietorial appreciation of the findings of psychoanalysis to a more explicatory, uncommitted acknowledgement of professional boundaries. Freud had opened up the unconscious, drawing together its ancient and hidden sources, making available the ground on which modernists would work. *But according to his theories* there is also a therapeutically inflected consequence of this, an echoing and rehearsing of this legacy. These are theories that H.D. neither rejects nor confirms, which is the proper role of an analysand. Her tribute is among other things the memory of her disobedient but grateful participation in the analytic contract – the role she remembers playing is, among other things, that of an anti-Dora. (33) H.D. more or less declines to analyse the therapeutic process, and the therapeutic content, of psychoanalysis throughout *Tribute*, including here. The human mind, though, is her own territory, a province she is comfortable to expand in her own words, as an aside or addition: "the human psyche, if you will." Psyche both suggests the Greek that sustained her fascination for so long and the "psychology" so important to her, so loathed by her once fiancé Ezra Pound. The final clause of the first sentence could then be both a playful imitation of the professorial explanation – if you will – or a tentative hitching of her own concerns to a more authoritative framework.

Later in the text, however, comes another particularly celebratory reading of Freud's achievements:

The picture-writing, the hieroglyph of the dream, was the common property of the whole race; in the dream, man, at the beginning of time, spoke a universal language, and man, meeting in the universal understanding of the unconscious or subconscious, would forgo barriers of time and space, and man, understanding man, would save mankind. (34)

Even disregarding the farcical repetition of "man" as synonym for "the whole race," this too is in some respects an effusive confirmation of Freud's ambition and psychoanalytic doctrine. However, this vision of psychoanalysis is one that Freud never presented himself – the topographical barriers that make up the psychoanalytic map are certainly comprised of time and space, but are also always necessary, always in place, never to be forgone. Similarly, the unconscious is a lot of things but saviour of humanity is definitely not one of them. H.D.'s "translation" of psychoanalysis, in Dianne Chisholm's words, is here a radically optimistic misreading of it. It is also a crucial and audacious reappropriation of the hieroglyph, that image and letter that belonged, so far as Pound was concerned, to Pound. H.D. takes up Pound's picture-writing, hieroglyph, image, and gives it to psychoanalysis. This appropriation is important in H.D.'s own idiosyncratic translation of psychoanalysis, her own interest in the hieroglyph and the saviour of "mankind," but is crucial too in the context of the vicious anti-Semitism of both Pound and Wyndham Lewis, the dehumanising project of *Blast*, and anti-humanist "universalism" of conservative modernists. (35) Her translation here performs three crucial tasks: it utilises of the devices of Pound and Lewis, but does so in a humanising, psychological project - and in the name of psychoanalysis.

As Abel has emphasised the gendered nature of anthropological schisms and the response of Woolf to these disputes, so Chisholm foregrounds the specifically feminist nature of H.D.'s project. Faced with claims of universalism that were obviously based in specificity, with explicit and implicit misogyny, with narratives of origin that erased or disfigured the maternal and the feminine, Woolf and H.D. responded with a recasting of dominant narratives. Abel traces the intertexts of anthropology and psychoanalysis, and Woolf's own feminist counter-narrative; while for Chisholm, H.D.'s relationship with Freud enabled her to stake out a feminist classicism:

He helped her affirm her own sense of *spiritus mundi*, which modernist male poets plundered as an exclusively male domain .. *Tribute to Freud* is a woman poet's late defence of her Freudian translation of the modernist translation that Eliot traced from Magdalenian rock drawings through Homer onward. *Tribute* ... defends her heterodox sense of descent from prehistoric sources in the 'Magdala' of matriarchal mystery cults, whose mythos/logos and signs she would endeavour to recover through the (mother) transference. (36)

To my opening argument that the modernist field is constituted by a complex politics of collusion and opposition to the projects of Empire must be added another element: that of discipline formation. As well as the explicit and visible gestures of imperialism, the emergence of Cambridge anthropology as a dominant cultural narrative, and the expansion of archaeological ground, were also important developments in the constitution of centre and periphery, of origin and evolution. Abel and Chisholm complicate both the ground of modernist engagement with narratives of origins and alterity, and present an alternative vision of feminist opposition to these narratives. Rather than the well known oppositional stances to imperialism taken by modernists, Chisholm foregrounds feminist mirroring and contesting of discourses integral to imperialism - anthropology, archaeology, classicism. For H.D. the recuperation of the matriarchal within anthropology, or the psychologising of the symbol, were gestures as important as any explicit opposition to imperialism. In fact, the critiques of modernist opposition to imperialism suggest that the production of anti-hegemonic narratives may be even more important than direct refutation of the dominant ones, since refutation is always irrevocably limited. As Jameson and Eagleton foreground *Ulysses* as a response to imperialism, (37) so the arguments of Chisholm suggest H.D.'s work is a response to imperialism, to anthropology, to psychoanalysis, to masculinist modernism.

What then are we to make of this ambivalent and essential series of connections

between modernism, psychoanalysis, and imperialism? (And, of course, although I have not the space here to do it justice, the ambivalent effects of archaeology and anthropology on the imperialist project itself?) What I have tried to sketch is a schema of these connections as kinds of disciplinary demarcation dispute. These connections can be schematised as follows. Firstly, the shared disciplinary heritage of both literature and psychoanalysis produced an uncertain though ambitious role for both. Newly academicised literature and newly born psychoanalysis crossed the same trajectories as psychology and philosophy, and needed to carve out a space that both differentiated them from these fields and established them as superior to them. Secondly, the ascendancy of anthropology - and the dazzling successes of archaeology - under the conditions of imperialism, provided a fruitful source for consolidating the synthetic projects of both. Thirdly, the disciplinary encounters of literature and psychoanalysis - with psychology, philosophy, archaeology, anthropology - produced a universalising project that reflects the contexts, politics and limitations of those disciplines. While there are differences not only between psychoanalysis and literature, but also between literary doctrines, the entire field of modernist speculations on the universal is grounded in an imperialist and metropolitan vision.

I want to argue that this approach forecloses any possibility of recuperating modernist literature or psychoanalysis as a radical progressive political program. They also present the blindspots and bigotries of the two canons as something more than a reflection of the individual bad tempers or prejudices of their practitioners. Instead, I have argued that they are institutionally grounded. This doesn't mean that the bigotries of practitioners should be excused, but that even in the absence of such prejudices, the foundations of psychoanalysis and literature are those of the metropolis in an era of imperialism: an era in which savage political and physical violence was visited on millions of people. However, I hope that the arguments I have presented also foreclose a dismissal of modernism as a blanket term describing all that is reactionary and homogeneous. Modernist literature is a heterogeneous field; classical psychoanalysis has interesting as well as deeply reactionary and banal things to say. The problems raised by nineteenth century philosophy and psychology, and taken up by psychoanalysis and literature, remain interesting: how can the self be described? How can the politics of self and society be discussed together? How can an avant-garde emerge as influential, and how can it survive? The foundational barriers across modernism's field of vision meant that these questions would never be answered satisfactorily by literature or psychoanalysis. It may be, too, that the pejorative valence attached to terms such as 'universal' are connected to the failures of modernism and psychoanalysis, and that these failures mean that these questions will be avoided for a while to come yet. It does not mean, however, that the questions themselves are unworthy of scrutiny, or that the lessons of modernism and psychoanalysis can be learnt by dismissing them.

Endnotes

1. Said, Edward W, *Culture and Imperialism* (London: Vintage, 1993), p. 268

2. Jameson, Fredric, "Modernism and Imperialism," *Nationalism, Colonialism, and Literature*, Terry Eagleton, Fredric Jameson and Edward W. Said, Intro. Seamus Deane (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990), p. 44

3. Phillips, Kathy J., *Virginia Woolf Against Empire*, (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1994), p. xi

4. Smith, Bernard, *Modernism's History: a study in twentieth-century art and ideas* (Sydney: UNSW Press, 1998), p. 29

5. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, "Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism." *Critical Inquiry* 12, Autumn 1985, p. 243

6. Chisholm, Dianne, *H.D.'s Freudian Poetics: psychoanalysis in translation* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992); Abel, Elizabeth, *Virginia Woolf and the fictions of psychoanalysis* (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989)

7. Riviere, Jacques. "Notes on a Possible Generalisation of the theory of Freud." *Criterion* 1.4, July 1923, Collected edition (London: Faber and Faber, 1967), pp. 329-147
8. qtd in Abel, *Woolf and the fictions of psychoanalysis*, p. 18
9. Woolf, Virginia, "Freudian Fiction," *Times Literary Supplement*, March 25, 1920, p. 199
10. qtd in Scott, Bonnie Kime, *Refiguring Modernism: Volume One: the women of 1928* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), p. 179
11. Berman, Emmanuel, "Introduction," *Essential Papers on Literature and Psychoanalysis*, Ed. Emmanuel Berman (New York and London: New York University Press, 1993), p. 2
12. Barkan, Elazar and Ronald Bush, "Introduction," *Prehistories of the Future: the primitivist project and the culture of modernism*, Ed. Elazar Barkan and Ronald Bush (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), p. 3
13. Anderson, Perry, "Modernity and Revolution," *New Left Review*, 14, March-April 1984, p. 104
14. Eagleton, Terry, *Literary Theory: An Introduction* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell), p. 32
15. Wark, Mckenzie, "All Hail to the Patron Saint of the Media," *The Australian, Higher Education Supplement*, July 14, 1999, p.38
16. Jones, Ernest, "Editorial," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 1, 1, 1920, p. 3
17. Meisel, Perry and Walter Kendrick, "Introduction," *Bloomsbury/Freud: the letters of James and Aliz Strachey 1924-5*, Ed. Perry Meisel and Walter Kendrick (London: Chatto and Windus), p. 46
18. Róheim, Géza, "Primitive Man and the Environment," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 2, 2, 1921; Berkeley-Hill, Owen, "The Anal-Erotic Factor in the Religion, Philosophy and Character of the Hindus," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 2, 3-4, 1921; Yates, Sybille L., "An Investigation of the Psychological Factors in Virginity and Ritual Defloration," *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, 11, 2, 1930
19. Cited in Meisel and Kendrick (ed.), *Bloomsbury/Freud*, p. 121
20. Abel, *Woolf and the Fictions of Psychoanalysis*, pp. 3-4
21. Riviere, "Notes on a Possible Generalisation," p. 335
22. Connell, R.W., "Why is Classical Theory Classical?" *American Journal of Sociology*, 102, 6, May 1997, pp. 1515-1520
23. Bush, Ronald, "The Presence of the Past: Ethnographic Thinking/Literary Politics," *Prehistories of the Future*, Ed. Barkan and Bush
24. Eliot, T.S., "Notes on The Waste Land," *The Waste Land and Other Poems* (London: Faber and Faber, 1972), p. 44
25. Abel, *Woolf and the Fictions of Psychoanalysis*, p. 29
26. Kahane, Claire, *Passions of the Voice: hysteria, narrative, and the figure of the speaking woman 1850 – 1913* (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995), p. 120
27. Woolf, Virginia, *To the Lighthouse*, 1927 (London: Grafton Books, 1988), p. 30
28. Smith, *Modernism's History*, p. 55

29. Jay, Martin, "Modernism and the Spectre of Psychologism," *Modernism/Modernity*, 3, 2, May 1996, p. 104

30. *ibid*, 97

31. Woolf, Virginia, "A Dialogue upon Mount Pentelicus," qtd. in Smith, *Modernism's History*, pp. 1-2

32. H.D., *Tribute to Freud: Writing on the Wall, Advent, 1933-1945* (Boston: David R. Godine, 1974), pp. 12-13

33. Steven Marcus uses 'anti-Dora' as well, but for a different reason, and in reference to different people: "we may observe that Dora is no Lolita and go on to suggest that *Lolita* is an anti-Dora." My use of the term is to suggest that 'Dora' is figured within "Fragment of an Analysis" as obedient, in that she follows Freud's directives, but also ungrateful in her demeanour and premature departure. Marcus, on the other hand, is referring to the radical absence of sexual precocity and seductiveness in Dora; to Dora's refusal to play the role of sexual foil to not one but two older men: Herr K., and Freud. Marcus, Steven, "Freud and Dora: story, history, case history," 1974, *In Dora's Case: Freud-Hysteria-Feminism*, Ed. Charles Bernheimer and Claire Kahane (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985), p. 78

34. H.D., *Tribute to Freud*, p. 78

35. Jay, "Modernism and the Spectre," p. 97

36. Chisholm, *H.D.'s Freudian Poetics*, p. 17

37. Jameson, "Modernism and Imperialism," Eagleton, Terry, "Nationalism: Irony and Commitment," *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*

kylie valentine's PhD is in Women's Studies at the University of Sydney. Her thesis explores connections between literary modernism, psychoanalysis, psychiatry, and women's madness.

Copyright © Monash University 2000. All rights reserved.

[about](#) | [current](#) | [archives](#) | [resources](#) | [acknowledgements](#) | [debate](#) | [papers](#) | [contact](#)

This page has been approved by the [Colloquy Editors](#).

Last Date Modified : 03 October 2000 - [Caution](#) - [Monash Home](#)