

Revised Dissertation Proposal
February 28, 2005

Theorizing a Locational Modernism: *Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse*

“a place on the map is also a place in history”
Adrienne Rich, “Notes Toward a Politics of Location”

“Maps are so naturalized within modern culture
that their construction and use are rarely remarked upon”
Matthew Edney, *Mapping an Empire*

This is a project of reclamation. It puts into conversation three little-known modernist little magazines—*Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse*—in order to resurrect a complex social history of modernism. Borrowing Louise Pratt’s term, it reads these magazines as “contact zones,” which Pratt defines as “the space of colonial encounters, the space in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations” (1992: 6). Specifically, these magazines operated as public forums in which modernist literary and visual artists addressed the complicated intersections of geography, history, and empire—intersections shaping the relations in any contact zone or borderland. Like the contributors to these magazines, this project asks, how do geography, history, and empire come together in the creation of a national(ist) art and identity?

Such was the question asked by W.B. Yeats on the pages of *Samhain*, the official organ of the Irish Literary Theatre (later the Abbey Theatre). Published in Dublin and edited by Yeats, *Samhain* (1901-1908)¹ is the earliest of the magazines examined here: as such, it is read as a precursor to the later two—a model of how to read the modernist little magazine as a contact zone. *Samhain* originated as a way to publicize the Irish Literary Theatre’s annual program. However, it quickly evolved into more than just a record of plays to be performed. In his

¹ My discussion of *Samhain* will also include a discussion of its predecessor, *Beltaine* (1899-1901) and *The Arrow* (1906), an interim publication predominately addressing the controversy that followed the Theatre’s production of Synge’s *Playboy of the Western World*.

commentary on the plays and on the nature of the theater itself, Yeats set local Irish drama on a global stage—writing it into the European dramatic tradition, while setting it against the British. *Samhain* thus became a forum in which Yeats developed a heavily politicized aesthetic that called sharply for an Irish national literature and theater—the foundations, as he saw it, of an Irish national(ist) identity.

Perhaps recognizing a similar attempt by its editors to grow a national(ist) identity out of a national arts, Yeats agreed to have his work published in *Orient* (1923-1928)², which appeared fifteen years after *Samhain*'s final issue. Published in New York by the New Orient Society and under the editorships of Hari Govil and Syud Hossain, *Orient* likewise examined the intersections of nationalism, geopolitics, empire, and the arts. Billing itself as “An International Magazine of Art and Culture,” its focus was the arts and cultures of Southeast Asia, generally—India, specifically. Far more strident in its politics than Yeats' little magazines, *Orient* vigorously demanded an end to British colonial occupation of those regions. In an attempt to make its readers appreciate the urgency of its cause, *Orient* brought together “scholars and artists of the East and West through the interchange of creative ideas” (Vol. 1, no. 4). Thus, on its pages, as on the pages of Yeats' little magazines, we find a blending of the local and global—Yeats was published alongside Indian poet Rabindranath Tagore, and Albert Einstein appeared with Mahatma Gandhi.

Also published regularly in *Orient* were the poetry and poetic translations of Willard Johnson and Witter Bynner, who served, respectively, as the editor of and mentor to *Laughing Horse*. Roughly contemporaneous with *Orient*, *Laughing Horse* (1922-1939) began as a

² *Orient* magazine appeared from February to November 1923 under the editorship of Hari Govil. Beginning in May 1924 and continuing until January 1927, the magazine appeared as *The New Orient*, edited by Syud Hossain. Govil resumed the editorship in March 1927 at which time the magazine became *The Oriental Magazine*. This project addresses all three versions. However, for clarity, I refer simply to *Orient* throughout this proposal.

collegiate satire magazine written and edited by four undergraduates at the University of California, Berkeley: being satirized was the state of American higher education. After being banned on Berkeley's campus in 1923, ostensibly for publishing D.H. Lawrence's "obscene" review of Ben Hecht's novel *Fantazius Mallare*,³ Johnson, then living in Taos, dissociated the magazine from Berkeley and broadened its focus, making it a magazine of (inter)national social criticism—one which spoke boldly about the legacies of American imperialist action in the southwestern United States and Mexico. Eventually, *Laughing Horse* became an organ of the Santa Fe writers group, which in addition to Bynner and Lawrence included Mary Austin and Mabel Dodge Luhan.

Though published at different times and representing diverse geopolitical realities, these little-known modernist little magazines, when read together, reveal the extent to which relationships among modernist artists and the circulation of their ideas intersected and overlapped not just at imperial centers—London, Paris, New York—but at modernism's peripheries, in literal and figurative contact zones—Dublin, Calcutta, Taos. Reading *Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse* challenges us to rethink our current "maps" of modernism and empire by triangulating both according to points currently absent from modernist studies. What were the relationships between Yeats, Tagore, and Bynner? How do Irish, Indian, and American Southwestern modernisms overlap and intersect? How did these magazines facilitate a mixing of the local and global, metropolitan and provincial, national and transnational as their editors and contributors called for an end to colonial occupations, argued strongly for (and helped create) national literatures, and examined (not always without blinders) the implications of (post)colonial rule? While the relations in Pratt's "contact zones" typically reveal "conditions of

³The banned issue of *Laughing Horse* (No. 4) also contained excerpts from Upton Sinclair's *The Goose Step: A Study of American Education* [1923], which criticized the "'militarization' of the University of California" and which some theorize was the real motivation for the University's sanctions (Gross n.p.).

coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict” (6), this project demonstrates such was not always the case. In fact, on the pages of these magazines, one finds cooperative and productive relations between and among artists traditionally set against one another by the scholarly apparatus of modernist studies (Oriental/Occidental, metropolitan/provincial, colonizer/colonized, literary/visual). When read together, these magazines reveal significant yet neglected modernist collaborations, conversations, and continuities—all of which create a cultural portrait to be reclaimed for modernist history and put back on the map of modernist studies.

In an attempt to remap modernism—to expand its topography and to reveal the cultural interchange occurring between its centers and peripheries—this project adapts not only Pratt’s theory of the “contact zone.” It also draws on Susan Stanford Friedman’s theories of “mapping” as articulated in her collection *Mappings: Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter* (1998).⁴ In outlining a possible future and more productive direction for feminism, Friedman “argues strongly for new ways of thinking that negotiate beyond the conventional boundaries”—the conventional binaries, the habits of mind—that separate individuals and disciplines into us and them, self and other. Specifically, she theorizes a “locational feminism” (5). Fluid and flexible, “locational feminism” acknowledges difference while simultaneously recognizing “ongoing intercultural exchange and hybridity” (5). According to Friedman, “Locational feminism requires a geopolitical literacy that acknowledges the interlocking dimension of global cultures, the way in which the local is always informed by the global and the global by the local”

⁴ In developing her theory, Friedman draws on the work of James Clifford and Arjun Appadurai. Specifically, she addresses Clifford’s idea of an “ethnography of travel” (see *Routes* [1997]), which disrupts the notion of a stable, centralized local(e) privileged through anthropological fieldwork. Instead, Clifford argues for an ethnographic approach that recognizes the constant “traveling” of people, ideas, and cultures through an interchange of the local and global. Friedman also draws on Appadurai’s concept of the “global ethnoscape,” which similarly foregrounds the idea that even stable communities (those based on kinship, for example) are nonetheless largely shaped by “human motion” and as a result “all cultures are products of intercultural transactions” (Appadurai 33; Friedman 113). The theories of both Appadurai and Clifford will be discussed in this project.

(5). In this way, a locational feminism acknowledges the influence of but refuses to limit women's experiences to a specific geopolitical *location*. Rather it acknowledges differences arising from *locale*, while simultaneously positioning those differences in a broader context of exchange—the interplay between the local and global.

Adapting Friedman's term, this project examines the implications of and argues strongly for a locational modernism. Something Friedman herself proposes in her essay "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of *Modern/Modernity/Modernism*" (2001). In this essay, she insists that "Left unexamined [in modernist studies] is the degree to which the production of western forms of modernity resulted from the heightened interaction western societies had with nonwestern others—with the Other of the western imaginary; and, with the real, heterogeneous multiplicitous others outside of the West. Also left unexplored is the production of different modernities through the histories of nonwestern peoples" (507). Though she does not name it as such, here Friedman points toward a locational modernism. Rather than simply expand modernism's growing list of "isms," a locational modernism invites serious examination of the "ongoing intercultural exchange" (positive and negative) between and among them. It encourages us as modernist scholars to consider how our maps of modernism continue to exclude locations, artists, and works not sufficiently "modernist" to warrant classification—but nonetheless a vital part of the local and global interchange underlying and, in some cases, giving rise to our most beloved texts and images.

Increasingly, modernist scholars are taking up the charge to "remap" modernist studies. In *Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial* (2002), Elleke Boehmer, for example, argues for a reconceptualization, a paradigm shift, in how we study the rise of anti-imperial, anti-colonial national identities. To do so, she argues, requires an examination of "the interconnected triangle

of Ireland and England, India, and South America,” as well as a relocation of the “‘contact zone’ of cultural and political change conventionally located between the European colonial centre and its periphery” to the peripheries (2). This type of remapping reveals “the movement and exchange of anti-colonialist, nationalist, class, gender, and other discourses” to be “more constellated and diversified, far more multiply-mediated than in standard dualistic configurations of the colonial relationship” (5).⁵ This project does similar work, triangulating Ireland, India, and the American Southwest to reveal the interconnectedness of modernist and imperial centers and their peripheries.

Like Boehmer, Howard J. Booth and Nigel Rigby, in their collection *Modernism and Empire* (2000), examine the interconnectedness, the interplay between empire, its centers and margins, and modernism. Specifically, theirs is an attempt to insert a discussion of empire into the conversation about modernism, believing that until recently the two have been mutually exclusive. In an attempt to expand modernism’s map, they question “how modernism appeared to those situated at the colonial margins, and how it might have been appropriated in the effort to establish national and post-colonial literatures” (4). While they conclude that answers to such questions contribute to our “analysis of multiple modernisms” (emphasis theirs), Booth and Rigby also recognize that “The established arguments around modernism remain at the centre, while the new issues cluster on the increasingly crowded periphery” (10). Like their collection, this project attempts to disrupt that hierarchy by challenging the center/periphery boundary through a reading of *Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse* as contact zones.

⁵ In addition to its theoretical relevance, Boehmer’s work is important to my project because she directly addresses Yeats’ collaboration with Tagore, arguing that it “demonstrates [...] the interrelation of cultural nationalisms with aims in common” (177). More specifically, she claims Yeats’ “reading of Tagore arguably contributed to shaping his theories concerning the formation of identity (including nationality) through struggle and difference, passion and abstraction” (181). Boehmer is one of the few critics to discuss this collaboration in great detail. (See also James Longenbach’s *Stone Cottage: Pound, Yeats and Modernism* [1988], which discusses the triangulated relationship between Yeats, Tagore and Pound.)

In *Modernism and Empire's* opening essay, “‘Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities’: Theorising Modernism and Empire,” Patrick Williams echoes his editors’ warning. Williams argues that “Modernism is [...] still viewed as the product of the Western metropolis and its immigrant intellectuals, rather than a cultural practice which might in fact be widely disseminated by those very imperial processes (social, cultural or economic) that, among other things, brought the immigrants to the metropolitan centre” (24). His goal, like Boehmer’s and mine, is “to confront the existence of a modernism from the empire” (25) by expanding modernisms’ “cartography” (Williams maps modernism to include writing from “Australia, New Zealand, India, Kenya, and Ireland—though he warns, such is not a “complete cartography” [25].) Such projects of “reconfiguration,” Williams argues, will “forever [alter] the map of modernism” (25)—the very goal of projects like this one.

As the language of this introduction makes quite clear, this project employs the literal and metaphoric conceits of mapping—map making, map reading, and by implication, travel. It does so while also acknowledging Richard Phillips’ claim that “the language of mapping, both literal and metaphorical, is perhaps more prolific than it is precise” (*Mapping Men and Empire: A Geography of Adventure* [1997] 14). This has certainly been the case in modernist studies, which in recent years has witnessed the publication of works that “map the field” or consider “how modernism has been mapped.”⁶ In contrast, I do what that is new and different? elements central to a theory of locational modernism. Need to define how I’m using the metaphor—one to mean cannon, one to mean direction. In doing so, it assumes two basic (and perhaps obvious)

⁶ See, for example, Armstrong’s *Modernism* (2005), which has a chapter “Mapping Modernism” that “reflect[s] on how we map literary modernism”(23); Soto’s *The Modernist Nation* (2004), “I wanted to know in the broadest possible terms how modernist movement in the United States have been symbolically imagined, and I wanted to map out the contours of the field as I saw it” (5); or Schedler’s *Border Modernism* (2002), “Within American literary studies [...] there has been a recent call for a remapping of the field” (131). And in *Geomodernisms* (2005), Laura Doyle and Laura Winkiel, describing the subjects in their collection, suggest, “Some of these artists are pointedly engaged with the notion of modernism, some not, but all are aware of it as a coordinate on a map they occupy” (4).

premises: 1) locations on a map are determined relative to one's starting point and 2) the technical aspects of map making, the sciences of geography and cartography, belie a map's ideological underpinnings. Beginning with the first premise, consider that defining a point as "east" or "west" depends on one's original location: while east of Taos, New York is west of Calcutta. Similarly (or perhaps, more accurately, as a result), conceptions of East/West, Eastern/Western are also determined by relative position. When asked to describe the West, a New Yorker might think cowboy hats and pick-up trucks; whereas a local resident of Calcutta might think McDonalds and *The Apprentice*. This example demonstrates how our "geographical imagination," that is, our "sensitivity towards the significance of place, space, and landscape in the construction of social life," is determined by the very places, spaces, and landscapes in which our imaginations take shape. To quote Phillips further, "The mental ground on which people think about society and culture [how we think about East and West] affects and limits what they think" (vii, 12). This seems obvious, yet,

As a result, despite the fluidity of these culturally arrived at definitions, they maintain fixed in people's minds and perhaps not surprisingly, conceptions of east and west continue to be applied monolithically within modernist studies, which necessarily maps modernism according to the intellectual positions of its dominant scholars (Booth's and Rigby's point). Notably, the East continues to be used interchangeably with "the Orient" and the "Occidental" West remains mapped on an axis of Euro-American cities. To challenge these ideas, this project asks, why in discussions of "western" modernism does the American West fall off the map? What happens to connotations of East/Orient/colonized, West/Occident/colonizer when Dublin is recognized as west of London? Or when anti-imperialist "Oriental" writers position themselves in a western capitol like New York and write for a mixed East/West audience?

Directly related to the issue of how locational terms are defined and applied within modernist studies is the second premise, namely, that in reading a map, we often are blind to its underlying ideology: What we map and how we map it are determined by our ideological positions, our “geographical imaginations.” Matthew Edney argues in *Mapping an Empire* (1997), our use of maps “as a concise statement of facts about geographic reality” (30) belies the cultural paradigms that produce them. In fact, as Phillips makes clear, a map’s authority arises in part out of its “propensity to ignore, suppress and negate alternative geographical imaginations” (14). Consider, for example, the location of a map’s “center.” While eastern territories often appear at the center of ancient Roman maps, reflecting the importance of Roman trade with the east, Medieval Christian cartographers frequently placed Jerusalem at the center of their maps. And not surprisingly, Germany sits at the center of the Mercator world projection, created in 1568 by cartographer Gerhardus Mercator, a German. Each of these maps reflects the “geographical imagination” of the culture producing it. Thus, as Edney reminds his readers, cartography, despite its reliance on science and technology, “is a human endeavor and is accordingly replete with all of the complexities, ambiguities, and contingencies which characterize any human activity” (32). In fact, Edney argues that in mapping India during the Empire’s earliest years, British colonialists did not map simply the physical contours of India’s geography. Rather “they mapped the India that they perceived and they governed” (2).

In this way, he acknowledges a necessary interface between maps and empire: “both are fundamentally concerned with territory and knowledge”—quite simply, “to govern territories, one must know them” (1). Drawing on Edney’s work, this project considers how the authors writing for *Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse* mapped the world. What did they locate at the center? On the margins? How do these magazines map modernism—that is, what does

modernism look like from their perspectives? What interplay exists between center/margin, local/global, national/transnational? By reading these magazines in their original contexts how do our maps of modernism change?

Such questions are vital and necessary ones, especially once we realize that little magazines first published an estimated “80% of our most important post-1912 critics, novelists, poets, and storytellers” (Hoffman et al 1)—including Eliot, Joyce, Pound, Stein, H.D., and Moore. Morrison argues, “The little magazine was the quintessential genre of modernist publication—and one of modernism’s many contributions to twentieth-century literature” (“Nationalism and the Modern American Canon” 18). Armstrong claims little magazines “are the ‘engine’ of modernism” (53). He goes on to claim, “This genre is, indeed, a logical starting place for any institutional exploration of American modernist canon formation” (18).

More scholars starting to pay attention to little magazines. In addition to Morrison’s little magazines section in *The Cambridge Companion to American Modernism*. See also Armstrong “Modernism, Mass Culture and the Market” section on “Little Magazines and Private Presses” Armstrong argues in his chapter “Mapping Modernism” (an attempt to document the various strands, threads of modernism) “To read modernist texts as they first appeared in the little magazines is to quickly gain a sense of culture as a communication system; a network of connections and flows” (29). Churchill’s *Others* and Modernist Journals Project, which has digitized *Blast* and *The New Age*. Sean Latham and Robert Scholes, organizers of the Modernist Journals Project, argue in “The Rise of Periodical Studies” that periodicals must be studied and required new approaches to the discipline—specifically collaboration, just like the magazines themselves are collaborative. Need digitization; need to take stock of what you have; digitize from originals when possible so as to have access to advertisements, which were routinely cut

from magazines when bound. They argue that there are holes in collected and archived materials (missing issues, missing ads, etc.). The legwork needed to digitize will help find some of those holes. “the digital archiving of periodicals should seek to fill the hole in the printed archive, through which so much valuable cultural material has been lost” (525). Also will be to bring to light magazines missing from the archives or from scholarly view, which is what this project does. That periodical studies should be increasing due to technological advances, the possibility of digitizing archives appropriate since the little magazines, especially those discussed here, were very connected to the emerging technologies of their time. Claim that “we have often been too quick to see magazines merely as containers of discrete bits of information rather than autonomous objects of study” (518). We pick out works by particular authors to anthologize; we cut out the ads; we research a particular trend. They acknowledge that periodicals “are frequently in dialogue with one another” (529) and they “create and occupy typically complex and often unstable positions in sometimes collaborative and sometimes competitive cultural networks. Uncovering these sorts of connections—which are inevitably lost in the process of anthologization—adds new layers of density both to the magazines themselves and to the work of individual contributors” (529).

modernist little magazines—with the exception of a few notable names: *Poetry*, *The Little Review*, *The Egoist*, *The Dial*—are not currently mapped by modernist studies. Despite the increase in scholarly work on little magazines, the canonical magazines still getting the most attention. In fact, Hoffman et al’s *The Little Magazine: A History and Bibliography* (1946) remains the definitive study of these primary sources of modernist literary and visual arts. Not surprisingly, given its publication date, *The Little Magazine* provides little examination of how issues of race, class, gender, and empire intersect and collide on the pages of the periodicals its

studies. This work needs to be done in order to create a more complete portrait of the cultural and aesthetic contexts out of which modernism emerged. Although Hoffman et al provide the most extensive bibliography of international little magazines published from 1891-1945, their focus remains on the canonical magazines and authors named above—and, therefore, maps modernism according to traditional patriarchal, Euro-American centers.

More recent scholarship attempts to complete the landscape sketched by *The Little Magazine*. Lawrence Rainey's *Institutions of Modernism* (1998), Mark Morrisson's *The Public Face of Modernism* (2001), and Georgina Taylor's *H.D. and the Public Sphere of Modernist Women Writers* (2001), for example, all examine how little magazines facilitate or contribute to modernism's relationship(s) with popular culture. Specifically, these studies examine how modernist little magazines became a forum in which modernist writers entered into and/or subverted the public sphere. Rainey examines the publication of *Ulysses* and *The Waste Land*, in *The Little Review* and *The Dial* (and *Criterion*), respectively, in an attempt to explore how the little magazines functioned as "institutions" responsible for "connect[ing] works to readerships, or readerships to particular social structures" (8, 4). Rainey's reading of the little magazines serves his larger argument that such institutions made modernism "more than a series of texts or the ideas that found expression in them" (4). Instead, "it becomes a social reality, a configuration of agents and practices that converge in the publication, marketing, and publicization of an idiom" (5). While Rainey reads little magazines as one of several modernist institutions, Morrisson makes little magazines his sole focus. In *The Public Face of Modernism*, he reads "the *English Review*, *Poetry and Drama*, *The Egoist*, *Blast*, *The Little Review*, and the *Masses*" (5) to illustrate that "modernists' engagements with the commercial mass market were rich and diverse" (5). Morrisson attempts to demonstrate that early Anglo-American modernism

was accompanied by “an explosion of publication and self-promotion and several serious attempts to address the institutions of the dominant culture,” and, therefore, he concludes “that the alienation and isolation from the dominant culture that have often been ascribed to modernism cannot be seen as originating with the emergence of modernism” (13). Taking up a different strand of the public sphere argument, Georgina Taylor situates H.D. “at the heart of a network of women writers spanning the Anglo-American divide” and argues that little magazines, specifically those edited by women (*Poetry*, *The New Freewoman*, and *The Little Review*) provided a significant counter-public sphere (Habermas’ term) for women writers. According to Taylor, through these magazines “a core group of women writers came to conceive of themselves as a public, and to enter into discussions with each other within, and eventually well beyond, their pages” (7).

As significant as works like Rainey’s, Morrison’s, and Taylor’s are to modernist studies generally and to the study of modernist little magazines specifically, gaps still remain. For example, all three authors take canonical magazines—*Poetry*, *The Little Review*, *Blast*, *The Egoist*—as their focus. While these magazines are undeniably important to the history of modernism, in order to accurately map modernism, we must examine its full terrain. We must ask, for example: How does our understanding of *Poetry* change once we recognize that Tagore published in it as well? Or when we see that its assistant editor, Alice Corbin Henderson, was a regular contributor to *Laughing Horse*? Additionally, we must ask, why is it that beyond Taylor’s work, Jayne Marek’s *Women Editing Modernism: “Little” Magazines and Literary History* (1995) remains the only published book-length study of women editors of little magazines? Why has Abbey Arthur Johnson’s and Ronald Mayberry Johnson’s twenty-six year old book, *Propaganda and Aesthetics: The Literary Politics of Afro-American Magazines in the*

Twentieth Century (1979) never been revisited, updated, or expanded? Clearly, there is still much work to be done on the modernist little magazines in order to portray the richly diverse contexts out of which modernism emerged.

With regard to the specific magazines addressed in this project, little if any scholarship exists. To date, one book-length study of *Laughing Horse* has been published: Sharyn Udall's *Spud Johnson and Laughing Horse* (1994), which provides a general history of the magazine. Also providing general histories of the magazine are Willard Johnson's article-length memoir, "The Laughing Horse" (1951) and Donald Barclay's "*The Laughing Horse: A Literary Magazine of the American West*" (1992). In assessing *Laughing Horse's* importance, Barclay argues that the magazine warrants study because in addition to publishing "the work of many important western writers," "it evolved into a literary magazine with a distinctly western focus, championing western lands, peoples, arts, and ideals" (49). Barclay, unfortunately, does not develop this point further. With regard to *Orient*, to date, no critical evaluation of the magazine has been published nor has it been discussed in any unpublished dissertations. The lack of scholarly attention to this work is surprising given the large number of Nobel laureates it published and its aggressively anti-colonial stance. Nonetheless, it appears in no studies of colonialism, orientalism, or modernism. And finally, available scholarship on the magazines of the Irish Literary Theatre examines them as artifacts of theater history or as contributing to the biographies of the artists involved, and while each of these magazines receives mention in any history of the Irish Literary or Abbey Theaters, no critic has considered these works within the larger context of modernism. Such is the scholarly context out of which this project emerges.

In theorizing a locational modernism through its readings of *Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse*, this project consists of three chapters and an epilogue. Chapter 1 provides a

close reading of *Samhain* in an attempt to analyze the kinds of intercultural exchanges occurring on its pages. Specifically, it examines how Yeats himself saw the magazine as a “contact zone.” In it he defines national literature as “the work of writers, who are moulded by influences that are moulding their country, and who write out of so deep a life that they are accepted there in the end” (“The Dramatic Movement” 20). Well aware of the international (and predominantly imperial) influences molding Ireland at the time, Yeats’ definition takes into account the intercultural exchanges shaping both geopolitics and art—exchanges resulting in the “deep” life of the writer, who, in authoring a national art, authorizes a national(ist) identity. As this chapter reveals, Yeats recognized the interplay between local and global, metropolitan and provincial, national and transnational: he put Irish folklore, myth, legend, history, and geography into conversation with (among others) the Continental and Classical dramatic traditions, American commercial theater, and British imperialism—a conversation that occasionally takes place in Gaelic. This chapter also examines how the interplay between the local and global contributed to Yeats’ development as a modernist. Arguing that the little magazines of the Irish Literary Theater provided a forum in which Yeats worked out his political and aesthetic theories, this chapter concludes that on the pages of even these very early magazines, Yeats’ positions as a national writer and a modernist coalesce. Finally, this chapter examines the magazines’ anti-imperial, anti-colonial rhetoric: while George Martin will declare in *Samhain*’s predecessor *Beltaine*, “Art is incompatible with Empire” (8), Yeats’ little magazine essays reveal him to be far more ambivalent.

Chapter 2, which provides a reading of *Orient*, complicates Yeats’ ambivalent anti-colonial position by examining his relationship with Rabindranath Tagore, which I theorize led to his contribution to the magazine. Specifically, it considers how Yeats’ anti-imperial positions

intersect with and are complicated by his own orientalism. In a review of Tagore's 1912 trip to England published in *The Modern Review of Calcutta* (a little magazine contemporaneous with *Orient*), British colonial turned Indian nationalist and *Orient* contributor, C.F. Andrews observes that in his interactions with Tagore, Yeats "seemed somewhat obsessed by his idea of what was 'oriental'—a dangerous theme for one who knows the East only through books" (71). This chapter examines Andrews' statement both in terms of Yeats' relationship with Tagore and as a way to read *Orient*. Though *Orient* editors Hari Govil and Syud Hossain envisioned their magazine to be a corrective to "western" orientalist stereotypes, many of their contributors, like Yeats, knew the "East" only through books. Therefore, this chapter examines how, through its collaborations and conversations between "armchair" travelers and actual travelers, *Orient* both challenges and perpetuates its own stereotypes. Additionally, this chapter considers how the ongoing intercultural exchanges that I argue necessitate a locational modernism appear in *Orient* in articles like "The Orientalism of Charlie Chaplin's Art" (Vol. 3, No. 1, 1925), coauthored by Muriel Ciolkowska, *The Egoist's* "Paris Correspondent" and William James Price, a contributor to the American pop-fiction serial *Weird Tales* (1923). In this one submission, there exists a mixing of the local and global, metropolitan and provincial, national and transnational—even a blending of high and low art. Like chapters 1 and 2, this chapter considers how such mixing and blending create the very conditions of modernism. Finally, this chapter will consider how a magazine that regularly published more than half a dozen Nobel Laureates and that had distribution offices in London, Paris, The Hague, Bombay, Shanghai, and Tokyo falls off the maps of modernism. This chapter argues that reading magazines like *Orient* is essential in order to resurrect the cultural portrait out of which a constellated modernism emerged.

Chapter 3 continues the examination of the intercultural exchanges occurring between modernists and modernisms of the “East” and “West,” only it does so by problematizing conventional definitions and applications of those locational terms. In this chapter, the American southwest is put into play with the “East” as represented by both the American east coast (New York, specifically) and the idea of the “East” as “Orient” or “Oriental.” This is accomplished in part by reading Bynner’s translations of T’ang poets Li Shang-Yin and Li Po, which were published in both *Orient* and *Laughing Horse* and on which he collaborated with Kiang Kang-hu, a professor of Chinese literature with whom Bynner had worked at Berkeley. This chapter reads Bynner’s correspondence with Kang-hu in an attempt to illustrate the nature of their collaboration—an important relationship at the time that has become little more than a footnote in modernist studies. This chapter then turns to a close reading of *Laughing Horse*, which, while firmly rooted to a specific location—the American southwest, generally and Taos, specifically—nonetheless transcends locale to display complicated intersections between and among the local and global, metropolitan and provincial, national and transnational. This chapter considers how the cultural portrait of modernism changes when, for example, D.H. Lawrence’s exoticizing and in some ways “orientalizing” portraits of Mexico and New Mexico are read against sketches of Mexico written by its then President, Alvaro Obregon. Such analysis reveals that within modernism, the American west, when seen at all, is often viewed through a lens similar to the “orientalist” one trained on the “Far” and “Middle East.” It also reveals that in this “contact zone,” this “space of colonial encounter” between Anglo-Americans, Native Americans, and Mexicans, the collaborations are as fruitful as they are conflicted. As in the chapter on *Orient*, this chapter considers how the spotlight *Laughing Horse* turned on imperialist action in the

American southwest both undermines and reinforces racial and ethnic stereotypes of Native Americans and Mexicans.

In its brief Epilogue, this project considers the implications of adopting a locational modernism. It asks, how do our responsibilities as modernist scholars change once (and if) we embrace such an idea? If we remap modernism to illustrate the permeability of the boundaries separating its centers and peripheries, to show how it contains a blending of the local and global, metropolitan and provincial, national and transnational, how must we also “remap” our syllabi and anthologies? In the epilogue I suggest that once we read *Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse* as contact zones, other contact zones open up—and so does our understanding of modernism. We can then consider, How does Pound come to publish “Certain Poems of Kabir” in *The Modern Review of Calcutta*? What kinds of collaborations and conversations occurred between Indian nationalists and artists of the Harlem Renaissance?—an exchange that can be unraveled by following the threads spinning out from *Orient*. Ultimately, reading little magazines like *Samhain*, *Orient*, and *Laughing Horse* resurrects a cultural portrait currently missing from modernist studies. However, more than simply write such a portrait onto modernism’s maps, we must use it to remake them.

Works Cited

- Appadurai, Arjun. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1996.
- Barclay, Donald A. "The Laughing Horse: A Literary Magazine of the American West." *Western American Literature* 27 (Spring 1992): 47-56.
- Boehmer, Elleke. *Empire, the National, and the Postcolonial, 1890-1920: Resistance in Interaction*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2002.
- Booth, Howard J., and Nigel Rigby, eds. *Modernism and Empire*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000.
- Clifford, James. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.
- Edney, Matthew H. *Mapping an Empire: The Geographical Construction of British India, 1765-1843*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1997
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Mappings Feminism and the Cultural Geographies of Encounter*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998.
- . "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of *Modern/Modernity/Modernism*." *Modernism/Modernity* 8.3 (2001): 493-513.
- Gross, Elaine. "Banned in Berkeley." *Bookman's Weekly*. 1 Mar. 2005.
<http://abbookman.com/ABBookman_F091704.html>.
- Hoffman, Frederick J., Charles Allen, and Carolyn F. Ulrich. *The Little Magazine: A History and Bibliography*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1946.
- Marek, Jayne E. *Women Editing Modernism: 'Little' Magazines and Literary History*. Lexington, KY: U of Kentucky P, 1995.
- Martin, George. "Is The Theatre a Place of Amusement?" *Beltaine* 2 (1900): 7-10.

- Morrisson, Mark S. *The Public Face of Modernism: Little Magazines, Audiences, and Reception, 1905-1920*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2001.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Rainey, Lawrence. *Institutions of Modernism: Literary Elites and Public Culture*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
- Rich, Adrienne. "Notes Toward a Politics of Location." *Blood, Bread, and Poetry*. New York: Norton, 1986.
- Taylor, Georgina. *H.D. and the Public Sphere of Modernist Women Writers, 1913-1946: Talking Women*. Oxford: Oxford English Monographs, 2001.
- Williams, Patrick. "'Simultaneous Uncontemporaneities': Theorising Modernism and Empire." *Modernism and Empire*. Eds. Howard J. Booth and Nigel Rigby. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2000:13-38.
- Yeats, W.B. "The Dramatic Movement." *Samhain* 4 (1904): 3-33.

Working Bibliography

Primary Works

Archives

Ananda K. Coomaraswamy Papers, Manuscript Division, Princeton University Library.

Idella Purnell Stone Collection, Humanities Research Center, University of Texas, Austin.

Letters from Witter Bynner, Willard Johnson, and Idella Purnell, Amistad Research Center,
Dillard University, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Stella Bloch Papers Relating to Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Manuscript Division, Princeton
University Library.

Witter Bynner Collection, Center for Southwest Research, General Library, University of New
Mexico.

Witter Bynner Papers, Rio Grande Historical Collections, New Mexico State University.

Witter Bynner Papers, University of New Hampshire.

Little Magazines

African Times and Orient Review (1912-1918) London. Ed. Duse Mohammed.

The Arrow (1906) London. Ed. W.B. Yeats.

Beltaine (1899-1900) London. Ed. W.B. Yeats.

The Brownies' Book (1920-1921) New York. Ed. Jessie Fauset (children's magazine published
in conjunction with NAACP's *The Crisis* and which published several contributors to
Orient)

Laughing Horse (1922-1939) Santa Fe. Ed. Willard Johnson.

Orient (1922-1923) New York. Ed. Hari Govil. Succeeded by *The New Orient* (1924-1926)
New York. Ed. Syud Hussain and by *The Oriental Magazine* (1927-1928) New York. Ed.
Hari Govil.

Palms (1923-1940) Guadalajara. Ed. Idella Purnell (sister magazine to *Laughing Horse*).

Samhain (1901-1908) Dublin. Ed. W.B. Yeats.

Essays, Anthologies, Manuscripts

Govil, Hari. *India Center: To Promote Cultural Relations Between India and America*. New
York: India Society of America, 1929.

Haydon, A.E., Halford L. Hoskins, A.H. Lyber, A.T. Olmstead, and Martin Sprengling. *The New Orient: A Series of Monographs on Oriental Culture*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1933.

Kelley, Charles Fabens. *The New Orient: The Chinese Exhibition in London*. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co., 1936[?].

Oriental Art in America: Recent Accessions in American Museums. Chicago: The New Orient Society, 1938.

Sheppherd, William R. *The New Orient Society of America: Address to be read at Annual Meeting Chicago, January 20, 1933*. New York [?]: New Orient Society, 1933.

Critical and Theoretical Sources

Barclay, Donald A. "The Laughing Horse: A Literary Magazine of the American West." *Western American Literature* 27 (Spring 1992): 47-56.

Bennett, David. "Periodical Fragments and Organic Culture: Modernism, the Avant-Garde, and the Little Magazine." *Contemporary Literature* 30 (1989): 480-502.

Benstock, Shari, and Bernard Benstock. "The Role of Little Magazines in the Emergence of Modernism." *Library Chronicle of the University of Texas, Austin* 20.4 (1991): 68-87.

Bishop, Edward. "Re:Covering Modernism—Format and Function in the Little Magazines." *Modernist Writers and the Marketplace*. Eds. Ian Willison, Warwick Gould, and Warren Chernaik. London: Macmillan P, 1996.

Bornstein, George. *Material Modernism: The Politics of the Page*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Bost, Suzanne. *Mulattas and Mestizas: Representing Mixed Identities in the Americas, 1850-2000*. Athens, GA: U of Georgia P, 2000.

Castle, Gregory. *Modernism and the Celtic Revival*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Catron, Douglas. "D.H. Lawrence's Early Writings: The Little Magazines." Diss. U of Tulsa, 1978.

Clifford, James. *The Predicament of Culture: Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1988.

Cowan, James. "Bynner on Lawrence." *The D.H. Lawrence Review* 14.1 (1981): 120-125.

Edwards, Holly, ed. *Noble Dreams, Wicked Pleasures: Orientalism in America, 1870-1930*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.

- Foster, John Wilson. *Colonial Consequences: Essays in Irish Literature and Culture*. Dublin: Lilliput P, 1991.
- Gallagher, Brian. "About Us, For Us, Near Us: The Irish and the Harlem Renaissances." *Eire-Ireland* 16.4 (1981):14-26.
- Gish, Robert. *Beyond Bounds: Cross-Cultural Essays on Anglo, American Indian, and Chicano Literature*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1995.
- Hartman, Charles O. "Some Notes on Poetic Value: Pound and Bynner." *Contemporary Poetry*. 2.3 (1977): 24-47.
- Hendrick, Tace. *Mestizo Modernism: Race, Nation, and Identity in Latin American Culture, 1900-1940*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers UP, 2003.
- Hoffman, Frederick J., Charles Allen, and Carolyn F. Ulrich. *The Little Magazine: A History and Bibliography*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1946.
- Hutchinson, George. *The Harlem Renaissance in Black and White*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.
- Johnson, Abby Arthur, and Ronald Mayberry Johnson. *Propaganda and Aesthetics: The Literary Politics of Afro-American Magazines in the Twentieth Century*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 1979.
- Johnson-Feelings, Dianne, ed. *The Best of the Brownies' Book*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.
- Johnson, Willard "Spud." "The Laughing Horse." *New Mexico Quarterly* 26:2 (1951): 161-167.
- Kraft, James, ed. *The Selected Witter Bynner: Poems, Plays, Translations, Prose and Letters*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1995.
- . *The Works of Witter Bynner: Prose Pieces*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1979.
- . *Selected Letters*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1981.
- Kraft, James. *Who is Witter Bynner?* Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1995.
- Lindsay, Robert O. *Witter Bynner: A Bibliography*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1967.
- Marek, Jayne E. *Women Editing Modernism: 'Little' Magazines and Literary History*. Lexington, KY: U of Kentucky P, 1995.
- Morrison, Mark. *The Public Face of Modernism: Little Magazines, Audiences, and Reception, 1905-1920*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2000.
- Mott, Frank Luther. *A History of American Magazines, 1885-1905*. Vol. 4 and *A History of American Magazines, 1905-1930*. Vol. 5. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1957 and 1968.

- Nelson, Cary. *Repression and Recovery: Modern Poetry and the Politics of Cultural Memory, 1910-1945*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1989.
- Peppis, Paul. *Literature, Politics, and the English Avant-Garde: Nation and Empire, 1901-1918*. New York: Cambridge UP, 2000.
- Potter, Vilma. "Idella Purnell's *PALMS* and Godfather Witter Bynner." *American Periodicals* 4 (1994): 47-64.
- Salzer, Maureen. "Modernism's Ventriloquist Texts: American Poetry, Gender and Indian Identity." Diss. U of Arizona, 1998.
- Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage, 1979.
- Scott, Bonnie Kime, ed. *The Gender of Modernism: A Critical Anthology*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990.
- Udall, Sharyn. *Spud Johnson and Laughing Horse*. Albuquerque: U of New Mexico P, 1994.
- Weigle, Marta, and Kyle Fiore. *Santa Fe and Taos: The Writer's Era, 1916-1941*. Santa Fe: Ancient City P, 1994.
- Welch, Robert. *The Abbey Theatre, 1899-1999*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

Proposed Timeline for Completion:

- Spring 2005: Finalize and defend proposal; continue secondary research on authors, period, and magazines; contact archives to coordinate on-site research.
- Summer 2005: Continue research; visit archives at Princeton and New Hampshire.
- Fall 2005: Continue research; visit archives at U of Texas, Austin.
- Spring 2006: Draft Introduction and Chapter 1
- Summer 2006 Draft Chapters 2 and 3
- Fall 2006 Draft Conclusion and begin revisions
- Spring 2007 Complete revisions and defend.