

**GENÊT UNMASKED: EXAMINING THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL IN
JANET FLANNER**

STACEY LEIGH GAUDETTE
Bachelor of Arts, University of Lethbridge, 2003

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
of the University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements of the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of English
University of Lethbridge
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

© Stacey Leigh Gaudette, 2006

GENÊT UNMASKED: THE AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL IN JANET FLANNER

STACEY LEIGH GAUDETTE

Approved:

- (Print Name) (Signature) (Rank) (Highest Degree)
(Date)

- Supervisor

- Thesis Examination Committee
Member

- External Examiner

- Chair, Thesis Examination Committee

Abstract

This thesis examines Janet Flanner, an expatriate writer whose fiction and journalism have been essential to the development of American literary modernism in that her work, taken together, comprises a remarkable autobiographical document which records her own unique experience of the period while simultaneously contributing to its particular aesthetic mission. Although recent discussions have opened debate as to how a variety of discourses can be read as autobiographical, Flanner's fifty years worth of cultural, political, and personal observation requires an analysis which incorporates traditional and contemporary theories concerning life-writing. Essentially, autobiographical scholarship must continue to push the boundaries of analysis, focusing on the interactions and reactions between the outer world and the inner self. This thesis, therefore, will situate Janet Flanner as an important writer whose experience among the modernist literary community in Europe informs, and is recorded in, her writing.

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my sincerest thanks to all those who helped make this thesis possible. My supervisor, Dr. Craig Monk, offered invaluable support and guidance, as did my committee members, Dr. Adam Carter and Dr. Malcolm Greenshields. I deeply appreciate all of your hard work on my behalf.

The Keith and Hope Ferguson Memorial Scholarship allowed me the freedom to focus solely on my thesis during my last year of study, for which I am very grateful.

I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my parents, Karen and Jake Gaudette, my brother Sid, and my grandmother, Cecile Lariviere. Without their unwavering faith, encouragement, and support this thesis never could have been written. This accomplishment is as much theirs as it is my own.

And, finally, all my thanks to Steve, whose selfless dedication has taught me a lot about myself. Here's to a brand new chapter.

Table of Contents

Young Woman in Paris	1
Paris Correspondent, 1925-1939	24
Paris Correspondent, 1939-1950	45
Expatriate Women Modernists and Autobiographical Inter-relatedness	66
Afterword	85
Works Cited	88

Chapter 1

Young Woman in Paris

Many young women in America led their own lives – yet virginity as a theory was apparently still well mixed with the republican civilization of the twentieth century – that fantastic decade in which no one had any new ideals and everyone patented a new invention, that upsidedown renaissance in which forgetting what little classical culture the country ever knew proved as stimulating as remembering all of it had been to the Florentine *moyenage*. Yes, a woman's reputation still counted...

(Flanner, *Cubical* 292)

Preface

It is, interestingly, the state of a “woman's reputation” in the early twentieth century that still captures the imaginations of contemporary literary scholars, prompting new theoretical examinations of contributions to modernism. Be they feminist, scientific, or philosophical, these more recent evaluations of Gertrude Stein, Sylvia Beach, H.D., and others are proving capable of reshaping not only our historical perspective of the period but also the techniques and the contexts through which we interpret literature, itself. In particular, it is women's autobiography that has inspired fresh analysis. Critics such as Estelle Jelinek, Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson, Noël Riley Fitch, and Nina Van

Gessel, to name but a few, have, in recent years, probed the significance of autobiographical acts in women's writing. Their scholarship has helped open these writers' lives to critical examination, revealing valuable information that has invariably been overlooked. Indeed, Van Gessel points out that women's autobiography has been "stigma[tized]" due to the very nature of the form. An autobiography is, essentially, an exercise in egoism and willful self-assertion. It is an act that has traditionally been contrary to the "patriarchal scripts [which] equate femininity with the qualities of effacement and passivity" (37). Thus, if a woman were to unabashedly claim herself worthy of public affirmation, she would subject herself and her work to censure and ridicule. Consequently, women writers have explored unconventional versions or innovations of autobiography in order to subvert the limitations imposed on them by cultural expectations concerning gender. In an effort to further expand investigation of these innovations, then, we shall examine the work of Janet Flanner – an American expatriate writer whose literary contributions from 1925 to 1975 comprise a remarkable autobiographical document. When one considers her non-fiction in combination with her fifty years worth of cultural, political, and social observation as Paris correspondent for the *New Yorker*, Flanner's work coalesces into an intimate account of the development of American literary modernism. As a case study, Flanner's work offers a unique opportunity to examine idiosyncratic versions of life-writing performed by women modernists who reflected their artistic and political ideologies even as they struggled to express them.

I

It is a natural evolution of human experience, and an inherently autobiographical urge, that near the end of life we are often wont to reflect on our past experiences. Some sixty years after producing her novel, *The Cubical City*, Janet Flanner was asked to write an afterword for its release in paperback for Southern Illinois University Press's *Lost American Fiction* series. It is an autobiographical account of how, as a child, she decided she wanted to become a writer. She makes little reference to the autobiographical nature of the novel itself, save to note that:

America has in recent years specialized in fiction dealing with novels featuring crime: yet what professional crime-writing expert could have invented a creation so complicated and involved as Watergate... only men alive, not pens or typewriters could have produced it as a creation.
(435)

This cryptic statement, seemingly out of context in regard to her fiction, actually communicates how her own writing, fiction or non-fiction, has been guided by personal experience. The greatest stories are those based in truth, and the relationship between experience and writing, for Flanner, are inextricably linked. Indeed, in writing *The Cubical City*, Flanner casts off the frustrations of her youth, her sexuality, and her family through the “fictional” representation of the novel, before embarking on a new life and a

dazzling career as a writer in Paris. Although *The Cubical City* is, technically, a work of fiction, critics have failed to investigate its inherent autobiographical elements. Indeed, there has been little scholarly comment on the work at all, even as it offers yet another example of a woman writer masking her experience as a valuable and contributing member of modernism.

Arriving in Paris in 1922, Janet Flanner began her search for aesthetic beauty and a flourishing literary culture that only Europe seemed to be able to offer. For Flanner, and other artists who wished to investigate their own aesthetic principles, Europe offered a refuge from the impingements of home and helped buoy their creative efforts. Paris was particularly genial to the artistic lifestyle, Flanner biographer Brenda Wineapple points out, and attracted those “too bohemian” to bear a life lived in any other city (76). Indeed, Paris of the twenties boomed with like-minded women who insisted on living and working in a place that did not so thoroughly dictate the difference of their sex or, for that matter, their sexual identity. At home, an American woman was subject to the restrictive mundanities of a feminine existence, but in Paris she could be, as Samuel Putnam has described Nancy Cunard, “an honest rebel against her class and what she took to be its narrow outlook” (89). By the end of 1923, Flanner felt inspired enough by her new surroundings and a lifestyle far different from that of her middle-class Midwestern upbringing to begin working on what would become her single work of fiction, *The Cubical City*. Much more than innocuously imagined prose, however, Flanner’s novel reflects her real experience as a young woman growing up in the American Midwest. Through the novel’s heroine, Delia Poole, Flanner intrepidly adapts the circumstances of

her youth to an examination of the contrary nature of womanhood in relation to the society in which she is born and which she must inevitably bear. Delia is a beautiful woman from the Midwest working as an artist in New York. Though her work gives her pleasure and affords her a fabulous lifestyle, she demands the kind of independence that would afford her not only the right to “take lovers” but also the “ability to enjoy without remorse or recrimination the pleasures of the flesh” as men have done (Wineapple 71). Unfortunately, social conventions conflict with her beliefs, Flanner informs us, and Delia inevitably submits to them in order to maintain a relationship with her mother, the only remaining individual at the end of the novel with whom she shares a personal connection. Beyond the story of Delia’s self-betrayal, though, Flanner incorporates her own experiences concerning her father’s death, her fragile relationship with her mother, and the complications of guilt and shame imbued in female sexuality. As this analysis will demonstrate, the autobiographical elements contained within *The Cubical City* effectively purge Flanner of her past and propel her into her future as a journalist in Paris. It is a work of fiction that is distinctly and unequivocally autobiographical. As we shall see in the following chapter, fiction is also an inherent element in autobiography. The autobiographical “I,” or identity as represented in an autobiographical text, is subject to subtle changes in memory, the passage of time, perception, and editorial selection as a process of writing. Taken further, this inexact representation of identity can be constructed so as to achieve a particular aesthetic function. In this way, Flanner manipulates representation of her own experience by veiling it as stock fiction.

Born to a thoroughly middle-class, middle-American family in 1892, Janet

Flanner was the second of three daughters to Frank and Mary Flanner of Indianapolis, Indiana. Frank, a staunch Protestant, philanthropist, and mortician by trade, was an “ardent admirer of Lincoln” and among the first in the State to undertake a settlement project for African American people of the community (Wineapple 12). Mary Flanner, who had discarded aspirations of becoming an acclaimed theater actress, did not take well to motherhood and considered her marriage and her children to have been “the major obstacle[s] to her career” (Wineapple 10). She was also extremely religious, demanding, and easily offended by matters of the flesh. Despite her resentments, though, Mary most certainly sparked an interest in art and education for her children, as she was very active in the local theater and art society, wrote poetry, and produced her own plays. She also routinely insisted that her girls be educated and that they always strive to reach the best of their potential. Beyond such practical advice, however, Mary was rarely affectionate. Janet Flanner loved her mother, but their relationship was strained for most of her adult life. Janet simply could not bear to live the kind of lifestyle her mother wished for her, nor could she avoid her “decidedly ambivalent feelings” wherever her mother was concerned (Wineapple 207).

Certainly, Mrs. Flanner embodied some violent contradictions in terms of her femininity, a problem that left a distinct impression on young Janet, who dreamed of being free of the sexual and occupational impediments of womanhood which seemed to dilute her mother’s happiness. Flanner addresses this issue through Delia Poole’s relationship with her mother as well as that of Delia’s parents, James and Agatha Poole. In the novel, Flanner describes Mrs. Poole with equal parts familiarity and regret:

Poor Mother... She has no appetite for flesh. She doesn't even like to eat it, let alone touch it. That must be why she likes the stage. No one ever really swallows a chop behind the footlights. A dumb show of pantomime appetite and papier maché meat. Kisses that are bits of business in script. Four acts in five but none of them intimate ones. Yes, in the theater after all lay Mrs. Poole's relief from life. (141)

Interestingly, Flanner's passage here seems to reject a model of fiction that would seek to escape real experience. While Mrs. Poole avoids the visceral in life, Delia actively seeks it out. *The Cubical City*, in this way, is really a personal exploration of those experiences that make up its author.

In terms of the novel's inherent autobiographical elements, Flanner's attribution of her own experience to fictional characters calls for an interpretation of feminist autobiographical theory. Rita Felski's investigation of "Confession," as well as Mary Jean Corbett's assessment of "Literary Domesticity and Women Writers' Subjectivities," will help focus our evaluation. The very intrepid nature of this kind of analysis makes it necessary to fuse theories of literary criticism in order to gain greater insight into a genre that inherently resists definition. Corbett asserts that women autobiographers represent themselves through others in an attempt to cloak their subjectivity and avoid public disclosure (255). Coupled with Felski's suggestion that confession in women's autobiography does not imply some sort of submission, but "foreground[s] the persona of the author through the inclusion of... biographical details that link [a] text to a life..." (84), we are able to construct a theoretical base for proper analysis of Flanner's secret autobiography. Though *The Cubical City* is not conspicuous about the reality of its

content, that is, it does not imply to the average reader that the information presented is based on biographical detail, it does attempt to “communicate... the feminist concern with representative and intersubjective elements of women’s experience” (Felski 84). Delia, for example, imagines that her family could be made aware of the happiness her choice of lifestyle (and Flanner’s, as we shall see) allows her to experience:

[They] might be proud of her if they knew (which she took care they didn’t) and regard her at last as someone who had come through fire. [She] was primitive. In her ruddy state of health, glands and ethics were the same things. But she hungered for sympathy, peace, her own desires and praise. (301-02)

For Flanner, being a woman meant living a contradiction. In order to subvert the limitations of her gender, to claim “sympathy, peace, her own desires and praise” yet avoid the regret and inhibition that darkened much of her mother’s experience, a woman writer such as herself must create a text which could bear her aesthetic and ideological mark in a subversive (though culturally acceptable) manner. It is precisely this “self-silencing” of the author in her work that “enable[s] [these] women to pursue their own aspirations without attracting criticism” (Van Gessel 17). There are numerous examples of Flanner’s female contemporaries who resorted to such diversions. Even Sylvia Beach, who single-handedly brought the great *Ulysses* to publication, downplays this extraordinary feat in her own autobiography *Shakespeare and Company* by adopting the guise of a worried matron looking out for her fragile, but very favorite offspring. In describing her strenuous efforts on Joyce’s behalf as a “natural” and necessarily “sacrific[ial]” act, Beach carefully avoids implication of herself as a business woman in favor of a more socially acceptable role (60). Even a cursory examination of Beach’s past,

however, will reveal this portrayal to be a complete fabrication, as she happened to become an ardent feminist during her tour of duty with the Red Cross during the war, never married, nor had any children of her own. As Beach biographer Noël Riley Fitch points out, “her [political] beliefs were doubtless quickened by the quasi military environment in which she worked, with many male doctors” (37). In letters home to her family, Beach was intensely critical of those authoritative “creatures” who were, she believed, “in the dark ages as regards to women” (qtd. in Fitch 37). By adapting her autobiography in such a way that her savvy business pursuits be alternatively regarded as natural maternal instinct, then, Beach cleverly works within the constructs of proper female authority while simultaneously securing her status as a valuable member of the modernist canon. Thus, as woman modernists were “[k]eely aware of the threat of public censure,” Van Gessel notes, “female autobiographers have commonly sought to minimize their transgression by adhering to, or at the very least acknowledging, cultural prescriptions of femininity” (37).

Stylistically, Flanner’s novel is reminiscent of the French *roman à clef*, as it veils the events of Flanner’s real experience and avoids blatant disclosure of her views. Jue Chen describes the *roman à clef* as “a kind of fiction in which actual people are presented under fictitious names” (5). Delia could bear society’s backlash to her unabashed sexual conquests, but Flanner wanted to be taken seriously. Her goal, after all, was to be involved in the exciting world of art, and she was sensitive to the fact that her gender posed certain obstacles to her success. Nor did she think it necessary to publicly exploit her family tragedy and upset her already tenuous relationship with her mother. Writing an

autobiography in the guise of a novel, as much as her decision to leave America, offered some measure of escape. “Leaving home,” Flanner later wrote of her departure from America with her lover, Solita Solano, “was part of our sense of liberty. That’s why we were able to begin anew... We wanted something we weren’t getting” (qtd. in Wineapple 60-61). Indeed, there was an inherent conflict of interest for all women of an artistic mind in the early part of the twentieth century, as gender was most certainly a “determining issue at the point at which culture... met aesthetic principals” (Benstock 21). Even Gertrude Stein, who so skillfully maintained her position at the center of the literary movement in Paris, could not avoid derision at transgressing the boundaries of her womanhood in her work, as even her contemporaries have attributed her talent to an unnatural “masculine intelligence” (Kreymborg 370). Susan Stanford Friedman points out in “Women’s Autobiographical Selves: Theory and Practice” that autobiographical representations of “the self, self-creation, and self-consciousness are profoundly different for women” as they must mitigate the ideological, social, and even psychological separateness imposed on them by a patriarchal culture (43-45). Given what we know about the fictive nature of identity as represented in autobiography, then, it is advantageous to interpret the obvious evolution of autobiographical discourse by women modernists. Under such circumstances, and steeped in an atmosphere of literary experimentalism, women modernists sought to approach this form from its opposite conclusion. That is, instead of simply translating past experience, these women wrote to determine it. As Paul De Man notes, “the autobiographical project may itself produce and determine the life... whatever the writer *does* is in fact governed by the technical demands

of self-portraiture” (qtd. in Eakin 185). Thus, women writers such as Janet Flanner, Sylvia Beach, and others have cleverly masked their attempts to gain agency as contributing members of the modernist movement through autobiographical adaptations that allow them to obscure their identities. The autobiographical elements of Flanner’s novel, and specifically those of feminist confession represented through Delia, provide a key to unlocking the secret of her *roman à clef* as a rejection of the imposition of her physicality in an effort to embrace her vocation.

II

In 1909, when Flanner was seventeen, her family visited Europe. This visit sparked in her a consuming (and lifelong) distaste for her own puritan upbringing. “Janet,” Wineapple notes, “was sensitive [to]...the gloomy and often hypocritical moralizing that seemed to occupy good social standing,” especially among the traditional Protestant families of Indianapolis, whom she considered “the worst offenders” and who were often “devoid of anything warm or human” (19). Life abroad, however, “stirred her imagination and her feelings and awakened her to the promise of – aesthetic and sexual – pleasures” (21). In Berlin, Flanner first encountered the inherent sensuality of the European people. Men and women spoke openly about sex and sexual matters. They discussed the work of Oscar Wilde and Havelock Ellis, kissed passionately in the streets, and hotly debated the criminalization of homosexuality (Wineapple 23). Europe was an eye-opening experience for a young woman from Indianapolis, and although the trip was

cut short due to a sudden devastation of her father's finances, she had been mesmerized by the nature of European culture and vowed to return. By the next year, however, Mr. Flanner's finances had not improved, and a last ditch business deal had fallen through. Frank's business partner and longtime family friend, Charles Buchanan, had "maneuvered Frank out of property that rightly belonged to both men" (Wineapple 27), a betrayal, Janet believed, which greatly contributed to her father's death. In the winter of 1912, Frank Flanner committed suicide by ingesting a cocktail of pain medications and poison (Wineapple 26). His death seemed only to increase Flanner's frustration with the conservative backwardness of her community, whom she blamed for exacerbating his fragile state by consistently thwarting his efforts to advocate African-American rights and ruining his business contracts. In *The Cubical City*, Flanner describes James Poole as a "vibrant, sympathetic, and deeply troubled figure, quite different from that of his delicate and passionless wife" (Wineapple 27). Betrayed by a business partner and stricken with ill health, Mr. Poole also commits suicide. While Flanner never forgave her father for what she believed to be a wholly selfish act, she seems to rationalize his defeat in the novel, suggesting that Poole was a man drowned by the forces of "Babylon," or Indianapolis, as it were (156). In the novel, Delia wonders:

What fatuous charitableness had made her father retain Crapsey [Buchanan] as his partner all these years?... How much had he and his wife robbed her father of and meekly given to their church? There was their passion— their corrupt love for God, their pride in paying for the most expensive pew. (155)

Interestingly, Flanner also indicts the entire Poole family for her father's death in

the novel, “even [those] who bore no direct responsibility for it – portraying a complicated situation filled with pain, anger, blame and guilt.” She writes that James Poole felt unloved by his wife, Agatha, and that Delia must share the responsibility of guilt for allowing her own “sexual dalliances to take precedence over family obligations” (Wineapple 27). Though there is no record of Flanner having had a relationship in the time before her father’s death, she must have been concerned with her own sexuality in relation to what she had experienced in Europe and the repression of it once they had returned home. This kind of personal divulgence, according to Felski, represents a significant feature of “feminist confessional literature,” in that Flanner’s novel “seeks to disclose the most intimate details of the author’s life and to elucidate their broader implications” (83). For Flanner, it seems, her mother’s disappointments coupled with the untimely death of her father proved a difficult lesson in guilt, something she (as well as Delia) struggle to come to terms with in the novel. Once again, it is Flanner’s concern with the subject of female physicality that follows a particularly disturbing moment in her personal history. “Even her victories,” Flanner writes, “were forgotten in this moment when it seemed to her that every human being who lived, lived only to apologize for going through existence housed in the indignity of chemical flesh” (420). The implication, of course, is that women are unjustly subject to culturally imposed restrictions on their bodies, which continually promote an etiquette of shame. Agatha, being physically and emotionally cold, and Delia, being very sensual, are made equally responsible for James’ death by failing to be properly sexualized. According to Jeanne Perreault in “Writing Selves,” autobiographical texts that “make the female body... a site

and source of written subjectivity, [invest] that individual body with the shifting ethics of a political, racial, and sexual consciousness” (2). While Flanner could never be so openly political and still enjoy some measure of literary acclaim, Delia could shoulder the burden of Flanner’s personal experience as well as mitigate her investigation of the female body as a politically charged subject of feminist discourse. It is through Delia that Flanner is able to ask why, “In an age of electricity, thousands of years after the parable of who should throw the first stone... the peculiar preoccupation with women’s virtue went on like something persistent and eternal that even in the New World did not change [?]” (291-92).

By 1913, Flanner had left Indianapolis to attend college in Chicago, but she returned home again after only a few semesters of poor academic performance. Despite her failure to leave Indianapolis for good, Flanner was rather indifferent about her college experience, insisting that “[n]onconformity, a fine-tuned sensibility, passionate eagerness, and burning love of the aesthetic... not one’s scholastic record, measured success as far as [she] was concerned” (qtd. in Wineapple 31). Certainly, Flanner had made an impression on her fellow students, amongst whom she had been popular, and in 1917 those contacts paid off when she was offered a post at the *Indianapolis Star* writing reviews of local theater productions (Wineapple 34). Another college friend, Lane Rhem, also kept in touch with Flanner. Rhem, studious and morally upright, seemed an odd choice of companion for Flanner, and her friends and family were equally shocked when the couple announced plans to wed in the spring of 1918. According to Wineapple, “Lane may have pressured Janet into an immediate marriage,” believing that he might be called

to military service. Flanner, averse as she was to domestic traditionalism, had her father's sense of patriotism and romance, and she may have been "confused by visions of heroic men marching nobly to the front" (38). The couple left Indianapolis by end of summer for New York and an apartment in Greenwich Village, and Flanner began to adapt her articles for the *Star* to relate for her readers the exciting atmosphere for artists and the art world in New York City. Inevitably, she also began to regret her hasty marriage.

If issues of conflict and war occupied most of the nation, "the subjects of art, sex, and women's rights continued to interest those coming to the Village" (Wineapple 41). New York had inspired an small revolution, where artists and free thinkers could live cheaply while promoting their various rebellions against traditionalism. Reflecting on the artistic community in Greenwich Village during the twenties, for instance, Dorothy Parker described the atmosphere as having a collective awareness or "sense of change" (Cowley 75), and according to Caroline F. Ware, it was the Village "artists as a group – painters and literary people especially – [who] were the first to make the Village a refuge from the social controls of Main Street and to establish the positive features of its challenge (240). Inspired by her new surroundings, Flanner insisted on maintaining her independence, developing a social network separate from her husband (which included keeping separate finances), and she began moving among the artists of the Village. It was not long before Flanner became a popular member of the literary set. Through Neysa McMein, whom Flanner thought very beautiful and considered a close friend, she met Alexander Woollcott, Jane Grant, and Robert Benchley, Dorothy Parker, Robert Sherwood, and many others. Flanner, though somewhat uncomfortable among the

“Algonquin Crowd” (whose presumptuousness often reminded her of the patronizing Protestant families from home), was especially drawn to McMein. Although there is no record of their ever having been lovers, Flanner was so influenced by the free spirited McMein that she attributed many of her affects to Delia Poole in *The Cubical City*. According to Wineapple, the “glamour” of Neysa’s studio and her ability to be “so willing to be herself on every occasion” are recounted in *Delia*. Just as McMein could not draw without a model, for instance, having Flanner dress up like a maid on one occasion so she could finish a specially commissioned portrait (44-45), Delia “could not draw a bird or a milk pail without having the models set in a good north light” (*Cubical* 14). Indeed, Flanner’s attraction to women was becoming so great that she began to feel some remorse at her treatment of her husband. In a letter to a friend, she recalled:

I was married, and so at sea in my disappointment in not being in love as I had been with women that I had no sense of recording any veracity of any sorts, my emotional push toward my lesbian approach to all life being so dominant that if I did not have it so vibrant a permanent problem in my daily life, I had nothing at all to replace it. (qtd. in Wineapple 46)

She would, however, attempt an innovative (indeed a feminist) interpretation of her emotional experience through the semi-veracious autobiographical adaptation of her novel. As Felski notes, “The goal of the confession is to strip away the superficial layers of convention and to expose an authentic core of self, of meaning as fully present to itself” (89). This representation of meaning, for Flanner, is *Delia*. She is an approximation of the kind of woman Flanner would aspire to be in life, yet one who

inevitably succumbs to the expectations of her gender, failing – as Flanner did in marrying a man she did not love – in spite of herself. Delia, like Flanner, is painfully aware of society's expectations of her, even the reasons behind those expectations, as she fights to maintain her independence. “Probably Puritanism had finished for the women what men, thousands and thousands of years ago, had thoughtlessly begun,” (203) she writes in *The Cubical City*:

Too soon Puritans... made on a new cold shore, cold and blue new laws. Mysogynist St. Paul finally triumphed in Salem, 1650A.D. And the New World quickly settled down in prosperous confusion, determined for the next three hundred years to forgive woman for its original fall and look up to her at the same time for purity, as with modest sexless instincts she ruled the American home, keeping it clear of the sensual candor she had never been properly invited to enjoy. (204-05)

Through a mode of feminist confession, then, *The Cubical City* marks its author's attempt to define, through elements of biographical detail, the struggle of all women to become more than what cultural scripts have perpetually determined for them over the course of history. “The obligation to honest self-depiction,” Felski points out, “is here mitigated by the feminist recognition that it is the representative aspects of the author's experience rather than her unique individuality which are important” (84). For this reason, the fictional details of Flanner's novel are insignificant in relation to the greater representation of female experience. It is the element of confession, then, that provides the key to discovering Flanner in her *roman à clef*.

III

In 1918, in the months after the culmination of the Great War, Janet Flanner met Solita Solano. She would become, according to Wineapple, “the first great – and in many ways undiminished – love of Janet’s life” (47). For sixty years, until Flanner’s death in 1978, they would maintain their relationship, if not as lovers, as each other’s most trusted confidante and kin. Hired on as drama editor for *Variety* magazine, Solano arrived in New York an independent woman of considerable world experience. Having already worked as an editor for the *Boston Traveler and Journal*, the sort of position that very few women at the time had attained, Solano was also widely traveled, having lived and worked in China, Japan, and the Phillipines. Consequently, she had become something of a noted writer and translator, being fluent in Spanish, Italian, and “three Malay languages,” and having published several short stories concerning her adventures around the world (Wineapple 50-51). It is easy to see, given Solano’s glamour and worldly-wise sophistication, how Flanner would have been attracted. They shared many common goals and aspirations; they wanted to write, to retain their sense of romance and passion for art.

As Wineapple notes:

... they both disliked their middle-class backgrounds, wanted to experience everything they thought had been denied them, and felt a bit lost in New York. The self-possessed Solita revealed herself to be vulnerable...And Janet, who wanted to be accepted in the world of her Algonquin acquaintances, also wanted to be free of their, and her own, provincialism. (52)

They also held common political beliefs, and, along with Jane Grant, Flanner and Solano joined the Lucy Stone League, an organization which lobbied for a woman's right to keep her name in marriage (53). Soon, the two women found themselves engaged in a passionate affair. They were in love, but the relationship was extremely difficult. Flanner, after all, was married. They realized that if they wanted to continue, if they were to "live as they wished," they would have to leave America (Wineapple 53). Fortunately, Solano was soon offered a position with *National Geographic* that entailed a significant amount of travel abroad. Determined that Flanner join her, Solano insisted she leave her husband. Though Flanner was congenial to the idea, she experienced tremendous guilt at continually disappointing her mother and hurting her husband. Despite her reservations, however, she relented. Flanner would always be grateful to Solano for pushing her to make that choice. Interestingly, though Mary Flanner was very fond of Rhem: "it seems that no one expected Janet and Lane to stay together," and the "separation and eventual divorce were... amicable" (Wineapple 53). Despite her family's lack of opposition to divorce, though, Flanner told neither her mother nor her sisters that she was planning to leave the country. As Wineapple notes, "It was almost as if the decision to leave was so important that any hesitation or consultation might threaten it" (54). In the summer of 1921, Flanner and Solano arrived in Greece. Ecstatic over the beauties they encountered as they toured the country, the two women excitedly began making a new world for themselves. Although Flanner had left America without so much as a goodbye, she did not, according to Wineapple,

... want to make a total break with her American heritage;

she wanted freedom from the sexual, personal and professional restrictions of an America that was inimical, if not openly hostile, to her relationship with Solita. They did not wish to live in a vacuum; rather, they wanted to be part of a tradition, one that could offer them a meaningful social and historical identity. (55-56)

In the early fall of 1922, after many months of travel, Flanner and Solano settled in Paris. Both women had been inspired to write, and Flanner, by the next year, was well on her way to completing a draft of *The Cubical City*. Mary Flanner was encouraged by her daughter's hard-working attempt to become a published author, yet she remained adamant that Janet could do so in America. Certainly, Mary never mentioned having any suspicion as to the nature of Janet's relationship with Solita, but she "asked [very] few questions and delicately ignored what she preferred not to see" (Wineapple 74). It would be more than twenty five years before she would visit Janet in Paris, and despite Flanner's reasons for wanting to escape to Europe, she was no doubt hurt by her mother's avoidance of her there. "To her mother sex was malignant," she would write in *The Cubical City*: "Where Adam and Eve were concerned, her mother was still on the side of God and the angels" (140).

The representation of sex and sexuality through Delia in *The Cubical City* is a direct reflection of Flanner's relationship with Solano. Though Flanner often felt that women could never truly attain sexual independence, she must have felt she owed it to herself, and to Solita, to try and express her views on the subject. "This awareness could not help but make her feel guilty and even hypocritical, leading as she must have, a kind of double life," Wineapple notes: "But her relationship with Solita allowed her to be,

finally, more at one with herself” (74). Flanner was proud of the fact that she was finally coming to terms with her feelings, yet she needed to find some way to interpret her past, having gained some measure of perspective. As Julia Watson notes in “Unspeakable Differences,” the autobiographical form has traditionally “functioned as the keeper of the “law” of patriarchal identity,” that is, that “women’s sexuality has usually been presumed as heterosexual” in an autobiographical text unless explicitly stated otherwise. However, as women autobiographers have often veiled their identities in order to express their ideological beliefs without fear of public reprisal, it is reasonable to assume that women writers have also used autobiography in “...speaking of sexuality as [sic] complex statements that may challenge or rethink contemporary ideologies of gender” (394). As Flanner writes:

There had always been a void between every generation and its offspring, of course, but certainly it seemed uniquely broad now. Broad enough, for the European war to have come between, killing a few of the younger American generation and setting all the rest free. Free for what? And as though it were an art peculiarly distinguishing their decade, sex had suddenly blossomed into a renaissance. (*Cubical* 140)

Indeed, women were enjoying more personal freedom than ever before, but sex as a subject was still very much taboo in the majority of American homes. As Flanner understood it, Wineapple suggests, “America was a masculine place— unappealing, unsensuous, restricting” (73). In her novel, she describes her own hometown as a “virile” place, “procreative and breastless, idling out the cold winter under a patient domestic sky” (*Cubical* 137). It is precisely this masculinized society that eventually destroys

Delia's relationships with the people she loves. She must, for instance, carry the guilt of responsibility for her father's death and, subsequently, for her mother's life. Though Agatha does not wish to live alone, she can not abide her daughter's lifestyle. Delia, similarly, can not seem to distance herself from Agatha's empty affections. Delia's best friend, Nancy Burke, "once loved Delia better than anything in the world, lavishing on her all the attentions of wife, mother, and friend" but the relationship does not last precisely because it is "modeled on a heterosexual relationship" (Wineapple 72). Nancy, angry and jealous of Delia's unbridled sexuality, leaves her. Delia, without the affection of either family or friend, continues to take lovers. Although she chooses not to marry, she is stunned to discover that her reputation as a "Bad Woman" (*Cubical* 292) precludes her from being asked, even when these men admit they "ought to be glad to marry [her]" (289). The price of her sexual freedom eventually becomes too much for her to bear, and Delia finally consents to marry a man she does not love, "capitulat[ing] to what she thinks her mother prefers" (Wineapple 73).

Obviously, the end of Flanner's novel departs from the biographical aspects of her own life to a deeper investigation of the implications of female sexuality. Oppressed by the patriarchal scripts of American society, Delia fails to be empowered by her sexual freedom, submitting instead to the traditional construct of womanhood in order to feel some measure of acceptance. "Driven by circumstances and devotion," Flanner writes, "led by lack of privacy and the exhaustion from suffering, she was closing in on a question that would deprive her of all she wanted... "Will you marry me?" For Delia, it seems, "It was the only way" (427). It is easy to imagine, had Flanner not left America,

that Delia's fate might well have been her own. In departing for Europe with Solano, Flanner is able to fully conceive the difference imposed on her gender, and what that difference means in disabling women of control in their own lives. Having gained some perspective on the experiences of her youth in relation to what she has learned as a young woman, Flanner is able to engage autobiography as a means to represent aspects of her experience and "[emphasize them] in relation to a notion of communal female identity" (Felski 85). Delia, like all women trapped inside the roles prescribed by their bodies in the twentieth century, Flanner believes, "lacked the ego for self-analyzation yet her artistic eye... vaguely informed her of certain truths and shapes of her own life. Her rooms were no habitat for theories of freedom..." (54). Masked as fiction in order to protect Flanner from critical derision, *The Cubical City* is an autobiographical text that communicates modernism's effort toward literary experimentalism while simultaneously constituting a subversive act of political independence. Although a "pluralistic" investigation of women's modernist writing has inspired new evaluations of "works long deemed external to the movement," the lack of scholarly attention afforded Janet Flanner's *roman à clef* indicates the necessity for further research. Certainly, *The Cubical City* offers a relevant and significant example of subversive innovations in American expatriate women's autobiographies and its inclusion among those of Beach, Stein, Crosby, and Boyle may serve to contribute a greater awareness of female subjectivities in modernism in the future.

Chapter 2

Paris Correspondent, 1925-1939

I should like to be a traveller proper to this century: a knapsack and a diary is no longer enough. A voyage suitable to the 20th [sic] century is like no exploration into visible space ever taken before, must be conducted with elaborate knowledge, scientific data, vaccinations, and most particularly, the superb modern mechanics which only a millionaire can rent... The day of pilgrims is over.

(Janet Flanner, qtd. in *Wineapple* 60)

Somehow aware that she was taking part in a dramatically significant period in human history, Janet Flanner must have felt a kinship with Jules Verne's eternally optimistic Mr. Phileas Fogg, challenging the mores of her American heritage to arrive in

Europe an unapologetically independent woman – a pilgrim, indeed. Together with Solita Solano, Flanner settled in the Hôtel Saint-Germain-des-Prés at 36 rue Bonaparte in Paris and began to enjoy the kind of lifestyle she had imagined for herself as a teenager: eating fine French food and drinking fine French Wine at the Deux Magots, and making acquaintance with the literary set who often met there. Indeed, it was at this very café that Flanner and Ernest Hemingway would develop an affectionate friendship, sharing some very frank discussions concerning the impact of their fathers’ deaths (both by suicide while they were in their early twenties) and on their perceptions of morality. They became so close, Flanner later described their relationship in a personal letter to Carlos Baker in 1966, that Hemingway often referred to “Jan” as a “member of the family” (qtd. in Wineapple 68). Both would go on to become very successful writers, but only Hemingway would come to be regarded critically as a modernist. Flanner’s story, to the detriment of literary scholarship, has never been recognized as inherent to the greater narrative of American expatriate modernism. Though she is generally acknowledged to have been a popular figure among her contemporaries during this period, her work has not been analyzed in conjunction with that of her compatriots. Indeed, her work as a journalist seems to have somehow precluded her from such analyses. *The Cubical City*, moreover, remains all but forgotten. Yet Flanner was confident, by the time a collection of her work was published in 1972, of her position within the ranks of modernism. In the introduction to *Paris Was Yesterday*, Flanner directly associates herself with the modernist canon as she recalls recognizing the special difference of her “compatriots” in Paris and including herself among them: “We were a literary lot,” she writes, “each of us

aspired to become a famous writer as soon as possible” (vii). As we have seen, however, women writers of the period were not guaranteed status as independent contributors. Despite their various achievements, women writers were often eclipsed by the men in their lives. Unlike Joyce, Hemingway, Fitzgerald, and other male members of the American expatriate generation, female modernists “rarely receive the respect accorded their male counterparts,” who have been granted the status of the movement’s “patron saints” (Van Gessel 20). Although recent scholarship has attempted to rectify the displacement of women modernists’ writing, it has failed to include women such as Flanner, whose contributions, despite the journalistic medium in which she worked, become equal to (or even extensions of) fundamental modernist principals.

In 1925, Flanner’s friend and fellow Lucy Stone leaguer from New York, Jane Grant, wrote to offer Flanner a position as Paris Correspondent for her husband’s budding magazine, the *New Yorker*. Under Harold Ross’s strict direction, Flanner adopted the pseudonym Genêt as well as a distinctive writing style representative of the magazine’s guiding principal – uncompromising sophistication. What is autobiographically significant about her early “Letter From Paris,”¹ however, is that like a diary her correspondence reflects not only the currents of Parisian culture, which was required of her as a journalist, but her own experiences as well. Significantly, Flanner’s work at once informs and determines aspects of her personal identity. Ultimately, Flanner’s work may be described as a historiographic discourse between herself and her audience, a public and

¹

Flanner’s “Letter From Paris” was published under a variety of titles, including “Paris Letter.”

continuously-present autobiographical exercise that records a fixed moment in history. Her correspondence becomes an example of yet another adaptation of women's writing in the early twentieth century, a means of placing one's personal history within a greater historical context. Interestingly, Flanner realized there was "no antecedent" for the kind of work she was doing, and throughout her career she remained painfully aware of her personal connection to each printed "Letter" (*Yesterday* xix). Although Flanner never directly identifies herself in her work during the early portion of her career as a *New Yorker* correspondent, she nonetheless emerges as a participant of history in a highly turbulent period, and she remains a member of the expatriate community through both location and enterprise.

II

According to Ben Yagoda in his comprehensive history of the *New Yorker*, *About Town: the New Yorker and the World it Made*, Jane Grant's request for Flanner's writing was highly specific. "He wants anecdotal and incidental stuff in places familiar to Americans and on people of note," she wrote on her husband's behalf:

... dope on fields of the arts and a little on fashion, perhaps, although he does not want the latter treated technically; there should be lots of chat about people... and in it all he wants a definite personality injected. In fact, any of your letters would be just the thing. (qtd. in Yagoda 76)

Recalling her initiation as a regular *New Yorker* contributor some fifty years later, Flanner

described the magazine as “an oversized minnow learning how to swim,” and she expressed her own struggle in developing a writing style that suited Ross’s purpose as much as her own aesthetic principles. Despite the descriptive nature of her subject matter, for instance, Flanner insisted on an autobiographically-based analysis of that subject. In other words, she believed that some aspect of her own experience must be communicated. It would be some time before she felt comfortable in her new style of writing, which she described as “instinctively lean[ing] toward comments with a critical edge.” Criticism, “to be valid... demanded a certain personal aspect or slant of the writer’s mind” (*Yesterday* xix). In this way, Flanner was able to incorporate for a wider audience back home her own experience as an American living abroad. Applying Smith and Watson’s interpretation of a diarist as a recorder of “dailiness in accounts and observations of emotional responses” to Flanner’s work explains how “Genêt” became a public adaptation of herself, her correspondence a chronological “accretion” of her own life lived immersed in the culture of Paris (193). “All I really knew about what Ross wished for me to write, and what I wished for me to write,” she later recalled, “was that it must be precisely accurate, highly personal, colorful, and ocularly descriptive” (*Yesterday* xx). Though she was often frustrated when her letters were adapted for content, clarity, or for lack of space by the editorial staff in New York, Flanner’s sharp yet eloquent style began to develop a consistent rhythm. In a letter dated September 25, printed in the October 10, 1925 issue of the *New Yorker*, for instance, Flanner cleverly employs her own experience as a point of reference but maintains her witty aloofness. “The third big item of the week has been the making public of some statistics regarding the Exhibition of Decorative

Arts,” she writes, “more than ten million people have attended which, by the way, if you have been there, you will know, has been nine million nine hundred thousand too many for comfort” (1.34 26).

Indeed, according to Yagoda, it was Flanner, “as much as anyone,” who established “essay-journalism as a *New Yorker* tradition” (77). Over several decades and together with other members of the *New Yorker* staff, including James Thurber and A. J. Liebling, Flanner helped define literary journalism as an autobiographically-based documentation of historical experience. During the Second World War especially, Flanner and the *New Yorker* perfected this style, externalizing the experience of war from an American’s perspective and revolutionizing public discourse in its bold correspondence of the daily atrocities occurring in Europe. During the early portion of her career as Paris correspondent, however, Flanner sought to cultivate an elitist demeanor in Genêt that was partly in keeping with the magazine’s strict editorial policies, which scorned “provincial morality” (or what Ross termed the “old lady from Dubuque”), and partly her own unique sense of irony and biting wit (Wineapple 96). “Genêt,” Wineapple observes, “reported on all the scenes – the street scene, the art scene, the fashion scene, the publishing scene; she thought of herself as a high-class gossip columnist and assumed her readers were familiar with her world and the people and places and issues inhabiting it...” (100). In a 1926 letter entitled “Art (Commerce),” for example, Flanner writes that:

Marcel Duchamp’s sale of Picabias is being widely discussed. Duchamp must be recalled in America for his “Nude Descending a Staircase”: since then he has never painted another canvas. He received about eighty-nine thousand francs for his entire collection of eighty Picabias,

the famous “Mind the Paint” bringing only three hundred and twenty francs. Today a good hat from a smart modiste costs more. (*Yesterday* 10)

It may be this sense of frivolity in her early work that has failed to inspire critical examination of her correspondence but, given her popularity among the expatriate literary community, it is more likely that journalistic writing itself was not considered a valid form of literature. Indeed, journalism and literature have seemed to occupy different aesthetic spheres, the obvious distinction being a matter of fact and fiction. Some writers have even considered journalism to be the antithesis of literature. Gertrude Stein, on being introduced to Ernest Hemingway, advised him to quit his newspaper job, suggesting that such writing would be detrimental to creative work, that “remarks are not literature” (Stein 77). Though autobiography has struggled throughout the twentieth century to find respectability as a literary form, “New Journalism” (a journalistic style most akin to Flanner’s) came into its own in the 1960s. Michael L. Johnson describes it as a form of writing that attempts to be “personalistic, involved, and creative in relation to the events [the writer] reports and comments upon.” Practiced by such politically minded writers as Truman Capote, Tom Wolfe, and Norman Mailer, the style, according to Johnson, is meant as a “response to the radically new kinds of events and personalities that are shaping American and world culture; it is an attempt to record and evaluate history by keeping language and attitude closely attuned and responsive to the style of events”(46). In retrospect, the kind of literary journalism that Flanner and her contemporaries at the magazine were developing may have inspired such personal

interpretations of news events.

Interestingly, autobiography is considered a literary genre as much as journalism is generally acknowledged to retain autobiographical qualities. In other words, there is fiction in journalism. In fact, both autobiography and journalism are inherently fictive. Identity as represented in autobiography, the autobiographical “I,” for instance, can never be defined as it maintains a constant flux of revision based on experience, memory, the passage of time, and selective editorship as a process of writing. Beyond this, authors often manipulate their biographical information, as many women modernists did, in order to subvert cultural prescriptions or to achieve a particular aesthetic quality. As Paul John Eakin notes in *Fictions in Autobiography*, an autobiographical act is best “understood as a ceaseless process of identity formation in which new versions of the past evolve to meet the constantly changing requirements of the self in each successive present.” In other words, the present circumstances in which the author finds herself continuously recreate a new or different interpretation of her past. In order for Flanner to analyze the difficult circumstances of her youth in *The Cubical City*, for example, she must mitigate her new perspective as an independent woman while simultaneously masking her own autobiographical authority from untoward criticism. Hence, Flanner adapts the *roman à clef*—it is a fictional representation of her own biographical experience. “Truth and identity in autobiography are plural,” Eakin points out, “and, therefore, so is the autobiographical text” (36).

Journalism, similarly, is inherently fictive due to the very nature of language. Richard V. Ericson, an expert in media technology and communications practices, argues

that:

every use of language, every classification has an element of fiction because it is not the thing itself... Fiction is bound up with our ways of imaginatively construing the world, of visualizing what something is in order to act upon it. Organized life depends upon acting as if things are as they have been imaginatively construed. (91)

This is not to say that every news report is a baseless construction of imagination but, like autobiography, is subject to different versions of perception as affected by time, chance, moral evaluation and, again, selection as a process of writing or editing. In this way, Ericson submits, “there is no real distinction between facts, information, and knowledge. They are all a result of interpretation through communication that give meaning in the contexts of their use” (84). Using this analysis, it becomes clear that there is less of a distinction between works of literature and works of journalism than we might originally have believed. Both modes of discourse result in a fictionally – based version of the truth, and as autobiography and journalism both contain inherently fictive qualities, they must be interpreted similarly. William Shawn, Flanner’s longtime editor at the magazine, identifies the autobiographical nature (as well as the fictional nature) of her discourse in the introduction to *Janet Flanner’s World: Uncollected Writings 1932-1975*. “Facts came to [Flanner] out of the air,” he writes:

She looked beyond what the ordinary eye could see, and she heard vibrations too delicate for the ordinary ear. She picked up signals, intimations, atmospheres, dim forms, ambiguous voices, and out of all this she constructed as accurate a representation as we have had of what was going on in Europe between 1925 and 1975. (xiv)

In other words, if truth and identity in autobiography are plural, as Eakin believes, and journalism is the result of communications formed by way of constantly evolving perceptions of the self and of the outside world, the two practices must be inextricably linked. This theory is well supported, as we shall see in the following pages, by Margo Culley's analysis of the interrelationship between women's diaries and journalism. Accordingly, we must be careful not to divorce essay journalism from literary scholarship and risk overlooking, as we have Janet Flanner's work, a significant contribution to the annals of literary modernism.

III

Beyond the presence of fiction in autobiography and journalism, there is further evidence of autobiographical proclivity in Flanner's correspondence. Indeed, instead of measuring the difference between genres, it is significantly more productive to take note of their obvious correlations, and Flanner's letters provide an excellent prototype for a comparative evaluation of journalism and diarism. Specifically, it is the diaristic elements of Flanner's work that result in a broader cultural analysis that may be described as a historiographic discourse between herself and her audience, a public and continuously present autobiographical exercise. Smith and Watson define a diary as an

autobiographical narrative in which “the self-constructions” it contains are fixed in time and space, available to the diarist for later viewing, and for comment or emendation” (Smith and Watson 193). One of its distinguishing characteristics as an autobiographical form, in other words, is a continual or constant process of revision. Flanner’s correspondence similarly affords her the opportunity to evaluate her identity as it is formed chronologically. It is this sense of immediacy, beyond depiction of her own experience, that becomes a significant factor in our evaluation. In this way, Flanner’s journalism not only reflects her personal experiences as an American in Paris but, in recording those significant events in our greater human history, is tantamount to a priceless historical document. In “A Reporter at Large” published in the January 9, 1932 issue of the *New Yorker*, for instance, Flanner documents her experience of post-war Berlin, a very different place from that she had visited as an adolescent:

Somewhere in the town are workers without work and capitalists without capital, but on the sidewalks are neither apples nor unemployed... the new Berliners’, strong where they used to be stout, affable where they were once formal, affectionate to adult foreigners as they used to be only to their own children... are sure their country is going to the dogs. (15.4 36)

But her description of the state of the German economic situation in relation to France and America, however lightly treated in her attempt to maintain Genêt’s air of sophisticated detachment, are particularly salient to historical investigations of European culture during the inter-war period. “Germany’s estimated unemployment figures for this winter would be terrifying to New Yorkers if they had not themselves seen apples and

unemployment,” she writes, “... if there were seven million Frenchman out of work, they’d all be busy making a revolution” (15.4 49). As it turned out, the Germans were. The most spectacular example of Flanner’s historical relevance, however, is her three-part “Profile” of Adolf Hitler printed in the February 29, March 7, and March 14, 1936 issues of the magazine. Though Flanner’s mandate (as well as Ross’s) was to remain politically neutral, she was proud of her ironic evaluation of the dictator’s malignance and, as she noted in a letter to *New Yorker* editor Katherine White in 1938, that she “had sufficient apprehension” in the years leading up to the war, “to propose to write about Hitler as an important man” (qtd. in Yagoda 138). Flanner’s best contact for information on Hitler, according to Wineapple, came from “the half American, half German” Ernst “Putzi” Hanfstaengl, a close friend of Hitler’s and a journalist, who “could get Janet all the information she wanted – like what Hitler ate for breakfast” (143). The result is a dramatic, eerily resonant snapshot of the dictator on the eve of his atrocious birth into world history. Hitler, Flanner wrote:

... has mystical tendencies, no common sense, and a Wagnerian taste for heroics and death. He was born loaded with vanities and has developed megalomania as his final decoration... as a politician, he nullifies opposition by letting friends oppose each other and by suppressing enemies... his fits of weeping are undenied and unexplained... (*World* 20-21)

The “Führer” profile also indicates a deeper level of personal commitment in regard to her work. It was dangerous to be a foreign reporter poking around unescorted in Germany during this period of rising violence and persecution, yet Flanner never wavered in her evaluation of Hitler’s ideology and his personal habits, boldly pointing out that the

“official translation” of *Mein Kampf* had curiously “deleted troubling comments” referring to the destruction of “the French hydra” and the “wipi[ing] out” of France (*World* 23). She even went so far as to point out that Hitler’s “inbreeding [was] as specific as any Austrian Hapsburg” (14). Flanner, Wineapple points out, was deeply moved by the information her research had revealed and “could not coolly itemize” the disturbing qualities of recent social history in Germany as she had the art and fashion scene in Paris, and her writing began to take on a sense of immediacy or presentness “impossible to imagine in her earlier, chattier profiles” (144-45). Moreover, as the political climate in France began to deteriorate, Flanner began to emerge from behind the sophisticated veneer of Genêt. Describing the scene at a French refugee camp in the spring of 1939, Flanner wrote: “The whole scene was an unforgettable one except to those living in it” (15.4 82). Ultimately, it is through Janet Flanner’s historical presence, her own documented experience, that the evolution of autobiographical elements in her correspondence may be measured.

In an “Introduction to *A Day At a Time: Diary Literature of American Women, From 1764 to 1985*,” Margo Culley supports analysis of such ontological intersections of a “journal and a life.” According to Culley, the autobiographical process is a paradoxical endeavor “whose frequent goal... to establish self-continuity involves at its heart a dislocation from the self, or a turning of subject into object” (217). In many instances, Culley believes, the autobiographer writes from a position of “self-examination” or from the “imagined” point of view of those around her. In objectifying her subjectivity (making her views or opinions the subject of her work in relation to how she believes she will be,

or should be, perceived) for an outside audience, which is the general aim of journalistic discourse, the autobiographer ultimately influences or reshapes the information she presents – altering her autobiographical identity and presenting a fictionalized version of herself (218). “This conflation of the journal and the life itself may indeed be an accurate rendering of a complex dialectic,” Culley notes, “... evidence exists that the persona in the pages of the diary shapes the life lived as well as the reverse” (219). The greatest example of this dialectic, as we shall see in the following chapter, is reflected in Flanner’s experience covering the devastations of World War II and the subsequent Nuremberg Trials. Her correspondence during this period indicates a shift in her personality that is thoroughly reflected in the style of her letters. Even so, the interdependent relationship between the autobiographer, the text, and her audience is present during the early portion of her career, as well. Essentially, Flanner’s experience is reflected in her work, and her work forms the basis of that experience. As she later recalled, her “satisfaction in living there was double: [she] felt [she] was living both at home and abroad – living surrounded with the human familiarity of American friends and acquaintances, and the constant, shifting stimulation that came from the native French” (*Yesterday* xvi). This interesting dynamic is often reflected in letters where her experiences as a resident of Paris and her work as a journalist merge. Flanner, for instance, describes the excitement of May 21, 1927, “[t]he night... a young tourist named Captain Charles Lindbergh landed his plane *The Spirit of St. Louis* at Le Bourget.” According to Flanner:

... the Paris news vendors screamed through the streets,
“*Bonnes nouvelles!* The American has arrived.” At their
Montmartre night clubs Zelli and Florence stood

champagne to the Americans, as did the excited patrons in humble bars, gallantly offering bad brandy to their Yankee clients... The Ministry of Foreign Affairs flew the Stars and Stripes, as did most of the tramcars. (*Yesterday* 22-23)

When Flanner visited Nîmes in July of the same year, Hemingway excitedly introduced her to his *aficion* for Spanish bullfighting and to the American bullfighter Sidney Franklin. According to Wineapple, the two men gave Flanner a short education on the subtleties of the sport. Franklin “unpack[ed] his matador costumes and swords” and “gave Janet detailed information on the cost and decor of a matador’s outfit as well as on the long complicated routine of dressing” (150-51). She included this information in a piece titled “Letter From The Bull Ring” that was printed in the August 7, 1937 issue of the magazine. “Because men are tragically fighting men in Spain,” she writes in an increasingly opinionated tone:

the best of Spanish bullfighting is being done this summer in southern France. The Fascists hold Andalusia and Salamanca, where blooded fighting bulls grow, the Loyalists have held out in Madrid, to whose ring great bullfighters go. In order to get together, both *matadors* and animals have passed over the border for special French *toros* at Bordeaux, Bayonne, Dax, Béziers. Especially for one who prefers good architecture to good bullfighting, the handsomest of the recent *corridas* was at Nîmes, in the magnificently preserved antique Roman arena where Christians used to be killed for sport. (13.25 47)

Essentially, it is this sense of “periodicity,” that inherent element of diary discourse in Flanner’s journalism, that records experience of a fixed time and a fixed place, that Culley believes is “the key phenomenon determining the relationship of the writer and the reader to the text, and to each other, within both real and imagined time”

(220-21). Moreover, it must be concluded that there exists an important dynamic between Flanner's experience and her correspondence which in turn determines or informs significant aspects of her identity. This conflation of Flanner's life and work, an issue which inspires further investigation into the subject of relationality in autobiography, has been described by Wineapple as a "double life" with a "double vision," a strange parallelism wherein "Genêt placed Janet inside history because she was there, as well as outside it, as an American in Paris, a woman, a spectator" (104-05).

IV

Observations in regard to Flanner's historical presence must be informed by the relational aspect of autobiography. Smith and Watson characterize relational autobiography as a "model of selfhood in women's autobiographical writing" in which the author identifies herself through (or in relation to) an "other" (201). Kay Boyle's revision of *Being Geniuses Together: 1920-1930*, for example, uses Robert McAlmon's life and work as a tool through which she defines her own. "In my account of the years 1920-1930," she writes, "I attempted to record the times and settings in my life that served to prepare the way for a recognition of McAlmon and his work" (333-34). Essentially, Boyle makes the process of revising *Being Geniuses Together* about herself, as Craig Monk points out in "Textual Authority and Modern American Autobiography," by "revoicing his story on her terms"(492). In this way, she is able to portray her own perceived experience as an influential member of the modernist cannon. Though Boyle

insists her motivations are selfless and that emphasis be placed on McAlmon and his achievements, Boyle's placement of herself between his pages constitutes her own willful (and thus inherently selfish) autobiographical act. Sylvia Beach's autobiography *Shakespeare and Company* also offers an excellent example of relational autobiography. In order to avoid blatant claims of her own significance to literary modernism, Beach subtly distinguishes herself in relation to her bookshop and its illustrious patrons. She insists her customers are "owed" the credit for her success when she recalls hearing that:

news of [her] bookshop had spread all over the United States, and it was the first thing the pilgrims looked up in Paris. They were all customers at Shakespeare and Company, which many of them looked upon as their club. Often, they would inform me that they had given Shakespeare and Company as their address, and they hoped I didn't mind. (23)

Indeed, Beach often personifies the shop in her autobiography. She writes, for instance, that: "Shakespeare and Company in 1921 moved to the rue de l'Odeon and Americanized it" (61), or "Shakespeare and Company was in close touch with the small presses in Paris that published books in English" (130). Moreover, Beach points out, "Joyce's expenses always exceeded his income, and he had moments of panic. And so did Shakespeare and Company" (201). Using the bookshop as an eminent "other" in such a way, Beach is able to "highlight the personal facets of interactions with her clientele" and simultaneously define her own identity as significant to literary modernism (Van Gessel 146).

Gertrude Stein's *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* similarly projects an

“other,” (though in a highly innovative manner) as a representation of herself. Richard Hardack describes Stein’s employment of Alice Toklas, Stein’s longtime companion and the illusory narrator of her autobiography, as an act of “ventriloquism” involving a “puppet third-person self” (18) which enables the author to “[disconnect] from the narration” of her own story (17). While Beach utilizes relationality as a means to subvert cultural expectations of femininity in regard to her entrepreneurship, Stein consciously fixes the “other” in her autobiography to serve a primary function in her theoretical method of experimentalism:

About six weeks ago Gertrude Stein said, it does not look to me as if you were ever going to write that autobiography. You know what I am going to do. I am going to write it for you. I am going to write as simply as Defoe did the autobiography of Robinson Crusoe. And she has and this is it. (*Toklas* 252)

Though modes of relationality in Kay Boyle’s *Being Geniuses Together*, Beach’s *Shakespeare and Company*, and Gertrude Stein’s *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* are represented differently, all three share a self-conscious awareness regarding identity; they all construct or define models of identity based on perceptions of society’s interpretations of their work. Boyle ironically claims that she has “come to believe that autobiography to fulfill a worthy purpose should be primarily a defense of those who have been unjustly dealt with in one’s own time, and whose lives and work ask for vindication” (333). Beach diminutively asks us to “imagine how happy [she] was to find [herself] suddenly the publisher of the work [she] admired above all” (47), and Stein assertively points out that “there was [a] general recognition of the quality of [her]

genius” (5). These adaptive identity strategies point to an interesting dynamic between narrative identity and experience. Again, it is the present circumstances in which the author finds herself that continuously recreate a new or different interpretation of her past. Consequently, we must assume (if the autobiographical act is based on a fictionalized version of authorial identity) that Flanner’s writing, being so intrinsically linked to her lifestyle, informs her experience. John Paul Eakin, in *How Our Lives Become Stories*, identifies the relativity of human experience through cognitive science and psychological analyses of identity. Approaching literary genre “in the spirit of a cultural anthropologist,” Eakin explores how autobiography can “teach us about the ways in which individuals in a particular culture experience their sense of being “I”” (4). Most relevant to our evaluation of Flanner, however, is Eakin’s claim that autobiographical scholarship “has not yet fully addressed the extent to which the self is defined by – and lives in terms of – its relations to others” (43). Flanner’s role as an autobiographer, after all, hinges on the discourse between herself (revealed through her experiences abroad) and her audience, resulting in the real-time autobiographical exercise that we have described as inherently diaristic. But taken further, Eakin argues, it becomes necessary to investigate how autobiographical narrative “is not merely an appropriate form for the expression of identity” but constitutes “an identity content” within itself (100). Anne E. Goldman alternatively describes this as a recognition of how the autobiographical “I” is “implicated and informed by circumstances” (288). In other words, Flanner’s experience, such as her education in Spanish bullfighting, often resulted in biographically- based public correspondence. The occupational result of that experience is less important than the fact that her occupation

informs her identity. “What enables such autobiographers simultaneously to represent culture and to write the self,” Goldman asserts, “is their insistence on the work involved in both activities” (290). Having attended the Olympic games in Berlin in the summer of 1936, for instance, Flanner can not help but write in relation to her own experience as a tourist and spectator that:

Anyone who attended the XI Olympic Games conscientiously for two weeks spent eight hours daily in the open air, rain or shine; sprinted miles from swimming pool to polo field, from hockey stands to jumping pits; and became as lean and strong as an athlete. The games did us non-competitors a lot of good. (*World* 28)

Moreover, Flanner refers to herself and her role as a reporter in this piece, cementing for her audience an image of a day in the life of an American correspondent on assignment in a foreign country:

Considering the megalomaniacal nationalism which Germans have recently been taught, it should be honestly reported that they never groaned, as did some folk, at the monotony of the American victories, but each time rose to the stadium orchestra’s “Star-Spangled Banner” and heiled the hoisted Stars and Stripes with protocol politeness. (29)

Essentially, Flanner’s work tends to define her *self*, as opposed to traditional autobiographical analyses that often support the idea that an autobiography is defined only by its author. “For students of autobiography’s history,” Eakin asserts, “there is no little irony in the thought that the very enlightenment model of the autonomous, rational individual that fostered the rise of the genre may also be responsible— now more than ever— for restricting its possibilities” (53). Although recent scholarship has attempted to

rectify the displacement of women modernists' writing, it has failed to include women such as Flanner who, perhaps because of the medium in which she worked, has not been recognized as an influential autobiographer of her time. Throughout her career as a journalist, Flanner insisted on a style of writing that placed her own personal history firmly within the greater historical context of which she wrote. Given contemporary developments in autobiographical theory, especially concerning Culley and Eakin's theories of identity and relationality, we may begin to grant writers such as Flanner the greater literary significance they deserve.

In terms of literary scholarship and its tendency to overlook journalism as a form of autobiographical discourse, we must investigate narrative not only as form "but a mode of phenomenological and cognitive self-experience" in which the autobiographical self "does not necessarily precede its constitution in narrative" (100). In such circumstances Flanner's correspondence for the *New Yorker* is as autobiographically valid as traditional narratives written for moral inspiration, such as Benjamin Franklin's autobiography. Both narratives simultaneously construct their authors' present as they signify their past. Having achieved her dream as an independent and successful writer, Flanner is able to eclipse the difficulties of her youth and continue to evolve her perception of self through her own experience as documented through her correspondence. As Glenway Westcott recalled in "The Frenchmen Six Feet Three," Flanner felt that "[t]o stay in France as long as it was humanly possible was her fate. Because it was fate of course she herself did not altogether understand why it was" (qtd. in Wineapple 148). Others, those members of the generation to which she belonged, seem to have a better understanding of what compelled

her constant investigation of herself and the world around her. Reflecting on finally being introduced to Picasso in the late 1950s, Flanner describes how:

Picasso turned to me with his hand outstretched in greeting, and then, with a loud cry of astonishment, shouted, "You! Why didn't you ever speak to me in the old days at the Flore? For years we saw each other and never spoke, until now... Do you still love life the way you used to, and love people the way you did? I watched you and always wanted to know what you were thinking. . . . [sic] Tell me, do you still love the human race, especially your best friends?"
(*Yesterday* xvi)

As we shall investigate further in the following chapter, it is the relational aspect of identity formation that evidences Flanner's autobiographical contributions and highlights the literary significance of her own personal history.

Chapter 3

Paris Correspondent, 1939 -1950

History looks queer when you are standing close to it,
watching where it is coming from and how it's being made.

(Flanner, *World* 46)

One of the most significant elements of Flanner's autobiographical act lies in her historical presence. Beyond having participated in the advancement of American

expatriate literary modernism, Flanner has produced unique chronological documentation of one of the most significant periods in contemporary human history. Her evolution as an autobiographer is ultimately confirmed by her correspondence concerning World War II. In relating to her American audience significant details of the effects of war, Flanner's correspondence recalls our collective historical experience as much as her own. Indeed, a comparison of her early work with her post-war writing indicates a dramatic shift in motivation. Instead of merely commenting, as per Harold Ross's instruction, on the high-class Parisian experience, Flanner's perspective became increasingly clear to her audience as the political situation in France deteriorated. In the May 14, 1938 issue of the *New Yorker*, for example, Flanner attempts to maintain a sense of detachment by describing herself as "an impersonal observer," yet she can not help but express her growing unease as France scrambled to avoid war, noting: "it's melancholy to see how quickly humanity, if left free after its initial success, deserts the early, earnest union that gave its cause strength and squabbles itself to bits" (14.13 58). Indeed, by 1940, Flanner had dropped Genêt and her pretentious, gossipy tone in favor of her own name and a determination to provide an uncensored account of the atrocities she witnessed as she traveled through Europe. Soon, Ross was beginning to understand the significance of his correspondents' accounts of their experience abroad. Though initially "disinclined to take a strong editorial position on the European hostilities," as *New Yorker* chronicler Ben Yagoda points out, "they were surely and unmistakably reflected in its pages. Flanner's and [A.J.] Liebling's dispatches from Paris gave an invaluable sense of how the coming of war itself, *felt*" (170). By the winter of 1940, and some many months after Flanner had fled

Paris for the safety of home, Ross asked her to compose an article about France under German occupation. The result, titled “Paris, Germany,” made no mention of “the life of the smart set” in the glamorous French capital. Avoiding her “usual cheekiness” and sense of “detachment,” the article, according to Wineapple, became an “implicit indictment of Genêt, who could no longer chronicle the comings and goings of society from an olympian detachment” (172). “The new French morale,” Flanner wrote, precisely capturing the depth of insult to French national (and therefore deeply personal) pride, “will surely consist not only of what the French see of the Germans at close range but also of what the French, when their bitterness dies down, remember about themselves” (16. 43 63). No longer bound by the frivolity of Ross’s early direction, and unable “to adjust to France’s inevitable defeat,” Flanner set out to protest the destruction of her adopted homeland through increasingly “personal” *New Yorker* contributions (172).

Once again, it is the relational aspect of identity formation that establishes Flanner’s validity as an autobiographer. A specific theoretical analysis that facilitates such an evaluation is Anne E. Goldman’s assertion that any woman’s expression of herself in writing affords her all the necessary tools of an autobiographer. Essentially, it is Flanner’s personal experience within a culture of writers and artists, of the French and Americans, of peace and war, which affords her “the rights to represent cultural practice,” to “confer upon [herself] the status to argue [her] claims” (290). The act of writing an autobiography then, even if the author prefers *not* to refer directly to herself, but to represent her experiences within a greater social and historical context, inevitably becomes a means of self-definition, an unequivocally inherent element of the

autobiographical form. Accordingly, Caren Kaplan's analysis of "out-law genres" provides a means through which we may identify autobiographical discourses that "often break most obvious rules of the genre" (208). Although the author locates herself within greater social, political, or cultural contexts that are unconventional to autobiographical scholarship, the "primacy of the individual author whose mind is separate and unique" nonetheless emerges (209).

II

The deteriorating political climate in France leading up to Hitler's advances between 1936 and 1938 marks the beginning of Flanner's evolution from Paris correspondent to war journalist. Experiencing the frightening changes occurring in Europe first-hand during a working vacation to Germany in the fall of 1938, Flanner discovered that it was becoming increasingly difficult "to maintain her distance and equilibrium" (Wineapple 153). According to Wineapple, Flanner "knew" that this year's trip with friends to the Vienna Symphony was probably going to be her last, and "she knew that after the festival," the persecution of the Jewish community "would continue" (153). Though Flanner found the Germans to be as cordial and polite as ever to her small group of foreign tourists, she was appalled by the antisemitic propaganda blatantly displayed wherever she went. Describing the "prints, photographs, models, electric signs, graphs, fine typography and sales talks," she encountered as she toured the country in "Letter From Vienna," Flanner vividly articulates the subtle brutality of such promotion,

intended “not to make consumers buy a product but to make the public boycott a race” (*World* 42). After the music festival, Flanner continued to research Nazi ideology, traveling to Hungary where she set herself to the arduous task of disentangling “local prejudices from facts” and “paranoia from portent” (Wineapple 154). Her “Letter From Budapest,” dated September 17, somberly concludes that, as a people, Hungarians were unsure of “what [would] happen to them if Herr Hitler [made] war... They’d rather be dead on the field of battle than absorbed” (*World* 47). Relieved and exhausted when she finally returned to Paris, Flanner resolved to hide her valuables and collect extra candles and tins of food. Despite her growing dread, though, Flanner was somehow aware of the significance of her own contemporaneity. “History,” she self-consciously admitted to her American audience, “looks queer when you’re standing close to it, watching where it is coming from and how it’s being made” (*World* 46).

Nationally, France was impeded by its own fractured government – incapable of influencing the major powers at Munich. The French people, though aghast at abandoning their responsibilities to Czechoslovakia, were still scarred by memories of the tremendous casualties they had suffered during the Great War, and they remained fearful and resentful of war preparations. Indeed, according to French-political historian Gordon Wright, “Frenchmen were quite naturally tempted to slip into a mood of wishful thinking, and to hope that, after all, Hitler might be reasonable in spite of all appearances to the contrary” (381). Though Premier Édouard Daladier attempted to secure military aid from Britain, without Neville Chamberlain’s support disorganized French politicians and military officials could not hope to mount a successful offensive against Hitler’s modern army. On

September 29, 1938, Chamberlain, Daladier, and Benito Mussolini signed the Munich Accord and abandoned Czechoslovakia to Germany. French citizens, despite the fact that their government had revoked their agreement to provide Czechoslovakia with military aid, were relieved. With the signing of the Munich Accord, war, it seemed, had been narrowly averted. Flanner's October 2, 1938 letter, ironically titled "Peace in Our Time," documents the tide of relief that swept the nation on Daladier's return, recalling that:

... all the French know there is peace. In their curious calm, they don't want to know anything else. It is the only thing worth knowing; that and the new knowledge which is exciting the whole population of France today – that statesmen can think everybody's way out of war... Lots of the French feel that no matter what it all has cost them and however much the franc drops, the solution has been worth the price." (*Yesterday* 190)

The relief she describes in her letters suggests that, at least at this point, Flanner seemed to agree with the happy turn of events. Avoiding war, at any cost, meant she and Solano were safe in Paris. Indeed, when critics soon began to condemn the appeasement of Hitler at Munich, Flanner wrote bitterly that "parliamentary locusts" in France and England had begun "nibbling at the peace laurels" (*Yesterday* 193). For Daladier and others who were observing the growing political crisis in Europe at this time, however, the Munich pact seemed an increasingly disastrous maneuver. According to historian James F. McMillan, fifty-seven percent of the of the French population were in favor of the Munich pacts before their ratification, yet less than a few weeks into October of 1938, polls indicated a dramatic reversal. "Munich," McMillan notes, "left a lingering stench which few could ignore. It was the smell of decadence, of the long disintegration of France as a great

power” (119). Flanner, it seems, could smell it as well. Despite her initial relief, a growing sense of unease is detectable in her October 25 letter, wherein she describes an emerging awareness that “Paris, once the leader of Europe, dare not risk even verbally offending neighbors whom she formerly deigned to insult by battle” (*Yesterday* 196). By March of 1939, the German army had fully occupied Czechoslovakia. In retrospect, it seems, it was Daladier who correctly perceived the futility of the Munich Accord. Genuinely concerned for his people, he lamented his inability to force the issues he knew to be right. France, he argued, “resolved to come to an understanding with a democratic and peaceful Germany, but not with the nationalistic and Nazi Germany which now dominates...” (41). With news of an alliance between Hitler and Stalin in the Summer of 1939, “most respectable Frenchmen,” Wright notes, “though dubious about the chances of victory, concluded that another Munich would turn France into a German satellite. They preferred to accept the formidable risks of war” (384). Fittingly, Flanner’s correspondence concerning French reaction indicates her own, as well as the French people’s, sense of betrayal. “In general,” Flanner writes in her August 26 letter, “Preparation for War,” “what Russia has done has been summed up by the French in one classic French phrase, ‘*Nous sommes cocus* (we’ve been cuckolded)’” (*Yesterday* 223).

By early October, Flanner and Solita Solano had fled France and returned to America. It was, for Flanner, the first time she had been home in seventeen years, and she felt like a fish out of water. “The symbols of her life were gone,” Wineapple notes, “so were her friends, her community, her routine of work and pleasure” (164). Beyond visiting her mother, who had taken ill and required surgery, Flanner haunted the offices at

the *New Yorker* and worked on various profiles, including one of Picasso. Lamenting her inability to confer with Gertrude Stein and Alice Toklas about her subject, Flanner, according to Wineapple, was finding it “difficult to concentrate” (164). France had been occupied now for some months, a coup which must have seemed incomprehensible in light of all she had left behind. Frightened and displaced, Flanner declared simply that this war might “prove to be civilization’s ruin” (*Yesterday* 224). Ross, perhaps sensing the depth of her unease, encouraged her to work on a piece about France under German occupation, gathering the necessary information through contacts in Washington. The resulting article, however, did not contain the practiced and detached observations of Genêt, but took the form of a kind of documentary of the ideological clash occurring between the Nazis and the free thinking French. Realizing, perhaps, that she might have lost her beloved Paris post forever, Flanner found it necessary to “drop the tone of neutral disinterest” that characterized her early, lighter work (Wineapple 172). When “Paris, Germany” was published in December 1940, Flanner was somber but determined. “This was to have been remembered as the century of perfected human communications,” she wrote disappointedly, “[i]n the autumn of 1940, the French of Nazi France communicate even with each other principally by word of mouth. With the rest of the world, they don’t communicate at all.” Despite her restlessness, though, Flanner seemed to console herself with the knowledge that “anybody who loved Paris and grieves at its plight is fortunate not to see it now, because Paris would seem hateful” (16.43 52). Aware that Genêt’s signature coolness no longer seemed appropriate, Flanner sought to bring to bear her own evaluation of the devastation occurring in Europe and to make her American audience

witness to the destruction abroad. In pointing out the significance of political acts and the psychological warfare being waged between the German occupiers and willful French citizens, for example, Flanner inspires American sympathies to the loss of personal freedoms. “In the application of... one of their better-known Nazi psychological devices,” she writes,

the Germans have been remiss in Paris. Though addicted, when at home, to book burning and the destruction of criticism in print, not until the last of July, five weeks after they marched into the capital of highly literate France, did the Germans get around to suppressing anti-Nazi books. In all, only one hundred and sixty-two books, including... “France and its Army” by Charles DeGaulle, now of the Free France movement, have been put on the index, though for the five years before the collapse France was fuller of anti-Nazi literature than it was of any other means of self defense. (16.43 56)

Now Flanner openly insisted that French minds were engaged and motivated, that there existed a “Free France movement,” and that efforts were being made by ordinary citizens to save themselves from German dictatorship. Armed with her newly formed convictions, and, perhaps to “signal that Genêt could not continue along in the same vein – ironic, accommodating, subdued, and ultimately helpless,” Flanner sought to produce more work about the underground resistance effort (Wineapple 172). Her very next article dedicated itself to an examination of Charles de Gaulle, in whom she solidly placed her hope that his efforts might “salvage the civilization she had thought lost” (173). As the leader of the Free France movement, she wrote in 1941, de Gaulle “aims... to help chase the Boches out of France, preserve the French colonial empire, and, by continuing French

participation in the war, earn a seat for France at the peace-conference table when the Germans have been defeated” (16.51 21). In order to cement her point, and as if in an effort to rally support for the French cause in America, Flanner translated a particularly moving excerpt from one of the General’s London broadcasts, during which he stated:

I, General de Gaulle, French soldier and officer, before my conscience speak to you in the name of France.... Every Frenchman who still carries arms has the absolute duty to continue fighting. To lay down his arms, to evacuate a military position, to consent to cede no matter what morsel of French soil to the enemy would be a crime against our country.... That the panic of Bordeaux should be able to cross the sea [to England] would be intolerable. Soldiers of France, wherever you may be, arise! (“Soldats de France, où que vous soyez, debout!”). (16.51 19)

This letter, titled “Soldats de France, Debout!” was printed with her own name attached.

Genêt would not appear again until after the liberation.

III

A useful model for interpreting Flanner’s work during this period is Anne E. Goldman’s essay “Autobiography, Ethnography, and History.” Goldman asserts that traditional analysis of autobiography must be reassessed and informed by the relational

aspect of identity formation, and “always with an eye toward the discursive and historical contexts in which such [texts are] conceived, produced, and read” (289). This argument is useful in defining Flanner’s identity as inherently associated with historical presence. In this way, Goldman notes, women who voice “their opinions about a collective with which they are affiliated” (and Flanner is proven to have been affiliated with modernists, Americans, and Parisians during those politically charged decades between 1920 and 1970), “whether they broadcast these opinions or argue them sotto voce, they accord themselves the agency and the presence necessary for autobiographical distinction” (290). As Wineapple points out, in “writing about France, not from the vantage point of a historian trying to sort out the reasons for its fall but as one who loved the country, [Flanner] began to write much better... she began to feel increasingly confident about her subject, her range, her style” (174). Essentially, Flanner once again began to re-define herself through her writing. Just as she had done in her novel *The Cubical City*, examining the difficult issues of her adolescence by adapting the roman à clef, and in being assigned the pseudonym “Genêt” in the 1920s, which required her to develop a new style of journalistic writing, Flanner now sought to bring to bear her own evaluations and opinions in her work, creating, as it were, her own form of literary protest. Genêt, in fact, was unmasked. “Having developed a new method of reporting,” Wineapple notes, Flanner “characterized life in Paris” by “marshaling” information from “American expatriates recently returned from France” and their, as well as her own, personal correspondence from friends who remained behind. Despite her distance from the war front, Flanner was able to immediately identify with the spirit of the French people,

creating “an impressive human document of struggle, adaptation, resistance, and collaboration” (173-74).

Indeed, as Ben Yagoda points out, “much significant writing on the war was done from [the North American] side of the Atlantic.” During the spring of 1943, for instance, Flanner wrote a striking “three-part account” of her friend and fellow expatriate Mary Reynolds’ seven month escape from occupied France (180). Reynolds, who is given the name “Mrs. Jeffries” in Flanner’s piece, left Paris on her own shortly before other American women who had remained behind, such as Sylvia Beach, were arrested. Specifically, “The Escape of Mrs. Jeffries” is significant to our evaluation of Flanner’s autobiographical proclivity in that it details many of the extensively complicated administrations and intelligences of the resistance effort. Without these valuable pieces of information, we might never begin to appreciate the full impact of the war, nor the general response of the resistance to it. According to Fred L. Hadsel’s 1946 evaluation of resistance materials, for instance, there remained very little authentic documentation (for obvious reasons) of underground activities after the war, and there was almost no journalism on the subject (339). Flanner’s account of Reynolds’ escape, though, records specific events crucial to an historically accurate representation of Europe in wartime, and highlights the American expatriate presence in France as well. In this way, the issue of historical presence in regard to Flanner is essential, as it is based on an acknowledgment of identity as formed by the inclusion of a “whole range of social, historical, political, and cultural circumstances within which the subject locates herself” (Goldman 292). Moreover, in bearing witness to her American audience the efforts of French resisters to

free an American citizen, Flanner is able to protest Nazism in dramatic (and highly personal) fashion.

Emphasizing the fact that Reynolds' delayed departure from occupied France could be blamed on having lived there for "twenty years," and that "she was in love with it," Flanner confidently reported that "Mrs. Ellen Jeffries" was one of a number of women "left over from that colony of about five thousand Americans to whom Paris, during the twenties and thirties, had seemed liberty itself" (19.14 23). Describing how Reynolds first made contact with the underground through a friendly café waiter, Flanner details Reynolds' flight, from the price of her initial "contact man" in Paris, "who on an every-other-day schedule got together passage parties of a dozen or more people," to coat-tailing two men "on a gun-running job for de Gaulle" (24), and finally her passage, on foot, across the Pyrenees mountains and into Spain. "No one in any country in Europe knows what is going on in the country next to it," Flanner wrote in disgust,

officials themselves, who have people's lives, documents, and plans in their hands, know little that is exact, except that whatever they know can change by breakfast tomorrow. In place of certainty there is only a vast, tangled ball of rumor. In place of sensible, human procedure, now destroyed by wars, revenge, suspicion, and power politics, petty official strictures have been built up against which the individual is as helpless as a caged animal. (19.16 65-66)

According to French historian Patrick Marnham, "65,000 French citizens were deported for resistance efforts or for political reasons, of whom only half survived to the end of the war. Many thousands more were executed" inside their own border (8). In

bearing witness to such atrocities through her correspondence, especially during a time when such information coming out of Europe was scarce, Flanner was thus able to communicate (as well as document) her outrage at the destruction of her adopted homeland. According to Wineapple, Flanner “was aware of the fact that she had changed in the last five years, and she wanted this change acknowledged.” More than anything, Flanner wanted to return to Europe and to “dissociate” herself from the “fashionable Fascists” and her “earlier role as their sometime chronicler.” Although she had spent much of the early portion of her career “reporting” on their “pastimes and pleasures,” Flanner now seemed to want to “make it completely clear that she had never participated in that world.” Essentially, by dropping her pseudonym, Flanner challenged herself to declare “that she had changed” and challenged her audience to embrace her work and the new level of “responsibility as a reporter... her relation to the events she reported” required (Wineapple 181-82).

In a “Reporter at Large,” written in March of 1941, for instance, Flanner implicitly indicts those “petty bourgeois, many of them formerly Front Populaire, who are now Fascist, in the hope of saving the little they still have” (17.5 48-49). By winter of 1944, Flanner had made up her mind. She would return to France as soon as possible. With the help, once again, of her friend Jane Grant, Flanner flew to London “as an official army war correspondent for the *New Yorker*” (Wineapple 182). Her writing, from this point forward, would comprise some of the most dramatic and, as Ross would later declare, honest journalistic accounts of post-war Europe. Flanner, who once again found herself witness to history in the making, simply wrote her experience as she had always

done.

IV

A significant theory employed in autobiographical scholarship that can be aptly applied to Flanner's work during this period is Caren Kaplan's analysis of "Out-Law Genres" in women's autobiography. According to Kaplan, "most autobiography criticism appears to be engaged in a vigorous effort to stabilize and fix generic boundaries," an exercise that, she suggests, is limiting and counter-productive. Instead, Kaplan argues in favor of mixing "autobiography criticism and autobiography as thing itself," promoting a "discourse of situation; a "politics of location"" (208). This argument is particularly useful in our evaluation of Flanner's writing as a completely original, historically significant, diaristic, and wholly autobiographical construct. Kaplan, for instance, points out that non-traditional versions of women's life-writing, such as "cultural autobiography," constitute "out-law genres" that resist the traditional parameters of autobiographical discourse. Flanner's work, because of our relatively progressive analysis, applies itself to the very same form of resistance, or "genre destabilization." The result, Kaplan insists, is that a "revelation of individuality, the chronological unfolding of a life, reflections and confessions, the recovery and re-assertion of a suppressed identity – are utilized, re-worked, and even abandoned" (209).

Flanner, as we have already noted, exemplifies this very process in her writing, a

process that reaches its climax during her tour as an army war correspondent. With growing revulsion at the destruction and death she encountered as she toured Europe on various assignments, Flanner began to provide Ross with some of the best and, interestingly, most self-referential, writing of her career. Her prose in “Letter From Cologne,” written in March 1945, for example, is significant in its direct and concise descriptions of the atrocities of Nazism, as well as in her explication of her own feelings, ideas, and opinions. “Cologne,” Flanner wrote,

contains two important chambers of horrors. It was good that a half a dozen of us American journalists viewed them together, so that our eyewitness reports would be unanimous and would be believed... Certainly the wrecked human beings whom I saw tumbling to liberty through the grilled doorway of the Klingelpütz Gestapo prison on the cold Saturday after our Army had entered Cologne were scarred, starved, in-the-flesh proofs of the existence of very bad Germans indeed. (21.7 60)

Certainly, the article spares no detail of these prisoners or of the corpses she encountered as she traversed the city, no matter how bloody or gut-wrenching. Yet Flanner manages to capture more than just images of brutality and suffering, she also betrays a tangible awareness of just how far her beloved Europe had fallen. Once a place where the superior aspects of reason, art, culture, and national pride reigned, where she herself had discovered personal liberties beyond those available to her in America, all human dignity was now lost. Recalling those prisoners who had survived the death camps, for example, she wrote:

During their first half hour’s delirium of freedom and fresh air,

these men and women who had been imprisoned for the adultness of their political faith acted like lunatics—sobbing, falling down on the cobblestones of the courtyard, wagging their heads, and holding their temples, where they had most often been beaten. From the nose of one French boy the blood spurted in a pale-pink, excited, pulsing jet. (21.7 60)

Flanner, no doubt, was severely affected by the carnage she discovered as she crisscrossed the continent. She had, during her stint in New York, spent more than a year researching European political history. Now, better educated as to the circumstances that had led to this war, and having “her sympathies... engaged by the plight of the people she saw – individuals caught by the machinations of history” (Wineapple 157). Flanner, according to Wineapple, was doubtful as to whether she could “muster what was needed to portray all she saw and felt” (187). Awed by the realization of what her friends had suffered in her absence, and perhaps to assuage her guilt at having fled to America, Flanner dedicated herself to an exhaustive travel schedule. Though she began to suffer bouts of illness, Flanner continued to walk through the destruction, to press for information in fluent German, and to insist on being escorted to areas none of the other reporters thought to investigate (189). Despite the hardship of travel and constant looming deadlines, however, Ross was highly impressed with the work she was turning in. His response to her “Letter From Cologne” indicates that he began “realizing, possibly for the first time, how outstanding a hard-news platform his weekly had become” (Yagoda 181). “Newspapers,” Ross wrote to Flanner on receipt of her correspondence, don’t think such things as visits to Cologne make the sort

of story you wrote. God knows why that is, but they don't. You have told me all I know of what the Germans did in Cologne and what the Germans *are* in Cologne, and elsewhere...You are safe in assuming that, in general, the other correspondents aren't going to cover stories you come upon unless the stories are right in certain well-established journalistic ruts. (qtd.in Yagoda 180-81)

Pleased that Ross was so moved by her work, Flanner was self-assured in her efforts and in her own writing in a way she had never experienced before. In a personal letter written to her close friend Natalia Danesi Murray in April of 1945, Flanner expressed some of the changes she had noticed in herself, confessing: "You'd not know me. I fly around like an elderly white crow; I have a fine Nazi pistol; I stand journeys which slay the younger women. I am trying to watch, learn, think, decide as to what will happen to this wicked Europe" (*Darlinghissima* 51). The weightiness of her writing, she realized, was utterly different from that of her early days as Paris correspondent. Now she expected more of herself, and so did Ross.

Despite the fact that she was being pulled in all directions over her difficult schedule, Flanner's best writing was yet to come. The *New Yorker* was expecting correspondence of the Nazi war trials at Nuremberg. According to Wineapple, in Flanner's coverage of these trials it is very clear how "deeply" she had come to despise Nazi psychology "with its lack of conscience, racial bigotry, illogic, and brutal disregard for human life – except, as she pointed out, that the Nazis on trial ironically did not want to die for the cause that had killed millions" (198). In her letters from Nuremberg, printed in the January 5 issue, and then consecutively in the magazine over the month of March,

1946, Flanner describes the “startling ruins” of the city and implicitly indicts “the prisoners on view in the courthouse” as “twenty-two of the causes” (21.47 46). Her second letter detailed the presentation of the defense, and describes what she termed the “still unreconstructed prewar German mind.” The defense counsel’s efforts, Flanner argued, “sound comical but are no laughing matter,” demonstrating “egomania, mythomania, paranoia, superiority complex, and a general falling flat in those areas which, in civilized men’s minds, logic and morality have always been supreme” (22.4 80). Most interesting is Flanner’s psychological evaluation of Reichsmarschall Göring, whose “unconscionable brilliance” she found as intriguing as it was disturbing (Wineapple 198). In any event, Flanner captured the proceedings in a way few of the other one hundred and sixty journalists on hand failed to achieve, pointing out that:

Everybody in court had suffered, one way or another, from Göring’s mind, but few had ever before sat and listened to it work. There was considerable surprise, though there should not have been, that behind his fancy tailoring, his fat, and his medals he had one of the best brains of a period in history when good brains were rare. On the stand, he was malicious and disturbing. He pointed out that only rich nations could afford the luxury of democracy... (22.6 82)

An interesting complement to Flanner’s evaluation of Göring is G. M. Gilbert’s *Nuremberg Diary*. Gilbert was the German-speaking military intelligence officer and American psychologist assigned to interrogate the Nazi war criminals in the Nuremberg prison during the trials. His principal duty, he notes in the diary, was to “maintain close daily contact with the prisoners in order to keep the prison commandant, Colonel B.C.

Andrus, aware of their state of morale, and to help in any way possible to assure their standing trial with orderly discipline” (3). Apparently, Gilbert could have access to the prisoners at any time, and his record of Göring’s actions and reactions to the trial lends support to the accuracy of Flanner’s evaluations. On completion of the afternoon session on which Flanner reported above, Gilbert reports that Göring complained to him that “bringing the heads of a sovereign state before a foreign court [was] a presumptuousness which [was] unique in history” (193). Again, Flanner perfectly captures for her audience the essence of Göring’s frightening intellect, noting that:

Göring’s twenty-one hours on the witness stand amounted to an alarmingly serious lecture given by an active, if captive, historian on the most cynical military period in Europe’s history. What his lecture featured was economic warfare, in the modern manner, which marks the difference between military murder in the nineteenth century and the twentieth... It was the complicated narrative of a brain without conscience. (22.6 83)

Flanner struggled with all aspects of her work on the war trials. She often felt she had to leave out too much in her letters. By the end, she was exhausted, but she felt that she had written to the best of her ability. There was much praise for her work from Ross and her *New Yorker* family, though she was continually overlooked for critical acclaim of her war coverage. This may have in fact been due to the magazine’s reputation as a satirical publication. Most people were not even aware of the excellent news stories and political pieces that increasingly filled its pages. When she was denied access to a junket headed for Moscow in 1947 due to the low rating given the magazine by the State

Department, Flanner took personal offense. “The *New Yorker*’s low rating,” Wineapple notes, “clearly didn’t match [Flanner’s] sense of what it stood for; and an insult to the magazine was an insult to her, for if it was frivolous, then what was her twenty-two-year commitment to it?” (202). Undeterred, Flanner continued to cover the political aftermath of the war. She traveled to Warsaw, Berlin, Munich and “implicitly campaigned against the treatment of displaced persons, especially the Polish Jews... Democracies, Janet felt, were everywhere threatened” (203).

Having come full circle in the evaluation of events that changed the course of her life, Flanner found herself a woman whose purpose had changed from the pursuit of a glittery career as a writer in Paris, to work as gritty chronicler of the devastations of war. Ultimately, as there is much empirical evidence to support an analysis of Flanner’s evolving identity in her work, it is practical to apply a literary construct that is based on identity to her writing. Kaplan’s theory posits an evaluation of non-traditional life narratives such as Flanner’s, and provides a context for critical scholarship that validates our analysis of Flanner as creator of her own autobiography over time. In evaluating Flanner’s work as an “out-law genre” which requires integration of various autobiographical theories, including analyses of fiction, relationality, identity, experience, and historical presence, we are able to find an autobiographical model that is flexible enough to accommodate non-traditional versions of life-narrative. When an author’s identity is as inextricable from her writing as Flanner’s is, given that the one defines the other, a comprehensive, scholarly, autobiographically based analysis is not only permissible, it is necessary. In relating intimate details of the effects of war on the proud

democratic people of France to an American audience, Flanner's writing achieves more than simple correspondence, managing to assist in the establishment of events, legends, myths, and memory that entreat us to grasp the significance of our collective historical experience.

Chapter 4

Expatriate Women Modernists and Autobiographical

Inter-relationality

Each wave of American invasion of Paris has had its own heroes and heroines, and though some asked, simply, what's this all about, the ones who came to stay asked, Why am I happy in Paris in a way that I am not happy in Altoona [sic]? Is it me, the place, or the time, or a little bit of all three?

(Gopnik, *Americans in Paris* xviii)

Beyond our evaluation of Flanner as an autobiographer, it is important to investigate her work in relation to that of other expatriate women modernists of the period. To begin with, Europe offered women such as Janet Flanner, Gertrude Stein, and Sylvia Beach artistic opportunity beyond what may have been available to them in America. Moreover, it allowed these women to live a little more freely as sexual beings (an issue of specific concern for Delia Poole in *The Cubical City*). Just as Paris inspired this easy artistic liberalism, autobiography thus presented these women both a method and a means of experimentation. Women modernists sought to define their agency through an investigation of identity, to test the limits of language, as Gertrude Stein did in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*, and to resist patriarchal definitions of women as objects of discourse. Others, such as Sylvia Beach in her *Shakespeare and Company*, illustrate the ways in which modernist women writers reveal a great deal about

themselves by writing about others. Interestingly, it is through this inter-relationality that we define autobiographical identity and, ultimately, through investigation and interpretation of these women writers as a group that reveals Flanner's own autobiographical significance. To posit an "other" (be it a city or a culture or a literary movement) in relation to the self, reveals as much about the author as the author reveals about the other. In this way, Flanner lends herself to autobiography as much as she does the modernist aesthetic in that the reciprocal nature of her life's work, so to speak, is motivated by a commitment to experimentalism in art, as well as in life.

II

Two useful factors in determining the significance of women's modernist autobiography are place and cultural circumstance. Beginning in the latter portion of the nineteenth century, and to an even greater degree in the 1920s and 1930s, Paris became the international destination for many young artists and writers. Indeed, Europe drew thousands of Americans because steamship travel and the favorable exchange rate made an extended visit widely affordable. Moreover, the First World War caused many Americans to feel a deep sense of alienation from the religious, political, and social mores on which they had been raised. The American government's strict prohibitions, as Janet Flanner expressed in *The Cubical City*, seemed to restrict and regulate those personal freedoms that lent themselves to artistic production. For many young Americans then,

identity had become a determining issue, and the validity of the strict moral values that defined and constrained their social circumstance was being questioned. These “fixed” social roles, according to Daniel Joseph Singal in his essay “Towards a Definition of American Modernism,” were defined by “heredity, upbringing, and vocation.” Despite the growing sense among young intellectuals that an “absolute system of morality” had stagnated human development, any deviation from Puritan strictures at home was met with “suspicion” and opposition (15). Not even in Greenwich Village could an artist expect to live and work as freely as seemed possible overseas. Women artists especially, according to Caroline F. Ware, who “tried to achieve a genuinely emancipated status” in the village, were often “exploit[ed]” in their efforts to become sexually liberated (258). Europe, however, offered refuge for a “generation turned to art, that is, to its order and beauty, to the preservation of the word.” In Paris, aesthetic “style,” or the freedom to live artistically as well as to produce art could, as it did for Janet Flanner, become a new “barrier against chaos and loss of faith” (Fitch 163). Certainly Flanner, having left her husband in New York in favor of a female lover and a writing career in Europe, embraced the easy liberalism French culture offered. Moreover, as an American living in Paris, Flanner was not expected to adhere to any local custom that might restrict expression of her personal beliefs. As Jerrold Seigel points out, American women in Paris during this period were:

free of ties to the surrounding society and culture, ready to devote their lives to their own self-development, able to participate in the city’s pleasures while acting out their independence from tradition and convention... by virtue of

having left their everyday identities, with their attendant restrictions, on the other side of the Atlantic. (368)

Indeed, American feminist Anita Loos thought Paris “divine” (qtd.in Gopnik 294). Sylvia Beach was so “extremely fond” of the city, and of her partner Adrienne Monnier, that she set out to “settle down there and become a Parisian” (*Shakespeare* 15). Kay Boyle credits the city with enabling “the scattered bits and pieces of the lives and hopes of writers,” many of them hopeful young women such as herself, to finally “[fall] into place” (*Geniuses* 175). H.D., one of the earliest women expatriates to arrive in France, developed theories concerning artistic “equilibrium;” a state of self-consciousness wherein thought, language, and physicality become inextricably linked (*Notes* 383). In other words, because Europe offered a relatively low cost of living, social freedoms, and a rich artistic heritage, women writers sought to claim an opportunity to individualistically explore avenues unavailable to them at home. This quality alone, given the relative proximity of their lifetimes to the age of Victorianism, makes their work particularly engaging.

The rise of modernism as an experimental aesthetic in artistic theory in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century seems to parallel, as Marianne Dekoven argues in “Modernism and gender [sic],” the beginnings of feminist solidarity. According to Dekoven, “the radical implications of the social-cultural changes feminism advocated produced in modernist writing an unprecedented pre-occupation with gender, both thematically and formally” (174). Certainly, issues of gender and gender conflation became recurring themes in many celebrated male modernists’ texts. Ernest Hemingway’s

female protagonist in *The Sun Also Rises*, for instance, finds herself torn between her liberated (and somewhat masculinized) personality and the financial security that her marital title, “Lady Ashley,” affords her. James Joyce boldly delved into the secretive and mysterious world of female sexuality in the “Nausicaa” and “Penelope” episodes of *Ulysses*; and F. Scott Fitzgerald, in his “Babylon Revisited,” nostalgically longed to “jump back a whole generation” to a time when men and women could “trust in character again” (214). This interest in gender and gender expectations, whether from a liberal or conservative perspective, is indicative of the modernist desire to investigate cultural phenomena that were formerly taboo, to “loosen formal and rational restraints, expand one’s consciousness, open oneself to the world, and perfect one’s ability to experience experience.” It was this tenet of modernism, in particular, this “desire to heighten, savor and share all varieties of experience,” Singal notes, which was “exactly what the Victorians had most feared” (11). In Europe at the turn of the century it had suddenly become possible for American women to enjoy those occupations and social and physical liberties that had previously been available only to men. This is not to say that men and women were considered equals in France, but that such an idea was no longer impossible, and in many small ways was beginning to take form among the artists and their work in France. As we have already noted in chapter one, Flanner’s novel, *The Cubical City*, provides an excellent example of how female writers of the period investigated gender issues through intrinsically based literary forms that would have been extremely difficult to produce, let alone publish, in America. “Like any great elderly capital,” Flanner would later recall in a thinly veiled comparison of her beloved city and the generation of writers

and artists who gathered there after the First World War, “Paris has accommodated itself to improvement and to destruction by modernization, and of loss through change” (*Yesterday* xxiii).

III

Undoubtedly, the issue of gender in modernist literature was simply a response to broader social and cultural changes, yet women modernists who found themselves working in Europe along with their male contemporaries have not, until recently, been properly credited with helping to inspire that movement which was so firmly based in exploring forms of non-traditionalism in art. Indeed, as in Janet Flanner’s case, we are still discovering female contributors to add to the list. Nevertheless, the presence of these women in Europe, women who clearly participated in the flourishing literary community there during the nineteen twenties and beyond, indicates a wealth of autobiographical information specific to a woman modernist’s perspective, not only of herself, but of her female contemporaries as well. Nina Van Gessel, in “Re-Casting the Midwives of Modernism,” argues that women autobiographers of the modernist period in France formed a “network” of artists committed to a new form of “experimentalism... [analogous to] their exploration of non-traditional lifestyles” (10). Flanner makes specific reference to that community of female artists in the introductory preface to *Paris Was Yesterday*. Recalling Djuna Barnes, Flanner writes that she “was the most important woman writer

we had in Paris,” and that Flanner herself was “devoted” to Barnes and that Barnes “was quite fond” of her, as well. Throughout her career she refers to publishing entrepreneur Natalie Barney as the “*doyenne* of the Left Bank” (xvii); to the creators of the *Little Review* – Margaret Anderson and Jane Heap, and to Kay Boyle, with her “brood of children,” a woman writer in Paris who possessed “a rare domestic center” (xviii). The “hearth and home of the Left Bank American Literary community,” however, Flanner unequivocally assigns to Sylvia Beach and her Shakespeare and Company. Describing the bookstore as an “extraordinary” place, Flanner credits its proprietress with single-handedly promoting and publishing James Joyce’s *Ulysses*, “the most exciting, important, historic single literary event of the early Paris expatriate literary colony.” Of Beach, Gertrude Stein, and Alice B. Toklas, whom Flanner describes as “neighborhood friends,” she writes that the three ladies always seemed “at swords’ points in their differing opinions on writing” (viii-xi).

Sylvia Beach similarly references Flanner and many other women of the Left Bank in her own autobiography, making sure to point out their significance to the literary community as much as to her bookshop. She recalls Annie Winifred Ellerman, better known as Bryher, as a great and “protective” friend of the bookshop as well as of the literary community who gathered there (100). Pointing out some of the more interesting aspects of Bryher’s life, and making specific reference to Bryher’s autobiographical series *Development*, Beach carefully describes Bryher as a “philanthropist” of the arts and, later, of “dozens of Nazi victims” during the war. According to Beach, whose testament to Bryher seeks to posit aspects of her personality that have little to do with her marriage to

writer Robert McAlmon, Bryher had “done more than anyone knows to maintain international contacts throughout the wars, and to keep together her large family of intellectuals, who are dispersed in many countries. She has looked after them in war and peace, and her correspondence is vast” (103). Moreover, in a chapter of her autobiography titled “The Crowd,” Beach acknowledges a writer whose “work did not resemble that of any other writer of the time,” and she notes that until T.S. Eliot “sought her out and ushered her to the place she deserves to be,” Djuna Barnes might not have become established as a writer of the period. “Even so,” Beach writes, Barnes “doesn’t seem to have been given her due... Certainly she was one of the most talented and, I think, one of the most fascinating literary figures in Paris of the twenties” (112). Describing Janet Flanner, Beach notes that “she was brilliant” and “always off, either to London or to Rome or to some other place to which her career as a roving writer took her.” Beach also mentions Flanner’s contributions to the bookshop: donating books, making news of the shop in her column, and helping to raise funds when “Joyce values were mounting” and the business was in danger of closing (110). Also included in Beach’s lengthy description of “The Crowd,” which makes little mention of male modernists in Paris at the time, are Mary Butts, Mina Loy, and Natalie Clifford Barney. Even Gertrude Stein, who most often liked to compare her genius to the most celebrated of male modernists and intellectuals, and who makes little mention of other women in her own autobiography save to make fun of her male contemporaries’ wives, notes in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* that Mina Loy was interested in her work and was therefore “interest[ing]” herself because Loy could “understand without the commas” (132).

This support of women modernists for one another is thus represented in their autobiographical work. Their tendency to reference one another as contemporaries in their autobiographies illustrates a collective awareness of their special position as women modernists. The modernist's desire to investigate identity through experience, for these women, must also include an investigation of gender that seeks to determine what it means to be feminine in a world wherein traditional social roles are no longer accepted as valid. Essentially, as Raffaella Baccolini argues in "What's in a Name?": Language and Self-Creation in Women's Writing," modernist women sought to "reclaim their position as subjects and themselves from the pages history and tradition and to autonomously define an identity for themselves" (45). For this reason, autobiographical representations of self, when we compare those of Janet Flanner, Sylvia Beach, Kay Boyle, and Gertrude Stein, for instance, are often so dramatically different. Each woman, in her own unique interpretation of the modernist aesthetic, investigates her identity. Moreover, in identifying herself as a member of the modernist group, she claims authority for the mode of experimentalism as well as for making herself the subject of her work. While Flanner may have done this indirectly as correspondent for the *New Yorker*, she irrefutably makes herself both the subject and object through which her audience may gauge experience of what life was like in Europe between 1925 and 1975.

Autobiography critic Joan W. Scott's analysis of experience is particularly relevant to issues of identity concerning women writers of the modernist period who, like Janet Flanner, resist the traditional parameters of autobiographical authorship. Scott argues that considering issues of experience in terms of human consciousness "leads us to

take the existence of individuals for granted (experience is something people have) rather than to ask how conceptions of selves (of subjects rather than identities) are produced” (61). This, she argues, leads to difficulties in “essentializing” identity; contemporary theories in autobiography must assume “that the appearance of a new identity is not inevitable or determined... not something that will always exist in the form it was given in a particular historical moment” (65). Scott’s theory appropriately dismisses those who may hold reservations concerning Flanner’s varied use of the pseudonym Genêt throughout her career, assuming, for instance, that masking her true identity precludes her from making a proper self-analysis. In fact, in pointing out that the relationship between experience and identity is necessarily symbiotic, her thesis at once connects John Paul Eakin’s theory of self-invention and relationality. As noted in chapter three, Flanner’s correspondence locates herself within greater social, political, and cultural contexts, yet her experiences nevertheless define her “self” through her documentation of others. In fact, Flanner’s post World War II letters, which once again adopt the Genêt moniker after having dropped it in favor of her own name after the fall of France in 1940, express more of Flanner’s individuality than they had previously done at any other point in her career. Describing, for instance, the French public’s reaction to the failed Algerian insurrection attempt in April 1961, Flanner directly references her own emotional response at having listened to Premier Michel Debrè’s national address on the radio, wherein he suggested that Algerian paratroopers might attempt to land in France. Noting that she felt “worried” and “worn out” upon finally going to bed in the very early hours of the morning, Flanner wrote that:

At least one of us (your correspondent) was possessed by an imaginary *tableau vivant* in which we saw crowds of hastily dressed French citizens on foot at some airport convincing misled, tough Foreign Legion paratroopers— eighty per cent [sic] of whom are Germans— of their erroneous conduct. (*Journal* 180)

The image Flanner constructs of herself is not only that of an informed and worried observer communicating the daily hardships of French life, but one who also experiences them herself. Even more interesting is how Flanner seems to develop a taste for literary criticism of her contemporaries' work in her correspondence, indicating a self-assurance and maturation of her own aesthetic literary abilities since the 1920s. Describing Albert Camus's "new novel" *La Chute* in the July 14, 1956 issue of the *New Yorker*, Flanner argues that it "is the single consequential work of fiction so far this year by any of the French intellectuals, new or old..." (79), and concludes that:

Camus's fictional monologue is thus really a philosophical dialogue with life itself— different from Malraux's heroic inquiry, yet also based on proof by noble action; different from Sartre's Existentialist answer, yet also based on man's helpless absurdity. (80)

Essentially, then, Scott's assertion that "the social and the personal are imbricated in one another," and that "both are historically variable," is in fact represented by an evaluation of Janet Flanner's work as autobiographically significant. Flanner's experience as both a woman and a modernist is present in her work, and her work as a journalist abroad, in turn, forms the basis of that experience. Ultimately, we see how Flanner's historical presence, how her reference to her own time and place, is conceptualized in her writing

and informs the evolution of her identity – a subject that becomes very evident given a chronological evaluation of her life’s work. In other words, as Scott believes, “the meanings of the categories of identity change and with them the possibilities for thinking of the self” (67). Autobiographical scholarship, in terms of what we have discovered in the work of Janet Flanner, must inevitably follow suit.

IV

If we are to take Daniel Joseph Singal’s analysis further and, as he proposes, consider Modernism “a full fledged historical culture much like Victorianism or the Enlightenment... that it supplies nothing less than the basic contours of our current mode of thought,” autobiography is certainly the form through which this generation is most thoroughly documented (8). As Baccolini notes, the “fragmentation” caused by the “collapse of traditional values” in American society at the turn of the century was often reflected in the fragmented versions of autobiographical discourse produced during this period, especially by women (44-45). As we have already noted in Chapter two, relationally based autobiographies (those in which the author identifies herself through or in relation to others) all construct or define models of identity based on perceptions of society’s interpretation of their work. Recalling the autobiographies of Kay Boyle, Sylvia Beach, and Gertrude Stein, we see how these women writers adapt different identity strategies in order to define, investigate, and inform their experience. Boyle, for instance,

uses Robert McAlmon's life and work as a tool through which she attempts to define her own. Beach, in order to avoid blatant claims of her own significance to literary modernism, subtly, and perhaps diminutively, outlines herself only in relation to her bookstore and its illustrious patrons. Gertrude Stein boldly employs Alice Toklas as the false author of her autobiography so that she might influence her audience's interpretation of her. Thus, like Flanner, these modernist women also mask their identities in their autobiographies in order to subvert the cultural limitations imposed on their work, as well as to achieve means to an aesthetic end.

Traditionally, women writers sought to portray their lives in, as Estelle Jelinek notes in *The Tradition of Women's Autobiography*, "such a way that their reputations... were protected" from criticism. In order to maintain social graces, many women "painted a rosy picture of themselves and their work, excluding anything negative or controversial" and avoiding transgression of male dominated subjects such as theoretical interpretation or analysis (107). This meant that autobiographical writing, for women, was often restricted to more acceptable (or feminine) forms such as keeping a diary, maintaining a travelog, or writing letters. Indeed, in her analysis of Jane Austen's private letters, Deborah Kaplan points out that despite her success as an author (though she was published anonymously), Austen's private correspondence betrays a "cultural doubleness," wherein the private and the public author is divided within herself; subject to the prescriptions of "gentry culture" in one instance and free from them in the other. For example, in letters to her sister Cassandra, Austen is able to freely express her opinion concerning their brother's behavior, noting that "the company of so good & so

clever a Man ought to be gratifying in itself; — but his Chat seems all forced, his Opinions on many points too much copied from his Wife's [sic]..." (*Letters* 181).

Alternatively, in *Pride and Prejudice*, female characters are often highly critical of one another's personal virtue, and the context of the letters represented in the novel does not waiver from the polite social graces women are expected to observe in public. Indeed, "no actual complaint, nor... any revival of past occurrences, or any communication of present suffering" is revealed in personal letters in the novel, even between sisters (141). As a result, Elizabeth literally 'prides' herself on her ability to evaluate character by reading, as it were, between the lines. Thus, Austen's portrayal of the gender dynamic in her novels is accurate, though obviously very different from her own private correspondence.

Essentially, Kaplan argues, Austen's letters:

express multiple, indeed even opposing, cultural values... because this private genre has no intrinsic censoring feature which would suppress or resolve cultural contradictions. Austen's novels, by contrast, as a public and ideological form, resist expressions of cultural contradictions, and hence they do not fully convey the double nature of women's cultural lives. (212)

Women writers at the turn of the century, then, were certainly "divided" between "the public and the personal," and they are most often "unaccepted as both." Unable to bridge the gap between their opposing identities, women writers could not hope to "integrate their lives" into print for public consumption (Jelinek 107).

These pervasive cultural limitations on women's writing imposed themselves well into the twentieth century, and they are characteristically represented in autobiographies

of women who, despite having advanced into the realms of employment and academia, felt the awkwardness of their presence there. Eventually, women modernists created adaptive strategies in their work which they believed might help to counteract this imbalance. Janet Flanner, as a member of the modernist generation, and taking into account the essential nature of autobiographical documentation during this period, also employs these strategies in her *roman à clef*—*The Cubical City*. Essentially, in veiling her own experiences concerning her father’s tragic death, her fragile relationship with her mother, and her struggle with her own sexuality within a fictionalized construct, Flanner is able to achieve a particular aesthetic style that upholds the tenets of modernism as well as subverts and examines the imposed limitations of her gender. Through the novel’s heroine, Delia Poole, Flanner is thus able to claim “sympathy, peace, her own desires and praise,” without the repercussions a more traditional form of autobiography might impose upon its female author (301-02). The “uneasiness” of male modernists “over women’s expanding role in literary production,” for example, is well demonstrated by Beach biographer Noel Riley Fitch in her analysis of James Joyce’s increasing dependence on various female patrons to support himself (Van Gessel 15). Beyond the fact that Joyce never properly compensated Beach for the extremely difficult task of transcribing, publishing, and promoting his voluminous work, a heavy burden that very nearly destroyed her small business, Fitch points out that Joyce was subject to “frequent tirades” concerning the women in his life. Describing, for instance, a circumstance during which Joyce declared, “I hate women who know anything,” she also points to a bit of Joycean verse that reads: “poor Joyce Saint James’ and seven extravagant dames’ with

bees in their bonnets and bats in their belfries” (*Beach* 309). Despite what must have been a frustrating experience, Beach comments very little on her personal relationship with Joyce (save to note that she felt a personal obligation toward the man and his art), focusing instead on detailed descriptions of her work on his novel and its publication. Thus, by ingratiating herself to Joyce in her own autobiography, Beach successfully masks her bid to place herself firmly within the ranks of modernism – without attracting criticism. Indeed, the difficulties Austen experienced nearly a century beforehand, this division of women’s identities between private and public spheres, was still being played out in the twentieth century. For, as Beach later wrote in a personal letter to her mother, “I’ve worked for all that crowd and the only bookseller in Paris who had their books and boomed them at that and made them known to the public and what would they have done without me if I do say it [sic]” (qtd. in Fitch 179).

Given the gender differentiated circumstances through which women modernists grappled, and, steeped as they were in a culture of literary experimentalism, women writers sought to approach autobiography from its opposite conclusion. That is, instead of simply translating past experience, women modernists wrote in order to determine it. In other words, Flanner’s autobiographical discourse, like that of her female contemporaries, hinges on the relationality between herself and her experience of French culture. In this way authorial identity becomes mutually exclusive, that is, it becomes impossible to define the “self” separately from those outward circumstances that inform the author’s experience. In Flanner’s case, the cumulative result of her correspondence

becomes biographically based, defining her identity through a process that is contrary to traditional autobiographical constructs.

Indeed, in her book *Writing for Their Lives: The Modernist Women*, Gillian Hanscombe points out the significance of this relationality among writers of the period, of the “interdependence” of women modernists’ “actual lives and of the work they produced and provided; the interdependence between “art” and “life” that resulted in so much autobiograph[y]...” and how the ““modernism””in their work “began to show... roots in the personalities and the lives of [its] creators” (xiii-xiv). Flanner biographer Brenda Wineapple, in exploring the cultural dynamics of Flanner’s lifestyle in America as well as in Paris, documents many examples of this connectedness between women writers in Europe at the time. For, despite “their differences in attitude and temperament,” she notes, women modernists could “[admire] each other’s accomplishments” (92). H.D. and Bryher, for example, published Marianne Moore’s first collection of *Poems* in 1921. Sure that Moore would be too modest concerning her own work, they published without seeking the author’s consent. Decades later, Moore would be celebrated as “the leading woman in modern American literature” (Cowley 63).

Often, women modernists demonstrated a unique spirit of generosity and solidarity toward those who found themselves in difficult circumstances, and they pooled resources and helped one another make connections with others who might help with a cause. Solita Solano, besides her role as friend and lover, helped Flanner maintain her personal finances, edited and transcribed many years worth of her correspondence, and acted as mediator between Flanner and her somewhat estranged mother. Though they

were no longer a couple by the late 1940s, Flanner and Solano together took care of Nancy Cunard when her health began to fail in the spring of 1965. Alice Toklas, years after Gertrude Stein's death, asked Flanner to make an inventory of Stein's vast collection of modern art, an interesting though difficult exercise which Flanner developed into a "Paris Letter," all in the hope that the publicity might help Toklas in her fight to keep some of the property from Stein's greedy relations. Indeed, Flanner often gave glowing reviews of inspiring female figures in her correspondence, extolling the significance of Isadora Duncan's dancing, Nancy Cunard's poetry, Colette's prose, and Josephine Baker's casino show. When Shakespeare and Company was in danger of closing its doors, Flanner wrote of the impressive "list of signatures" protesting the publication ban on *Ulysses* in the United States. The petition, she wrote, is a grand gesture to Joyce and Miss Beach and to the writing craft's spirited solidarity" (*Yesterday* 17-18). And, it was Jane Grant, the accomplished journalist and ardent feminist, who in 1925 offered Flanner a position as Paris correspondent for a budding literary magazine, the *New Yorker*. Essentially, these women have influenced, and are reflected in, one another's work. They supported one another, gathered resources, and used their contacts to help others achieve success. Ultimately, there is much evidence to support an evaluation of Janet Flanner's evolving identity in her work. Emphasizing several autobiographical theories that posit a non-traditional, relationally-based analysis and establishing a historical precedent for adaptive strategies by women autobiographers during the early portion of the twentieth century, we must conclude that Janet Flanner's writing comprises a unique, and formatically valid, autobiographical document. "Paris then seemed immutably

French,” Flanner later recalled of her beloved foreign home, “the quasi-American atmosphere which we had tentatively established around the Saint-Germain had not yet infringed onto the rest of the city. In the early twenties, when I was new there, Paris was still yesterday” (*Yesterday* xxiv).

Afterword

Janet Flanner found considerable acclaim for her work in the latter portion of her lifetime. In 1966, the publisher of *Paris Journal* sent Flanner on a whirlwind publicity tour. Appearing on several television programs, including the “Today” show, Flanner found it particularly rewarding when asked to speak about her craft. In the winter of the same year, *Paris Journal* won the National Book Award. Graciously accepting the honor, Flanner noted how pleased she was to find herself in the “most delightful circumstances possible for a writer,” and that writing itself “is an odd profession and life work because it is so particularly balanced” (qtd. in Wineapple 277). Indeed, in examining the breadth of Flanner’s prose, we too have discovered the fine balance that occurred between her life and her art.

As a case study, Janet Flanner’s work offers a unique opportunity to examine idiosyncratic versions of life-writing performed by women modernists who reflected their artistic and political ideologies even as they struggled to express them. Indeed, the relationship between experience and writing, for Flanner, is inextricably linked. In *The Cubical City*, for instance, Flanner intrepidly adapts the circumstances of her own youth to an examination of the contrary nature of femininity in relation to the society in which she is born. This inexact representation of identity is constructed so as to achieve a

particular aesthetic function. In this way, Flanner manipulates her own experience by veiling it as stock fiction. Other women modernists, such as Sylvia Beach, Gertrude Stein, and Kay Boyle, also use this kind of literary experimentalism to investigate or interpret their own life stories.

Significantly, Flanner's journalism also informs and determines aspects of her personal identity. Her early letters are diaristic in that they present a form of autobiographical discourse between herself and her audience which records a fixed moment in history. Her correspondence becomes an example of yet another adaptation of women's writing in the early twentieth century, a means of placing one's personal history within a greater historical context. In this way, Flanner's journalism not only reflects her personal experiences as an American in Paris, but in recording those significant events in our greater human history, she provides us with a significant historical document as well. Essentially, the relationship between Flanner, her writing, and her audience becomes inseparable. Flanner's experience is reflected in her work, and her work informs the basis of that experience. The act of writing an autobiography then, even if the author prefers not to refer directly to herself, represents her experiences within a greater social and historical context, and inevitably becomes a means of self-definition.

Janet Flanner continued to write well into her eighties, despite her deteriorating health, until the time of her death in the fall of 1978. Honors and accolades continued to pour in, and Flanner was proud when *Paris Was Yesterday* and the second volume of *Paris Journal* were published. "I am *not* ashamed of those early letters on the whole as I expected to be," she explained to Solita Solano, "they have pith..." (qtd. in Wineapple

291). Indeed, the thread of Flanner's personal experience, as reflected in her work, seems to be what her admirers cherish most in her writing. As William Shawn, Flanner's longtime friend and editor points out in his introduction to *Janet Flanner's World*, "what separated Janet Flanner from her colleagues was the sureness of her instinct, the individual mind in which her reports took shape" (xiv). Flanner, Shawn believed, was "equally at home in France and America, but managed to put down roots wherever she happened to be: she arrived in Rome or Salzburg, went to her hotel room, looked out the window, took further bearings, and, as soon as she had opened her typewriter, was on her way to a journalistic dispatch that would someday be seen as literature" (xiii).

Works Cited

- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. 1813. New York: Bantam, 1981.
- - -. *Jane Austen's Letters to Her Sister Cassandra and Others*. Ed. R.W. Chapman. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1952.
- Baccolini, Raffaella. "What's in a Name?": Language and Self-Creation in Women's Writing." *The Representation of Self in Women's Autobiography*. Ed. Gabriella Morisco. Bologna: University of Bologna, 1993. 44-64.
- Beach, Sylvia. *Shakespeare and Company*. Lincoln: Nebraska UP, 1991.
- Benstock, Shari. "Authorizing the Autobiographical." *The Private Self*. Ed. Shari Benstock. Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1988. 10-33.
- Billson, Marcus K. and Smith, Sidonie. "Lillian Hellman and the Strategy of the Other." *Women's Autobiography: Essays in Criticism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980. 163-79.
- Chen, Jue. "Poetics of Historical Referentiality: Roman à Clef and Beyond." Dissertation Abstracts International. B, The Sciences and Engineering (June 1997): UMI Microform 9727028.
- Corbett, Mary Jean. "Literary Domesticity and Women Writers' Subjectivities." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Ed. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 255-63.
- Culley, Margo. "Introduction to A Day at a Time: Diary Literature of American Women, From 1764 to 1985." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Ed. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 217-21.

- Daladier, Edouard. "Europe After the Ratification of the London and Paris Agreements." *Yale French Studies: Social and Political France* 15 (1955): 38-41.
- Dekoven, Marianne. "Modernism and gender." *The Cambridge Companion to Modernism*. Ed. Michael Levenson. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.174-93.
- Donals, Michael Bernard. "Beyond the Question of Authenticity: Witness and Testimony in the Fragments Controversy." *PMLA* 116 (2001): 1302-15.
- Doolittle, Hilda. "Notes on Thought and Vision." *Modernism: An Anthology of Sources and Documents*. Ed. Vassiliki Kolocotroni, Jane Goldman, and Olga Taxidon. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1998. 382-85.
- Eakin, Paul John. *Fictions of Autobiography: Studies in the Art of Self-Invention*. New Jersey: Princeton UP, 1985.
- - -. *How Our Lives Become Stories: Making Selves*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1999.
- Ericson, Richard V. "How Journalists Visualize Fact." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Spec. Issue of *The Future of Fact* 560. (1998): 83-95.
- Felski, Rita. "On Confession." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Ed. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 83-95.
- Fitzgerald, F. Scott. "Babylon Revisited." *Babylon Revisited and Other Stories by F. Scott Fitzgerald*. New York: Scribners, 1960. 210-230.
- Flanner, Janet. *Paris Was Yesterday 1925-1939*. 1972. Ed. Irving Drutman. New York: Harvest, 1988.
- - -. *Janet Flanner's World: Uncollected Writings, 1932-1975*. Ed. Irving Drutman. New York: Harvest/HBJ. 1979.
- - -. *Paris Journal, 1956-1964*. Ed. William Shawn. New York: Harvest/HBJ. 1988.
- - -. "Letter From Paris." *New Yorker* 1.34 (1925): 26-27.
- - -. "A Reporter At Large." *New Yorker* 7.47 (1932): 36.
- - -. "Letter From the Bullring." *New Yorker* 13.25 (1937): 47-49.

- . "Letter From Paris." *New Yorker* 14.13 (1938): 57-59.
- . "Letter From Perpignan." *New Yorker* 15.4 (1939): 81-82.
- . "Paris, Germany." *New Yorker* 16.43 (1940): 52-64.
- . "Soldats de France, Debout!" *New Yorker* 16.51 (1941): 19-24.
- . "Reporter At Large– Le Nouvel Ordre." *New Yorker* 17.5 (1941): 42-57.
- . "The Escape of Mrs. Jeffries." *New Yorker* 19.14 (1943): 23-28.
- . "The Escape of Mrs. Jeffries." *New Yorker* 19.16 (1943): 50-67.
- . "Letter From Cologne." *New Yorker* 21.7 (1945): 58-63.
- . "Letter From Nuremberg." *New Yorker* 21.47 (1946): 46-50.
- . "Letter From Nuremberg." *New Yorker* 22.4 (1946): 80-86.
- . "Letter From Nuremberg." *New Yorker* 22.5 (1946): 92-94.
- . "Letter From Nuremberg." *New Yorker* 22.6 (1946): 78-84.
- . "Letter From Nuremberg." *New Yorker* 22.7 (1946): 76-82.
- . "Letter From Paris." *New Yorker* 32.21 (1956): 76-79.
- . *Darlinghissima: Letters to a Friend*. Ed. Natalia Danesi Murray. New York: Random, 1985.
- Fitch, Noel Riley. *Sylvia Beach and the Lost Generation: A History of Literary Paris in the Twenties and Thirties*. New York: Norton, 1985.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. "Women's Autobiographical Selves: Theory and Practice." *The Private Self*. Ed. Shari Benstock. Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1988. 34-62.
- . *Penelope's Web*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1990.
- Gilbert, G.M. *Nuremberg Diary*. New York: Farrar, 1947.

- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Gubar, Susan. "Infection in the Sentence: The Woman Writer and the Anxiety of Authorship." *The Critical Tradition: Classic Texts and Contemporary Trends*. Boston: Bedford, 1998. 1360-74.
- Gilmore, Leigh. "Autobiographics.." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Eds. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP.1998. 183-89.
- Goldman, Anne E. "Autobiography, Ethnography, and History: A Model for Reading." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Eds. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 288-98.
- Gopnik, Adam, ed. *Americans in Paris: A Literary Anthology*. New York: Library of America, 2004.
- Hadsel, Fred., L. "Some Sources on the Resistance Movement in France During the Nazi Occupation." *The Journal of Modern History* 18:4 (Dec. 1946): 333-40.
- Hardack, Richard. "The Franklin-Stein Monster: Ventriloquism and Missing Persons in American Autobiography." *Writing Lives: American Biography and Autobiography*. Ed. Hans Krabbendam. Amsterdam: VU UP, 1998. 17-28.
- Handsome, Gillian. *Writing for Their Lives: The Modernist Women 1910-1940*. Boston: Northeastern UP, 1987.
- Jelinek, Estelle. "Women's Autobiography and the Male Tradition." Introduction. *Women's Autobiography: Essays in Criticism*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980. 1-20.
- . *The Tradition of Women's Autobiography: From Antiquity to the Present*. Boston: Twayne, 1986.
- Johnson, Micheal J. *The New Journalism: The Underground Press, The Artists of Non Fiction and Changes in Established Media*. Lawrence: Kansas UP, 1971.
- Kaplan, Caren. "Resisting Autobiography: Out-law genres and Transnational Feminist Subjects." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Eds. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 208-16.
- Kaplan, Deborah. "Representing Two Cultures: Jane Austen's Letters." *The Private Self*. Ed. Shari Benstock. Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1988. 211-29.
- Kaufman, Dorothy. "Uncovering a Woman's Life: Edith Thomas (Novelist, Historian, Resistante)." *The French Review* 67 (1993): 61-72.

- Kontje, Todd. *Private Lives in the Public Sphere: The German Bildungsroman as Metafiction*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP, 1992.
- Krymborg, Alfred. *Troubadour: An Autobiography*. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1925.
- Kunkel, Thomas. *Genius in Disguise*. New York: Carroll and Graf, 1995.
- Lane, Jim. *The Autobiographical Documentary in America*. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 2002.
- Liebling, A. J., Sheffer Eugene Jay, ed. *La Republique Du Silence*. New York: Harcourt, 1947.
- Marnham, Patrick. *Resistance and Betrayal: The Life and Death of the Greatest Hero of the French Resistance*. New York: Random, 2000.
- McMillan, James F. *Dreyfus to De Gaulle: Politics and Society in France 1898-1969*. London: Arnold, 1985.
- Miller, Henry. *Tropic of Cancer*. New York: Grove, 1961.
- Monk, Craig. "Textual Authority and Modern American Autobiography: Robert McAlmon, Kay Boyle and the writing of a Lost Generation." *Journal of American Studies* 35.3 (2001): 485-95.
- Ong, Walter J. "The Writer's Audience is Always a Fiction." *PMLA* 90 (1975): 9-21.
- Parker, Dorothy. *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*. Ed. Malcolm Cowley. New York: Viking, 1959. 69-82.
- Perreault, Jeanne. *Writing Selves: Contemporary Feminist Autography*. Minneapolis: Minneapolis UP, 1995.
- Putnam, Samuel. *Paris Was Our Mistress*. New York: Viking, 1947.
- Richmond, Hugh M. "Personal Identity and Literary Personae: A Study in Historical Psychology." *PMLA* 90 (1975): 209-21.
- Ross, Harold. Letter to Janet Flanner in Yagoda, *About Town: The New Yorker and The World It Made*. New York: De Capo, 2000.
- Scott, Joan W. "Experience." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Eds. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 1-71.

- Seigel, Jerrold. *Bohemian Paris: Culture, Politics, and the Boundaries of Bourgeois Life, 1830- 1930*. New York: Viking, 1986.
- Singal, Daniel Joseph. "Towards a Definition of American Modernism." *American Quarterly*. Spec. issue of *Modernist Culture in America* 39.1 (Spring 1987): 7-26.
- Shawn, William. Introduction. *Janet Flanner's World*. By Flanner. Ed. Irving Drutman. New York: Harvest, 1979.
- Smith, Sidonie and Watson, Julia. *Reading Autobiography: A Guide for Interpretive Life Narratives*. Minneapolis: Minnesota UP, 2001.
- Smith, Sidonie. "Performativity, Autobiographical Practice, Resistance." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Eds. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 108-15.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. "Selves in Hiding." *Women's Autobiography: Essays in Criticism*. Ed. Estelle Jelinek. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980. 112-32.
- - -. "Female Rhetorics." *The Private Self*. Ed. Shari Benstock. Chapel Hill: North Carolina UP, 1988. 177-91.
- Stein, Gertrude. *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. New York: Vintage, 1990.
- Toker, Leona. "Toward a Poetics of Documentary Prose— from the Perspective of Gulag Testimonies." *Poetics Today* 18 (1997): 187-22.
- Van Gessel, Nina. "Re-Casting the Midwives of Modernism: Autobiographies of American Expatriate Women Publishers and Editors." *Dissertation Abstracts International* (1997): *Section A- The Humanities and Social Sciences* 58 (1994-2005): fiche 1-3.
- Ware, Caroline F. *Greenwich Village 1920-1930: A Comment on American Civilization in the Post-War Years*. New York: Harper, 1965.
- Watson, Julia. "Unspeakable differences: The Politics of Gender in Lesbian and Heterosexual Women's Autobiographies." *Women, Autobiography, Theory*. Eds. Sidonie Smith and Julia Watson. Madison: Wisconsin UP, 1998. 393-402.
- Wineapple, Brenda. *Genet: A Biography of Janet Flanner*. New York: Tinknor, 1989.
- Wright, Gordon. *France in Modern Times*. New York: Norton, 1981.

Yagoda, Ben. *About Town: The New Yorker and The World it Made*. New York: De Capo, 2000.