TEXAS STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE is published four times a year by the University of Texas Press, Austin. It invites significant contributions from scholars in all areas of the humanities, and also in the sciences where these touch the humanities. Features of each issue include an article-review (of an author, a group, an area, or a period).

Prospective contributors are requested to consult an issue of *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* for matters of form. Manuscripts should be double-spaced throughout (including footnotes and quoted matter), and footnotes should be numbered consecutively and grouped on pages separate from the text. A stamped envelope should accompany all manuscripts. Each author will receive free of charge fifty reprints of his article.

Mailing Address

Manuscripts: The Editor
Texas Studies in Literature and Language
University Station, Box 7822
Austin 12, Texas

Subscriptions: ($4.00 per year) The Business Manager
Texas Studies in Literature and Language
University of Texas Press
Austin 12, Texas

TEXAS STUDIES IN LITERATURE AND LANGUAGE

A Journal of the Humanities

VOLUME III, NO. 2 SUMMER 1961

EDITED BY
PHILIP GRAHAM

ADVISORY BOARD
HAZARD ADAMS, JAMES COLVERT, THOMAS CRANFILL
FREDERICK GINASCOL, ERNEST MOSSNER, WINFRED LEHMANN
JAMES MERIWETHER, ROGER W. SHATTUCK
MILTON STERN, WILLIAM TODD

PUBLISHED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS PRESS

© 1961 by the University of Texas Press, Austin

find science too difficult; these students must be provided with unparalleled training. For in handling the complex data of human behavior, mathematical manipulations will need to be developed that have only been foreshadowed, e.g., in probability theory. This new role of the humanities will follow the construction of adequate computers. Programmers are already at work on the requisite programs; the machines should be available within the decade. The humanities will then emerge from the tranquility of Gothic chambers to become again the central discipline.

The University of Texas
Austin, Texas

A SECOND COUNTRY: THE EXPATRIATE IMAGE

By WARREN I. SUSMAN

THE SIGNAL FACT ABOUT AMERICAN EXPATRIATION in the 1920's is the fact of place: the young intellectuals who discovered they could not live in the United States generally made France and more specifically Paris the center of their expatriate adventures.[1] The movement to Paris and to France represented a major shift of expatriate interest from the prewar center, London and England, a migration which heightens the significance of place in expatriation. There were expatriate groups in other countries during the 1920's, indeed important groups in Italy, England, and Germany. And of course before the war there were also American expatriates in France. Nevertheless, the cultural importance of London before the war and Paris after it cannot be denied. Any attempt to analyze the movement of the 1920's, then, must come to grips with this central fact.[2]

Expatriation is essentially a cultural mechanism available to the intellectual whereby he can attempt to turn his personal problems into public issues. Specifically, expatriation usually involves at least two separate but related acts: the rejection of the homeland and the embracing of another country. But put in this way the specific issues involved in any particular act of expatriation lack clarity. For what precisely does it mean to reject one's country and to embrace another? Exactly *what* is being rejected, *what* embraced? For expatriation to serve its function of creating public issues from private problems, the expatriate must have reference to a particular set of images—of his homeland, of his second country—which will effectively aid in sharpening his own position and in giving significance to his expatriation as part of a larger cultural phenomenon.

France as a second country for Americans was not a new idea in the 1920's. In the eighteenth century Jefferson had suggested that all

[1] A slightly different version of this paper was delivered at a meeting of the American Studies Association held in conjunction with the Modern Language Association in Chicago, December, 1959. I wish to acknowledge the unusual aid and encouragement in its preparation by Professor Frederick J. Hoffman, University of California at Riverside, who served as Chairman of that program. Some of the ideas expressed in this paper are developed at much greater length in my study of the background of American expatriation in the 1920's to be published by the Columbia University Press.

[2] R. P. Blackmur, "The American Literary Expatriate" in *Foreign Influences in American Life*, ed. David Bowers (Princeton, 1944), pp. 126–145, offers illuminating insights into the relationship of expatriation to cultural development with suggestive comments about the difference between the expatriation of the 1920's and previous such movements.

Americans had two countries, their own and France. In the nineteenth century, T. G. Appleton had become famous for his *bon mot*, "All good Americans, when they die, go to Paris." Yet it is obvious that Jefferson's image of France—republican, revolutionary, the moral and intellectual capital of the Enlightenment—was vastly different from the image Appleton held of the social center that was his France—imperial, reactionary, the capital of high society and the arbiter of high fashion. Both of these images of France as a second country were held, furthermore, by individuals who were not themselves part of any expatriate movement.

Thus place alone—or even a significant shift of locus—tells the cultural historian only a little about expatriation. The particular image or vision of place, the particular use to which a place is put are also essential to any full understanding. The cultural historian must discover the set of images developed of the second country which best reveals its nature and meaning. He must see these special attitudes toward place against the background of current images of that place held by others not a part of the movement, if he is to note its peculiar qualities as well as its essential difference from previous expatriate developments and from dissident movements at home. The investigator must assess the consequences for culture generally of these images and uses of place.

France for most American intellectuals during the nineteenth century—and on into the early twentieth century as well—meant the France of history. For the intellectuals of Protestant America the Catholic countries of Europe held a special fascination. But it was not the Europe of their own day which most intrigued them. Rather, their images of Europe were primarily historical, generally medieval ones. Willa Cather's primary interests during her first visit to Europe in 1902 seem to have been the villages, cathedrals, and cemeteries.[3] She had a special fondness for the cathedral at Rouen where Claude, the hero of her war novel *One of Ours* (1922), also has his greatest moment, a fact which stands in striking contrast to the inability of a Hemingway hero like Jake Barnes to bring himself to go into old churches. It was the France that best served as the outstanding representative of the world order of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that most attracted American interest in the prewar years. The great cathedral at Chartres became for individuals who were as different as Henry Adams, Willa Cather, and Sherwood Anderson the symbol of culture, tradition, and unified social and moral order which seemed most lacking in the modern world.[4] On their voyages to France they came as pilgrims seeking the

[3] *Willa Cather in Europe* (New York, 1956).

[4] Sherwood Anderson makes explicit his attempt to relate himself to the tra-

past, frequently discovering that the France of the present hindered their search. The France of the village—untouched by the passing of centuries—appealed more strongly than more modern Paris, the countryside more than the city.

To many American intellectuals most attracted initially by the Catholic France of tradition and even more interested in the major achievements of French culture, modern France and especially Paris seemed unbearable. They could not live there, no matter how exhilarating for the moment they might find their experience. Henry Adams, whose interest in medieval France produced one of his major historical and literary achievements, insisted that "he had wanted no French influence in his education. He disapproved of France in a lump . . . France was not serious."[5] Henry James, admitted as he was to the very center of the artistic and intellectual life of France, the great salons, confessing even that he found life in Paris "easy and smooth flowing," soon developed a "weariness and satiety with the French mind."[6] T. S. Eliot, who had once returned from his initial experiences of the French capital looking very much like a Parisian bohemian, could early in the 1920's warn a young friend, if he was interested in serious work, to take the city as a tradition and to avoid (except as a spectator) the people and the temptations of the life offered in Paris.[7] All of these seekers after tradition, pilgrims to the past, soon found the Paris of the present too frivolous and disconcerting. In spite of a genuine interest in the nature of Catholic culture and their search for ancestors whom they might reverence and with whom they might feel a more contemporary kinship, they threw themselves, with Henry Adams, into the arms of the Anglo-Saxons. When they or their fellows sought a second country it was almost inevitably England that attracted them.[8]

dition of Henry Adams in *A Story-Teller's Story* (New York, 1924). There is no study of the "Chartres theme" among American intellectuals—a study of American interest in the Catholic Middle Ages.

[5] *The Education of Henry Adams* (Modern Library Edition, New York, 1931), p. 96. Adams' firm Anglo-Saxonism in many matters is clear.

[6] See the letter to his brother, William, July 29, 1876, reprinted in *The Selected Letters of Henry James*, ed. Leon Edel (New York, 1955), pp. 50–51. "I desire only to be fed on English life and the contacts of English minds—I greatly wish to know some."

[7] Conrad Aiken so describes Eliot on his return from Paris in *Ushant* (Boston, 1952), p. 143. The Eliot letter, addressed to Robert McAlmon, 22 May, 1921, is in the McAlmon Papers, the private collection of Professor Norman Holmes Pearson, who kindly let me examine these documents.

[8] It is perhaps not beside the point to remark that all of the figures discussed in this paragraph were New Englanders. Intellectuals from this region frequently seem more closely attached to England and things English than do intellectuals from other areas.

There was at least one notable exception in the prewar period. Although Edith Wharton is usually thought of in the tradition of her dear friend Henry James, she did settle and spend most of her twentieth-century life in France. Perhaps Mrs. Wharton felt no need of ancestors from some alien shore, for she was able—as Eliot and James were not—to look back in her own family to a rich social patrician tradition from colonial American days. But whatever her personal reasons, Mrs. Wharton could and did clearly reject England and the Anglo-Saxon in favor of France and French ways. Mrs. Wharton's image of France was dual: she saw France as an intelligent and civilized way of life and, perhaps more importantly, she saw France as a moral lesson for her America in its efforts to become a civilization, a model of just those qualities of culture and life most lacking in the United States. *French Ways and Their Meanings* was more than simply a wartime tract to solidify an alliance between the United States and France; it indicated specifically why America needed France, what she might learn from a study of France.[9] The younger people needed to learn of those qualities of culture which they had too little time to acquire but which they must have to be fully civilized: taste, reverence, belief in continuity and tradition, intellectual honesty. They include, also, the view "that real civilization means an education that extends to the whole of life, in contradistinction to that of school or college: it means an education that forms speech, forms manners, forms taste, forms ideals, and above all forms judgment. This is the kind of civilization of which France has always been the foremost model."[10]

Mrs. Wharton's France represented a conscious criticism of the Anglo-Saxon world and the characteristics that Americans had inherited from England. She saw France as a criticism of that world easily embraced by James and Eliot. She pointedly attacked the hypocrisy which Puritan England bequeathed to America concerning the danger of free discussion of sex and social relations between the sexes, much favoring French attitudes on these subjects; she insisted that in France "culture . . . is an eminently social quality, while in Anglo-Saxon countries it might be called anti-social."[11] In that almost running debate—

[9] (New York, 1919). Mrs. Wharton's volume *Fighting France* (New York, 1915) is much more a wartime tract. But see also *A Motor Flight Through France* (New York, 1908) and especially her autobiography *A Backward Glance* (New York, 1934).

[10] Edith Wharton, *French Ways and Their Meanings* (New York, 1919), pp. 20, 113.

[11] Edith Wharton, *A Backward Glance* (New York, 1934), p. 261. There are times in Mrs. Wharton's analysis in *French Ways and Their Meanings* when the reader might easily think that England as well as Germany was an enemy of the United States. See, for example, p. 113.

one of the major cultural tensions in America with reference to Europe from Revolutionary days—between Anglophiles and Francophiles, Mrs. Wharton clearly put herself with the latter group.

In the decade preceding America's entrance into the First World War, a group of dissident young American intellectuals sought to create a national American culture. These young publicists and critics, Herbert Croly, Van Wyck Brooks, Harold Stearns, Waldo Frank, Randolph Bourne among others, almost all rejected America's subservience to Anglo-Saxondom because, in part, it suggested cultural dependence on Great Britain at the very time these men sought to create a consciousness of American cultural distinctiveness. For each of these figures, French culture and society—organic, homogeneous, full—provided a model of the general kind of national culture they would create in America. "Our civilization . . . can learn more from France than from almost any other country," one of the most self-conscious of the younger intellectuals insisted.[12] Frequently, it was their own experience of French ways that taught them exactly what a truly national culture might be like. France seemed to have solved the major problems of the dissociation of the intellectual from society and even of the dissociation of sensibility itself—which appeared to many an intellectual the key cultural problem of his time. Bourne, for example, repudiated England and the English tradition and discovered in France "an intellectual vitality, a sincerity and candor, a tendency to think emotions and feel ideas, that integrated the spiritual world" as he knew it. "In fact, the distinction between the 'intellectual' and the non-intellectual seems to have quite broken down in France. . . . It was a new world, where the values and the issues of life got reinstated for me into something of their proper emphasis."[13]

France, and especially some of her young intellectuals, admired and respected many of the products of American cultural development with a fervor and an interest seldom shown by older American intellectuals. They felt France could use with profit an understanding of these Americans in their own development as artists and as Frenchmen. Even more significantly, these young students in France were playing a vital role in their own society in "perpetuating, rejuvenating, vivifying, and if

[12] Harold Stearns, *America and the Young Intellectual* (New York, 1921), p. 83. The quotation is from an earlier review which first appeared in the *Freeman*, I (September 1, 1920), 595. This magazine, along with *Seven Arts, Dial,* and *The New Republic,* was a leading organ of the cultural nationalists.

[13] Randolph Bourne, "Impressions of Europe, 1913–1914" (a report to the trustees of Columbia University of his travels as Gilder Fellow) in *The History of a Literary Radical and Other Essays* (New York, 1956), pp. 86–87.

need be, creating the national consciousness."[14] The young Americans in similar positions in the United States might learn how to do this for their own country by frequent interchanges with their French counterparts.[15]

Even before the war intensified the interrelationship, a fruitful exchange of opinions between young American and French intellectuals had developed. They saw their basic problem as similar: the creating and maintaining of a worthwhile national culture in an era of international industrialism. The Americans welcomed such a volume as Pierre de Lanux's *Young France and New America* as a way of learning how each people might develop "the fullest and freest expression... along the lines of its own genius."[16] Lanux had suggested in 1917 an image of France that must have seemed especially appealing: "France means . . . among other things, the land of free invention, discussion and experiment for social progress . . . a living laboratory, where every principle was tried . . . before being spread over the world."[17] This image of France stood in chiaroscuro contrast to the image of America frequently held by the young intellectuals of the 1920's. The cultural nationalists did not become expatriates, even to France.[18] They frequently attacked the expatriate position, preferring to find in a study of the American past the grounds for a richer American culture in the future. But they could understand the pull of France; they continued to encourage the interchange between the intellectuals of the two nations; they realized the need for American support and even participation in the great cultural activities of Paris.

The movement of Ezra Pound from London to Paris in 1920 gives the historian a symbolic instance on which to build an analysis. Pound's move was made against a background of more than a decade's devotion to the study of the problems of modern culture. He was the link between two expatriate generations, for he knew intimately many of

[14] Van Wyck Brooks, in his introduction to his edition of Randolph Bourne's *History of a Literary Radical*, pp. 7–8. Originally published in 1920.

[15] Waldo Frank, for example, had spent 1913 in Europe, as had Bourne. Both returned and became editors of the cultural nationalist organ *Seven Arts* when it was founded in 1917. Frank was especially interested in developments in the French theater and in 1918 published a study of the Theatre du Vieux Columbier. His *Our America* (New York, 1919) was originally written to explain America to Young France. See his "Foreword to the American Edition," pp. ix–xi.

[16] Pierre de Lanux's book was published in New York in 1917. It met with an enthusiastic reception from Van Wyck Brooks, "War's Heritage to Youth," *Dial*, LX (January 17, 1918), 47.

[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

[18] One major exception was Harold Stearns. While in his writings upon his return to America from France he attempted to see himself as a typical expatriate, he was never in the main stream of American expatriate life in Paris.

the expatriates of the London era and served later as friend, teacher, and counselor for many of the younger expatriate group in Paris. Pound was clearly interested in the cause of the arts in America. He shared, in his unique way, many of the aims of the younger cultural nationalists at home. But his analysis of cultural history had left him dedicated to what he called the "comparative method" in the study of literature and culture. He appealed for greater knowledge of the world and its literature in part because he considered such knowledge essential for the creation of a truly American culture: the study of something simply called "American literature" was as misleading for a writer as a course in something called "American chemistry" would be for those wishing to become better chemists.[19]

The question of expatriation itself took on new meaning in Pound's analysis. He defined for himself—and in large measure for many who followed him abroad—a new, self-conscious function for expatriation. The expatriate was essentially an agent for American culture abroad; letters were a "nation's foreign office" and the expatriate a liaison between cultures with a sacred obligation of keeping his own country informed about cultural developments in other lands.[20] In his own career he carefully attempted to fulfill all of these special functions and this tradition was continued by many of the younger Americans in France during the 1920's. Fuller knowledge and appreciation of both literature and life abroad did not make anyone less American; rather it better enabled him to achieve his full American potential.[21]

Pound's position always stemmed from his interest in furthering a cultural renaissance in America.[22] Writing in that prewar decade of the cultural nationalist in America, but from the vantage point of London, he undertook an analysis of the particular conditions necessary to achieve the desired cultural rebirth at home. The greatest deficiency he discovered was quite simply the lack in America of a natural capital. "America, my country, is almost a continent and hardly yet a nation, for no nation can be considered historically as such until it has achieved within itself a city to which all roads lead, and from which there goes

[19] Ezra Pound, "The Renaissance," in *The Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*, ed. T. S. Eliot (New York, 1954), p. 218. Originally in three different issues of *Poetry*, 1914.

[20] These ideas were originally developed in "What America Has to Live Down," *The New Age*, XXII (September 12, 1918), 314.

[21] For Pound the real danger to men and to cultures was provincialism. See "Provincialism the Enemy," *The New Age*, XXI (July 12—August 2, 1917), 244–245, 268–269, 288–289, 308–309.

[22] In addition to "The Renaissance," previously cited, see also "America: Chances and Remedies," *The New Age*, XIII (May 1—May 22, 1913), 9–10, 34, 57–58, 83.

out an authority."[23] Such a center should provide real artists with permanent comfort and support to do the kind of work they wish to do, regardless of the public's demands. Great libraries, galleries, studios should offer at such a center the opportunity to see and study the great models for painting, sculpture, or writing by importing and collecting the great works of the present as well as the past. Such a capital should make possible the artist's devotion to his own intellectual development and give him a chance to learn from his fellow artists. It should be a place for the fullest communication—between intellectuals of the day and those of the past. The establishment of such a capital, Pound insisted, had historically preceded all the great renaissances of the past.[24]

Over and over again in his articles before and during the war, Pound called for the creation of these conditions, for the establishment in America of such a capital. Meanwhile, until America was able to provide the circumstances for her renaissance at home, Americans might well have to find some other capital abroad. Even during his London days, Paris stood as a proper model for such a center. Pound knew that the really important things done in the arts for decades had been done in Paris. "There are just two things in the world," he could write in 1913, "two great and interesting phenomena: the intellectual life of Paris and the curious teething promise of my own vast occidental nation."[25] It is not surprising, then, that he should in 1920 discover a way of combining the "two great and interesting phenomena" by making Paris, in the absence of such a capital in the United States, the center of his activities in behalf of an American Renaissance.

But too frequently the discussion of American expatriation is taken out of a larger historical context; too infrequently do students remember that much of what we consider the finest in modern culture—in the arts generally—has been the product of expatriate figures; too seldom do we recall that most of these figures made Paris their capital in the first several decades of our century. Not only did Americans flock to Paris, but also Poles, Russians, Spaniards, Germans, Englishmen, Italians, Irishmen, Latin Americans. Paris was *the* international capital;

[23] Ezra Pound, *Patria Mia* (Chicago, 1950), p. 21. This volume reprints parts of a long series under the same name which Pound wrote for Orage's *The New Age* in 1913. Pound's remarkable cultural analysis and criticism in this magazine are too little known.

[24] Ezra Pound, "The Approach to Paris," *The New Age,* XIII (September 4, 1913), 551–552.

[25] *Ibid.*, p. 552. For his interest in the work being done in Paris, see his "Status Rerum," *Poetry,* I (January, 1913), 123. "The important work of the last twenty-five years has been done in Paris."

Pound and the younger Americans who came after him were joining a great international movement.[26]

Paris existed as a comfortable place, a place where the artist was more than tolerated, a place where one could work and learn. This was especially true in the 1920's, when the very opportunities and liberties Paris offered were clearly being denied in America. It remained, as Pound suggested, a center where an individual's peculiarities and eccentricities were forgiven, where there was a sense of leniency, a symptom of "some instinct against vested interest" which recognized that "indiscipline is perhaps in this aspect the only basis of culture."[27] But above all, Paris remained in 1920 "the laboratory of ideas; it is there poisons can be tested, new modes of sanity discovered. It is there that the antiseptic conditions of the laboratory exist. That is the function of Paris."[28]

There were, to be sure, traditional images of Paris and France which no doubt inspired many journeys. Vincent Sheehan has suggested that Paris "preëxisted in the memory, somehow, so that it began by being familiar even to those who had never seen it before: it was a *patrie* of the imagination."[29] But any full understanding of the special uses of place in the expatriation of the 1920's must add to the older, persisting images the new and special enticements of Paris as a laboratory of ideas. Here the salon, the studio, the cafes, the bookshops were not simply pleasant places for social gatherings—they were small, individual laboratories; the magazines, the publishing ventures were not schemes for making money—they were necessary laboratory equipment, less expensive and less curtailed by censorship and other forces than those available in the United States. Here the willing student might discover the great directors of the international laboratory—some like Pound and Gertrude Stein from the United States, others from all over the world. Here in Paris, Pound's laboratory of ideas was easily and necessarily combined with Lanux's Paris as social laboratory.

This was the special function, the special image of Paris and of France which best illuminates the initial nature of the expatriate move-

[26] William Gaunt (*The March of the Moderns,* London, 1949, p. 193) is not being melodramatic when he sums up that "The modern movement has been a pattern of expatriation." His evidence proves it.

[27] Ezra Pound, "Paris Letter," *Dial,* LXXI (October, 1921), 457.

[28] Ezra Pound, "Remy de Gourmont," in *Pavannes and Divisions* (New York, 1918), p. 116. In a famous earlier essay, "The Serious Artist," also reprinted in this volume, Pound attempts to compare the function and aim of the artist with those of the doctor and scientist.

[29] Vincent Sheehan, *Personal History* (New York, 1935), p. 27.

ment of the time. The older expatriate generation remained in London, seeking somehow to make use of the past, the tradition and society related to Anglo-Saxon ancestors. The cultural nationalists at home attempted to discover a usable past deep within America's own cultural history. The expatriates of the 1920's, however, sought a usable present, a place of learning and living among the best of their contemporaries. The pilgrimage to Paris was a commitment to one's own times and its special problems in an environment which best permitted the free play of professional, personal, and social experimentation.

If Ezra Pound suggested the initial images which give special significance to Paris as a place of expatriation in the period, it was Gertrude Stein who perhaps best summarized the cultural consequences of this particular relationship between the young American expatriates and Paris. In the 1930's, after her visit to the United States, she could look back not only on her own experiences but also on those of many expatriate groups that frequented France in the 1920's. Her assessment correctly revealed the fact that more came out of the Paris laboratory than a set of individual contributions to American cultural life. What was produced was a new attitude toward America and toward culture itself.

If Miss Stein seemed to be recalling Thomas Jefferson when she declared "America is my country and Paris is my home town," she was in fact suggesting a much deeper relationship than Jefferson proposed.[30] For Miss Stein, extended residence abroad did not make anyone less an American. Like Pound, she insisted that everyone who proposed to do anything creative actually needed two civilizations. "They have to have the civilization that makes them and the civilization that has nothing to do with them." Furthermore, like Pound, she supported her contention by citing historical evidence. "The Renaissance needed the Greek, as the modern painter needed the negroes [*sic*] and as the English writers needed Italy and as many Americans have needed Spain or France."[31]

The creative artist, the thinker, must have some kind of isolation from the particular qualities and demands that one's country is sure to make upon him if he lives in it. This kind of detachment enables the intellectual to devote himself to the development of "what is inside" of him, not only his own special gifts and talents, but the experience and

[30] Gertrude Stein, "An American and France," reprinted in *The Discovery of Europe*, ed. Philip Rahv (Boston, 1947), p. 571. First published in 1936.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 572. These ideas appear also in her *Paris France* (New York, 1940), essentially an extension of the argument of the 1936 essay, but written under the more emotion-packed circumstances of the coming of World War II.

background of the civilization that "made" him. But this isolation is not simply a matter of expatriation; rather it is the question of selecting the proper place to live. Under no circumstances does this mean the expatriate should adopt another civilization, or "mix himself up" with another civilization. The expatriate simply selected the place he needed, the place that provided the proper kind of isolation and freedom. Thus Americans were drawn to Latin countries because these remained, through previous literary and other experiences, countries of romance and unreality. England, for example, would never do for Americans because England is associated with reality, with history, and thus could not isolate or free the intellectual.

France, for Miss Stein, was not simply a land of romance; there were positive qualities in the new environment which were essential to the American if the twentieth century was in fact to come of age. The century itself was first born in the United States, and for this reason America is older than France.[32] Simply, American character had shown the tendencies which were to be the spirit of the new age; Americans possessed them as a natural heritage. But while the century was in effect theirs (thanks largely to the processes of mechanization, industrialization, standardization), they were unable to use it, to look at it objectively. They could not mold the spiritual and material achievements into creative work unless they had some kind of contrast, some background against which they could see their own century more clearly. France was that natural background. The experience of French civilization best enabled the Americans to see the creative possibilities of the new century and of their own particular qualities.[33] Certainly this was in fact one of the most important consequences of the expatriation of the 1920's.

Miss Stein's France had, in its own civilization, those qualities of tradition, conservatism, individualism, and a firm belief in logic which were the very qualities necessary to enable any civilization to mature. Thus the experience of Americans in France was actually a process of maturation and civilization—both for the young Americans who came to France and who were the makers of the twentieth century and for the civilization, the century itself through these creators and others like them. It was France, the experience of French culture itself, which civilized these young Americans—especially those who had lost the significant years between eighteen and twenty-three in wartime service—and made possible, in a creative sense, the twentieth century. And

[32] Gertrude Stein, *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* (New York, 1933), p. 95.

[33] Gertrude Stein, *Paris France*, p. 18.

since the new century was the American century, this experience of France also made possible the maturation of American civilization itself. Thus every American who would be part of his century needed both his own country and France.[34]

Miss Stein's own expatriation significantly involved two Frances, both necessary, in her analysis, to achieve the twentieth century: there was, initially, the France of the present and the France which was the laboratory of ideas, symbolized by her friendship with Matisse, Picasso, and Jean Cocteau; there was also the France of history and tradition, the France that taught her the ways of older civilizations, perhaps best symbolized by her friendship with the royalist Bernard Fay. It is not unfair to see in Miss Stein's relationship with France and the lessons she drew from that relationship many of the special consequences of place for the expatriate movement of the 1920's.

No matter what the traditional images of France might have been for the young American expatriates, they came clearly not in search of the past; we hear little of pilgrimages to Chartres in expatriate memoirs. They sought instead the great international capital of the present, the laboratory of ideas, the social laboratory as well, where the young Americans, in an environment and with facilities unavailable in the United States, could devote themselves to the present and its problems. John Peale Bishop, writing in 1941, has provided us with the best short analysis, from the point of view of one of these young men himself: it is in these culture capitals that "in each art, the tradition can best be acquired and with it an intenser consciousness of one's own time. The contacts of a capital can mean many things to a young man, but none more important than this. Twenty years ago there were many capitals in the world, but in only one was it possible to know the extreme moment of time. And that was Paris."[35] But in the process itself the French experience also taught the young American a new respect for his own culture and its possibilities, for his own century, while at the same time providing a richer and more cogent understanding of the nature of culture itself. And significantly the movement marked a final break of the main body of our intellectual and artistic effort with the Anglo-Saxon dominance which had ruled for so long.

Thus the new images and uses of place in expatriation mark a positive contribution to American civilization rather than simply a negative rejection of America. While these images clearly drew attention to many of the weaknesses of America, the expatriates sought more frequently, through that French education Henry Adams so scornfully rejected, to fulfill their own potential as intellectuals and in the course of this development the expatriate learned important lessons about the nature of culture which could and did contribute to the new American Renaissance Pound had called for in 1914. It is the importance of Paris as a cultural capital which best sums up the significance of place in the expatriation of the 1920's and which emphasizes the values of such centers for cultural growth. Here the expatriate lived among the problems, the techniques, the activities of the present; yet here, too, he learned how best to use the past.

Rutgers—The State University
New Brunswick, New Jersey

[34] *Ibid.*, pp. 58–59.

[35] *The Collected Essays of John Peale Bishop*, ed. Edmund Wilson (New York, 1948), p. 172. There are several brilliant paragraphs on the meaning of Paris as an international laboratory of the 1920's written by Harold Rosenberg and originally published in 1940, but recently reprinted in his *The Tradition of the New* (New York, 1959), pp. 209–220.