

***Close Up* & Wars They Saw: From Visual Erotics to a Transferential Politics of Film**

Susan McCabe
University of Southern California

“And for more than ten years, the consciousness of the world has concentrated on events which have made the ordinary movement of life seem to be the movement of people in the intervals of a storm.”
—Wallace Stevens, “The Noble Rider and The Sound of Words” (1942)

In an unpublished interview conducted by Virginia Smeyers in December 1979, Bryher (born Annie Winifred Ellerman in 1894) repeated: “film was not my *métier*,” retrospectively attributing her excitement about film and filmmaking to H.D. (Hilda Doolittle) and Kenneth Macpherson.¹ While there may be some truth to this, her insistence upon her non-centrality in the trio’s venture into cinema protests too much. Bryher, H.D., and Macpherson made three experimental films together, including *Borderline* (1930). In addition, Bryher’s money funded *Close Up* (1927-1933), to which all three contributed work. It was, after all, the first international journal of its kind that surveyed every aspect of avant-garde film, including work by Sergei Eisenstein (featuring first translations), Gertrude Stein, Marianne Moore, Oswald Blakeston, Robert Herring, Hanns Sachs, Dorothy Richardson, and Bryher herself. *Close Up* remains a rich repository of many stills from now lost films.² Anne Friedberg describes the journal as “situated symmetrically on the brink of two decades; at the threshold, as well as between silent cinema and sound film” (4). *Close Up* also reflected the hydraulic shift from the relatively liberating Weimar culture of the 1920s to its increasing repression in the 1930s. It is no coincidence that the journal shut down with Hitler’s rise to power in 1933. The journal functioned, to quote my epigraph from Stevens, between the “intervals of a storm.”

Bryher was the daughter of a shipping magnate, Sir John Ellerman, the richest man in England when he died in 1933. *Close Up* had been launched six years earlier, at which time Bryher was already using her

wealth to fund numerous artists along with H.D., her greatest “star.” After all, they were each other’s most significant relationship. When they met in 1918, H.D. had already garnered much attention for her poetry, having been dubbed an “Imagist” by Ezra Pound. Macpherson was Bryher’s “second husband of convenience” (after she divorced bisexual Robert McAlmon in 1926), and although he was mostly attracted to men as sexual partners, Macpherson had a truncated affair with H.D. during the first year of *Close Up*. He was keen to make films with H.D. and Bryher as well as work on the journal. As this interpersonal sketch suggests, while the magazine bears the imprimatur of the tumultuous historic times during which it was produced, it also mediated the entangling relations among those involved.

This essay zooms in on Bryher’s cinematic collaboration with Macpherson and H.D. However, it must be prefaced by an explanation that this task is obscured by Bryher’s own personality. She consistently puts herself in the background. For instance, she credited Macpherson as “Editor” on the masthead of *Close Up*, naming herself alongside Oswald Blakeston, another gay friend, as “Assistant Editor.” Bryher occluded herself within POOL, the name of the “production company” she created to fund the journal as well as assorted other books, including her own *Film Problems of Soviet Russia* (1929). Further, she and H.D. both advanced Macpherson as the one most responsible for *Borderline*, released in 1930, for which H.D. wrote the pamphlet “Borderline: A POOL Film with Paul Robeson” published in the November 1930 issue of *Close Up*.³ In fact, Jayne E. Marek claims that Bryher’s “extensive role” in modernist literary and film culture has been eclipsed in part by her “characteristic modesty” (101). In my own view, she paradoxically meshed her generous funding of others with her sense of inadequacy, what I call elsewhere her “melancholy of money.”⁴

Bryher’s direct collaboration with H.D. and Macpherson is most visible in *Borderline*, a collaboration I return to as indelibly linked to *Close Up*. For now, it is important to recognize the film, centered on racial and sexual identities, as one that she both acted in and helped to edit. In so doing, she accrues polyphonic credit, while engendering a space in the film’s café-scene where disavowed desires and emotions erupt. There Bryher plays the film’s de facto social conscience, the café manageress, a character who represents a hope for rational activism. The still below (Figure 1) characterizes Bryher’s historical resonance: reading a newspaper, in touch with current events, almost playing herself—for she was, in fact, the most politically active in the POOL group. In this essay, I position Bryher’s role in *Close Up* as akin to her self-presentation in *Borderline*, at the ethical, intellectual and political helm. She shaped the journal’s fundamental linking of an avant-garde aesthetic with social consciousness.



Figure 1: Production still from *Borderline* (1930).
Courtesy of the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library,
Yale University

H.D.'s ten contributions to *Close Up* appeared primarily in the first three years of the journal. In comparison, Bryher not only edited and proofread the journal throughout its entire run, but sought out and magnetized contributors and wrote twenty-two articles, variously addressing war films, censorship, the silent/sound controversy, education, film distribution, the launching of film clubs and the availability of inexpensive projectors. Cassandra-like, Bryher repeatedly used the journal to warn of war and the rise of fascism.⁵ Laura Marcus, in her book on modernist film culture, *The Tenth Muse*, further reveals the "danger" to those writing for *Close Up*, let alone editing it, partly due to its stance on censorship and its insistence that Soviet films be freely exhibited in England (365). In her risky exposition in *Close Up* of a militaristic culture, Bryher specifically studied G.W. Pabst's *Joyless Street*, King Vidor's *The Big Parade*, Buster Keaton's *The General*, Eisenstein's *Potemkin*, and two sound films

of 1930, Pabst's *Westfront 1918*, and Lewis Milestone's *All Quiet on the Western Front*.⁶ These articles, taken together, articulate Bryher's sense that any political praxis has to possess an accompanying psychological (better yet psychoanalytic) perspective along with an awareness of film's capacity to shape physical and mental states. Because of the continuity, quantity, and subject matter of her writings, Bryher, I argue, more so than H.D. or Macpherson, maintained the journal's political and cosmopolitan perspective.

Bryher's vision for the magazine was fuelled by a utopian belief that war could be avoided with sufficient "rational" discourse, fulfilling what Georgina Taylor calls the Habermasian tenor of *Close Up*, allowing as it did the kind of exchange pursued in the public spheres of coffee-houses and newspapers of the eighteenth century. Taylor argues that a counter-public sphere flourished among women modernists between 1913 and 1946, with H.D. at the center, where "new ideas emerged through a process of interaction" primarily through the little magazines (*Little Review*, *Poetry*, *The Egoist*). The cinematic turn in the mid-twenties, she observes, provided a "relief from the generally troubled state of the women's literary arena" (125), for *Close Up* "allowed these writers—H.D., Richardson, Bryher, and others—to continue to find new ways to express a disaffection with the sentimental and hackneyed and to seek out radical new forms" (125). Along with other *Close Up* contributors, Bryher encouraged "radical new forms," in her case writing articles that incorporated and even enacted Soviet film theory and psychoanalysis in her anti-war utopianism.

In this essay, I show how Bryher served as the journal's necessary backbone and even conductor, steering it into increasingly political waters. Marcus has described the collaboration necessary to *Close Up*, but she acknowledges in her nuanced chapter "The Close Up Moment" that "[Bryher] almost certainly had greater practical and intellectual contribution to the Press than she has been credited with" (325). More fleshing out of this premise is necessary. Thus I re-examine Bryher's significance to the project as a whole, within the cultural context of Switzerland and Berlin where she spent the majority of her *Close Up* years, as well as through her dialogue with other contributors, especially H.D. I juxtapose H.D.'s view of film as lyric "vision," an almost erotic and intimate experience that could create a healing cocoon for the war-tortured psyche, with Bryher's theory of film as stimulating shocks of memory, having the potential of jolting the viewer into action. The complementary relationship between Bryher's and H.D.'s perspectives on film emerges through juxtaposition of two films by Pabst whose *Joyless Street* (1924) was a touchstone for both H.D. and Bryher, and whose banned *Westfront 1918* (1930), was a model for Bryher of an effective war film. Overall, my aim is to set forth Bryher's

incipient film theories, reorienting her position vis-à-vis the journal, in which psychoanalysis functions as a rationalizing discourse that could mediate and structure spectators' relations to avant-garde film and explain avant-garde film's stimulus to anti-war activism.

"Seeing it Together":

The Aftermath of World War I: Towards Film Collaboration

Bryher and H.D. had endured multiple traumas before *Close Up*. H.D.'s brother died in combat, and her father subsequently died as a result of shock from loss of his son. H.D. gave birth to a stillborn baby during the War. When the pair met in 1918, Bryher was twenty-four, and eight years younger than H.D. Bryher herself had suffered less directly from the War, yet in her words, she had "gone to pieces" from some "vague malady" as she wrote her transatlantic correspondent Amy Lowell (Bryher, Letter to Amy Lowell). She had watched the Armistice from her windows in Hyde Park, the gas lamps relit and the crowds cheer.⁷ More dramatically, upon following H.D.'s advice to see the famous sexologist Havelock Ellis in 1919, Bryher came to believe that she was "a girl only by accident" (Bryher, Letter to H.D.). Such a discovery came with confusion about how to manage her life. Her romance with H.D. was by this time at its height; 1919 was also the year that H.D.'s illegitimate child, Perdita, was born. After the pregnancy, H.D. suffered from poor health and Bryher consequently helped nurse H.D. and care for Perdita.

When H.D. recovered, Bryher arranged a trip to Greece where their relationship coalesced around a "series of shadow-or of light-pictures [H.D.] saw projected on the wall of a hotel bedroom on the Ionian island of Corfu" recounted in her 1956 memoir, *Tribute to Freud* (H.D. 72). One of these pictures, "the three-legged lamp stand," seems rather quotidian, but H.D. saw it as a "tripod of the classic Priestess or Pythoness of Delphi" (75) and compared Bryher to the Pythoness: "Or perhaps in some sense, we were 'seeing' it [i.e. the "series" of disparate images on the wall] together, for without her, admittedly, I could not have gone on" (H.D., *Tribute* 72). This "seeing it together," both a lesbian folie à deux and what H.D. called a "writing on the wall," seems to anticipate the pair's love affair with silent film, as "a form of hieroglyphics, a thinking in pictures rather than words" (Donald, Friedberg, and Marcus 45).

While their visions were possibly yet another product of war shock, the Corfu experience attuned them to film projection and the screen as a repository for psychological processes. Adalaide Morris suggests that for H.D. projection carried multiple inflections: the cinematic, the militaristic (with the tripod she also saw the figure of Nike), and of course the psychoanalytic.⁸ Morris further describes H.D.'s notion of projection as "the thrust that bridges two worlds. It is the movement across

a borderline" (413). Still both H.D. and Bryher recognized the visionary and intersubjective elements in film-making prior to being immersed in cinema, suggesting another meaning of visionary to be deployed in this essay: Bryher was not a visionary poet, but was another kind of seer, tapping into a simultaneously "Enlightenment" and visionary understanding of the screen as mediating and possibly transforming damages of the First World War. Anticipating another war led to her incredibly focused aesthetic and political activism for which *Close Up* became a template.

Close Up originated in a swirl of personal and emotional adjustment. In other words, the Swiss ménage (Bryher, H.D., Macpherson along with the young Perdita), with its proximity to the film culture and sexual experimentation burgeoning in nearby Berlin, was fraught with intense closeness as well as frustration. Recall that H.D. and Macpherson had an affair in 1927. In 1927, Bryher also adopted Perdita—whom Bryher provided with cameras, gramophones, and double doses of psychoanalysis and historical awareness as well as Macpherson's last name. The *Close Up* trio pursued their triangular relationship in tandem with their cinematic and psychoanalytic explorations between the "intervals of storm." In a sense, they were trying to work out their "phobes," as H.D. and Bryher called them, while watching them transcribed on the film screen. While my focus is here upon Bryher, both women were entranced by psychoanalysis: phobias (or "phobes") were for them partly a result of a dissonance between modern sexual identifications and prevailing pathologies of "queerness." During the publication of *Close Up*, Bryher and Macpherson's own intimacy constituted a kind of queer male-male companionship, as the image below suggests (Figure 2), with Bryher as "butch" acolyte as well as sponsor. Macpherson was deeply committed to *Close Up*, and Bryher saw their "marriage" as one based on creative collaboration.

Starting in that momentous year of 1927 when the journal debuted, Bryher was in analysis with Hanns Sachs until he emigrated to Boston in 1932, where she would visit for month-long stints whenever possible;⁹ H.D.'s analysis with Freud, arranged by Bryher, took place during the very apex of *Close Up* between 1931 and 1933, putting her contributions to the journal in the background. After *Close Up* ended, Macpherson entered therapy with the son-in law of Melanie Klein and one of Bryher's closest friends, Walter Schmideberg, to satisfy a condition posed by Bryher.¹⁰ Meanwhile, Bryher mainlined psychoanalysis, as much as possible, into the journal.

Enter Berlin

Between 1927 and 1933, Bryher and Macpherson made numerous visits to Berlin, staying for lengthy periods at the Hotel Adlon at least two or three times a year to attend film festivals and psychoanalytic lectures. Look-

ing back, Bryher described her cinema habits: “I went five or six times a week in the Berlin of the Thirties” (“Notes on Berlin”). She alternated her Berlin visits between the Kino and what she calls “the time of her life” on the couch of Hanns Sachs, who, according to Bryher regarded film as a kind of “second sight” (“Notes on Berlin”).¹¹ Consistent with Bryher’s attempt to link the social and the psychic, she attended lectures at the Berlin Psychoanalytic Institute, of which Sachs was a member, and which operated from 1921 through 1933. Its mission, distinct from Vienna’s Institute, was to treat the poor, working-class, veterans, and war-shocked bodies that populated post-World War Germany. As a “polyclinic” it made itself open to training analysts and educational lectures.¹² Bryher herself began training as an analyst. In many respects, then, Bryher was a kind of cultural ambassador, forging international relations; she was, after all, the only one of the three who could write or speak German.



Figure 2: Macpherson and Bryher c. 1927.
Courtesy of Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library.

On their stays in Berlin, Bryher and Macpherson absorbed the films of Eisenstein, Pudovkin, F. S. Murnau, and Fritz Lang, striving to showcase them for audiences elsewhere, including the dazzled H.D. in Switzerland. In fragmentary notes on Berlin possibly jotted down in preparation for her autobiography, Bryher wrote: “We knew we were walking across a thin slab of ice. Fritz Lang and the perfect lunar landscape” (“Notes on Berlin”). These notes struggle to make sense of her paradoxical experience: “I

find myself unable to describe the atmosphere of that time. It was violent and strange. I felt more drawn into it than I had been into the literary world of Paris" ("Notes on Berlin"). At the same time, visceral anxiety colored her excitement: "A sensation that a trifle could mar a whole life ran through current films and literature" ("Notes on Berlin"). In short, Berlin became paradigmatic of "the flowering and almost annihilation of the new art of the film" ("Notes on Berlin").

Bryher wistfully summarizes the temporary stimulus Berlin generated in a letter to Schmideberg:

You do not like Berlin, I know, but for us there seemed so much hope there, and possibility of change, in those 1927-31 years. The Institute, and Turtle's [nickname for Sachs] lectures, and Pabst making his best film, and seeing things like Ten Days that Shook the World, [1928; referred to as *October* in English] down in a cellar of the Russian trade place. To say nothing, of Cordelia in Shakespeare, discovering Brecht's poems, and sitting on the floor of Lotte's [Reiniger] studio while she cut out silhouettes or going to market with her, and hearing Berlin slang, which I never understood, but had an exciting, harsh quality, that I have always desired. (Letter to Walter Schmideberg, February 18, 1937)

This passage indicates Bryher's retrospective sense of belonging to an energetic, almost kaleidoscopic alternative film culture as well as psycho-analytic circle, the BPI or "The Institute." *Ten Days*, referred to above, attracted Bryher through its "intellectual cinematography," its perfection of "all rhythm, all movement"; after seeing *Ten Days* three times, she admits in 1929 that were she to make a film, this would be its model, which she would "run through [the projector] a score of times" (*Film Problems* 37).¹³ The film dramatized the events of the 1917 Russian Revolution, following an account by an American, John Reed. Bryher noted the shared quality of "epic" in *Ten Days* and *Potemkin*: "[they] recall by their austerity and power of compression the Homeric phrases and the siege of Troy" (30). Further, similarly, both films, with their "intellectual montage" of linking disparate objects or images, have "no individual heroes" (there is a crowd scene of people scattered by machine gun fire, shot from an aerial point-of-view, as well as a teeming multitude seizing of the Winter Palace). Eisenstein introduced in such ways an aesthetic that could "lead the way to completely new forms," aesthetically, politically and psychologically (*Film Problems* 38).

Bryher's film aesthetic, embodied here in *Ten Days*, was not pri-

marily oriented to the sensational or the emotional: "It is much more difficult to base the appeal [to the spectator] upon a knowledge of each incident and its interrelation with history, science and mechanics, and yet to achieve as emotional an effect, through penetrating below emotion to the truth beneath" (*Film Problems* 38). Like H.D., who looked to sensory images, such as a "bit of chiffon" as trigger for memory ("Cinema and Classics" 30), Bryher accentuated how such an imagistic prompt worked in *Ten Days*, for instance "the power of the single empty chair, which throws back at the receptive spectator whole cycles of history" (38). In this way, Bryher's incipient notions of history and film look forward to Walter Benjamin's "historical materialism," a method for disrupting seamless historiography, pivoting upon interruptions in cohesion, like those embodied through Eisenstein's "dialectical montage" where "dynamism" emerges out of a "rhythm" produced through the "collision of independent shots" ("Dialectic Approach" 49). Stops or "caesuras" are as important as movement in Benjamin's related premise: "Thinking involves not only the flow of thoughts, but their arrest as well. Where thinking suddenly stops in a configuration pregnant with tensions, it gives that configuration a shock" ("Theses on the Philosophy of History" 262).

I cite these observations as representative of the culture which informed Bryher's overarching film ideal as one that seeks to incite and value historical illuminations and shocks: images, such as the empty chair, could potentially signal vaster, layered geopolitical trauma. Eisenstein's *Potemkin* "was first shown in Germany in a censored version"; in the know, Bryher writes: "An attempt was made secretly to stop German soldiers in some places from seeing the film, but it failed," while "[a] mutilated version was sent to America" (*Film Problems* 32). Bryher's relationship to cinema culture is expansive; she internalizes it in the way she imagined her ideal spectator could. More centrally, Bryher's emergent film views function in dialogue with H.D.'s film phenomenology in *Close Up*.

In fact, H.D. acted out a post-war "symptomatic" psyche in *Borderline*, and to some extent, in response to trauma, her article "Mask and the Movietone" describes cinema as a "half-world of lights and music and blurred perception into which" she would like to "float as a moth into summer darkness"; by contrast, Bryher is not "paralyzed before too much reality," but rather activated by the "cross currents of potentialities" ("Mask and the Movietone" 23). These convergent yet distinct responses will have a bearing on my later elaboration of Bryher's use of Macpherson's coinage of "transferential" to resist H.D.'s notion that "[w]e want healing in blur of half tones and hypnotic vibrant darkness" ("Mask and the Movietone" 23). For now, I want to stress that while H.D. turned to cinema for "healing," Bryher, and to some extent Macpherson, sought a medium that

would shock observers into historical and cultural recognitions. Thus, while H.D. and Bryher each regarded cinema as a medium especially desirable for its ability to act on a visceral level, they diverged in the effects they privileged. Among other possibilities explored in *Close Up*, film could be either soothing, or it could reenact traumatic experience: for H.D., cinema was “a sort of temple” where body and mind could tenuously reunite in “the sub-stratum of warmth” (“Mask and the Movietone” 23), whereas Bryher divergently emphasized an “education” of the senses as well as Eisenstein’s dialectical model of shocking “collision” in order to activate the spectator.

From *Joyless Street* to the Mechanics of Film Transference

While in Berlin, Macpherson and Bryher socialized with their idol, G. W. Pabst. Macpherson wrote to H.D. that they were both “in love with Pabst” (Letter to H.D., October 29, 1927); Macpherson sent photos to H.D., “one of Pabst himself, young, very very very very Lesbian” (Letter to H.D., October 27, 1927). In some ways, Macpherson’s eroticizing of Pabst extended to Bryher’s and Macpherson’s writings about Garbo in *Joyless Street*, and later Louise Brooks in *Pandora’s Box*; Bryher for her part, encouraged her friend, Trude Weiss, to write on the films of Bryher’s personal heartthrob, the cross-dressing actor Elizabeth Bergner—whom Bryher also sent for analysis to Sachs. But significantly, Bryher wanted to move away from the singular erotic cathexis possible with film idols, to the more communal suturing of spectator to the screen.

For Bryher and H.D., Pabst’s films represented the apex of their journal’s ideals and endorsements; his work exemplified cinema’s ability to expose intimate psychical processes. The first issue of *Close Up* in July 1927 featured H.D.’s, “The Cinema and The Classics: Beauty,” where she describes *Joyless Street* as her “first real revelation of the real art of the cinema” (26); Bryher in her “G.W. Pabst: A Survey” published later that same year echoes her: “I came late to the cinema and I came because of *Joyless Street*” (56). Pabst’s *Joyless Street* brought both H.D. and Bryher frissons of recognition of an otherworldly “beauty broken by war” (Bryher, “G.W. Pabst” 60). For H.D., *Joyless Street* presented a visceral post-war landscape through “the somber plodding limp of a one-legged old rufian . . . no glory, no pathos, no glamour” and the iconic yet sensual body of Garbo as Helen set against “a long, Freudian tunnel-like street” (“Cinema and Classics” 30). Bryher congruently “saw what [she] had looked for in vain in post-war literature, the unrelenting portrayal of what war does to life, of the destruction of beauty.” Further echoing H.D., Bryher describes Garbo: “it will be hard to forget her as a symbol of beauty in war as she stood (right at the beginning) in the queue in the dreary street or that

other moment when the whole end of destruction was in her gesture as she stood staring by the window at the finish of the film" ("G. W. Pabst" 58).

H.D. first saw *Joyless Street* in Switzerland when it was just "released from Germany to take its tottering frail way across Europe towards Paris, where it was half-heartedly received" ("Cinema and Classics" 28). Although the film follows two women struggling to survive during post-war hyperinflation, H.D. insistently zooms in upon Garbo (her face, her gesture, her body) as a Helen of Troy:

Greta Garbo as I first saw her, gave me a clue, a new angle, and a new sense of elation. This is beauty, and this is a beautiful and young woman not exaggerated in any particular, stepping, frail yet secure across a wasted city. Post-war Vienna really wrung our hearts that time . . . Before our eyes, the city was unfolded, like some blighted flower, like some modernized epic of Troy town is down, like some mournful and pitiful Babylon is fallen, is fallen. The true note was struck, the first post-war touch of authentic pathos, not-over-done, not over-exaggerated . . . London could not (being governed also by a brother to our American Cyclops) allow this performance to be broadcast. War and war and war. Helen who ruined Troy seems to have taken shape, but this time it is a Troy by some fantastic readjustment who is about to ruin Helen. ("Cinema and Classics" 28).¹⁴

I quote this passage at length as a complementary, yet distinct, moment in H.D. and Bryher's film criticism. H.D. fixates upon Garbo, "frail, yet secure," as capable of calling forth the whole of the Trojan War and subsequent "[w]ar and war and war"; this celluloid figure is a living palimpsest of survival and beauty, linking the past to the present, defying the censorship of the London "Cyclops," and creating for H.D. a moment of extreme identification. H.D. envisions Garbo as ancient, transcendent icon: "Helen walking scatheless among execrating warriors, the plague, distress, and famine is in this child's icy, mermaid-like integrity" ("Cinema and Classics" 31). For her, the figure of Helen/Garbo offers a temporary overcoming of what H.D. describes as "something too subtle to be called disintegration or dissociation, but a state in which the soul and body didn't seem on good terms. Hardly on speaking terms" ("Cinema and Classics" 30). Between the wars, H.D. contemplated how cinema might overcome trauma through a form of "inter-action," even replicating a natal "sub-stratum of warmth" ("Mask and the Movietone" 21, 23).

H.D.'s film criticism has perhaps occluded Bryher's less celebrated but no less provocative set of theories. Bryher's pieces underscored that psychoanalysis and film were both practical and messianic. For Bryher, *The Big Parade* (which she saw seven times), King Vidor's powerful 1925 film, was "the first authentic comment with War" ("The War From Three Angles" 16). Bryher's article appeared alongside H.D.'s "Cinema and the Classics: Beauty," where H.D. elevated the endangered yet enduring persona projected by Garbo. Bryher's later "The War from More Angles," in the October issue, further described the theme of Vidor's film as "the complete wastage and stupidity of war" (48). H.D.'s fascination with the figure of Garbo counterpoints with Bryher's utopian point of view that film, even with its disparate images, could overcome nationalism, as it seemingly "offered a single language across Europe" (Bryher, *Heart to Artemis* 247).

In all her writing about film, Bryher intimated that film could both reenact and absorb shock, that film could "deepen consciousness . . . through a process of concentration" (Bryher, "Westfront 1918" 105). Building upon this assertion, Dorothy Richardson, warning of the bluntness of "talkies" and their greater capacity to harness propaganda, wrote that silent film could be as "intimate as thought," inducing a necessary "forgetfulness" and opening a space for a freely circulating set of emotions and thoughts ("Continuous Performance" 35). Throughout, Bryher claimed that film could alter political convictions without lulling the movie-goer's sensorium. In her "Notes on Berlin," she configured war as replicating psychic regression to infantilism on a wider scale: with Sachs, as her notes suggest, she believed film theaters were akin to "nurseries," whereby spectators could be retrained in the desire for total omnipotence and the expression of aggressive id desires; in other words the spectator, analogously to the analysand, could ideally "work through" his or her primal urges. By projecting these urges outwardly or perceiving them as deflated (as with the war films Bryher admired), the spectator might be inadvertently "educated" to pacifism.

Sachs had already collaborated with Pabst on the film *Secrets of a Soul* (1926), which explicated dream analysis; he tellingly described the film in a *Close Up* article of November 1928 as mapping "psychic events" through the camera's attunement to "small reflexes" or "symptomatic acts" that registered "before or beyond speech" ("Film Psychology" 9). Writing ten years after the release of *Secrets of a Soul*, in 1936, Walter Benjamin famously formulated the reciprocity of film and psychology: "The camera introduces us to unconscious optics as does psychoanalysis to unconscious impulses" ("Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" 37). Ever sympathetic to Sachs and anticipating Benjamin, Bryher writes in "Notes on Berlin": "films and psychoanalysis, in those experimental days they were twins, [sic] some directors were trying to 'make thoughts

visible.”¹⁵ One might consider how psychoanalysis itself is filmic: there is ample vocabulary connecting the two fields: close ups, interior monologue, flashbacks, recurrent images.

As Marcus observes, Bryher was aligned with Benjamin’s “technique of the sudden shock” and his “model of the ‘optical unconscious’” (332). The immediacy of Benjamin’s dialectical montage, mentioned earlier, is augured in *Close Up*, and is elemental to Bryher’s own vision of fractal historical moments “that flare briefly,” to use Benjamin’s words (“Theses on the Philosophy of History” 256). H.D.’s view that film was a means of rescuing fragments of mutilated beauty was consistent to some degree with Bryher’s obsessive linking of war with film, where juxtaposed fragments are usually necessary. Enmeshing the physical with the psychological, Bryher’s *Joyless Street* demonstrates that “war intensifies the conflict between those primal emotions, ‘hunger and eroticism’” (“G.W. Pabst” 60). This psycho-physiological reading in the 1927 *Close Up* influenced the emphasis upon image and gesture in the 1930 *Borderline*, which directly grew out of the *Close Up* collaboration.

Borderline uses avant-garde techniques of quick cutting, which both H.D. and Bryher advocated, to embody its war-shocked neurasthenics, characters whom H.D. might have diagnosed as having souls and bodies “hardly on speaking terms.” In “The Borderline Pamphlet,” H.D. sought to explain the film’s method, comparing it to Eisenstein’s montage: “An effect almost that of super-imposition but subtly differing from it is achieved by the meticulous cutting of three and four and five inch lengths of film and pasting these tiny strips together,” producing a “jagged lightening effect”; second, she compares the technique of *Borderline* to that of *Ten Days*: “The almost instantaneous effect was Eisenstein’s meticulous innovation—the cutting and fitting of minute strips of soldier, gun, gun-fire, soldier, gun” (230). A pivotal copula linking Bryher and H.D.’s disparate yet overlapping film theories is Macpherson’s evocative further claims in 1930 about *Borderline* and its distinctive portrayal of “mental processes” where “the film unit, or, in this case, film strip, or scene, cannot be thought of as a static quantity. Its essential character is *transfere[n]tial*” (“As Is” 294, 296).

According to Macpherson, *Borderline* is “transfere[n]tial” through “its queer impulses and tricks, its unreliability, its stresses and obsessions, its half-formed deductions, its glibness, its occasional amnesia, its fantasy, suppressions and desires” (“As Is” 296). He thus refashioned what his introduction to Eisenstein’s “Fourth Dimension in the Kino” had already described as the director’s “physiology,” “inseparable from the psychic, from the inferential” where every scene has “to create a special nervous reflexive response.” Macpherson’s introduction quotes from “Fourth Dimension”: “The physiological process of the higher nerve centers is physi-

ological only according as it is also psychic” (179). Eisenstein writes that the conflict between sequential shots results in a montage effect, “one of shock,” which will have “*reflex-physiological essence*” (“Fourth Dimension” 185, 188). *Borderline* was filmed in March, as Anne Friedberg notes, coincident with Macpherson’s preface and Eisenstein’s essay (Donald, Friedberg, and Marcus 220).

The concept of transference, as Macpherson uses it, does not hold an identical technical meaning to that which is strictly psychoanalytic; in this context, bearing Eisenstein’s words in mind, it denotes a method of suturing a spectator through reflexive engagement with montage. For Freud, transference occurs in analysis as a “resistance phenomenon,” “an obstacle to the recollection of early traumatic events” (Eshman 3). To act out and transform trauma, the patient has to transfer his or her emotional entanglement with a significant other (usually a parent or authority), letting the analyst stand in for that other. Transference also entails “counter-transference,” so that patient and doctor engage complex identifications with one another, enacting projections and/or identifications.

Macpherson’s coinage of “transferential” for film technique clarifies the leap from the psychical to cultural that Bryher’s conception implies. By invoking transference, I suggest an intricate tracing of reference in cinema that binds inanimate objects, images, and bodies, saturating them with emotional meaning through the spectator’s investment. As spectators, we engage in transference, especially when a film, such as *Borderline*, self-consciously uses the modernist techniques of cutting, collision of disparate images, and the play with distance of close up and long shot. We might think of the evocative “empty chair” in *Ten Days*, weighted with rupture and loss, or H.D.’s own hallucinated images of a tripod or “three-legged stool,” especially as Bryher was able to “see it [i.e. the images] with” her. The very cutting and piecing of disparate elements can, in fact, replicate psychoanalytic processes or dream analysis cocreated by psychoanalyst and patient. If we agree with Bryher, such transference potentially disrupts social discourses, operating with one foot of the tripod in the unconscious, another in the subliminal, and the third in the field of the body politic. Bryher observed that Soviet directors subordinated plot to rhythm, with cutting “considered far more important than the story” (*Soviet Film Problems* 14), a method that informs Bryher’s own emphasis upon montage that disrupts singular identification or seamless narrative.

While Bryher shared H.D.’s love of *Joyless Street*, Bryher produced an archive of criticism on war films that builds upon isolated, fragmented gestures (emblematic of “the whole end of destruction”), foregrounding them as part of a destabilizing montage. No surprise, then, that she loved Pabst’s *Westfront 1918*, dominantly non-narrative, which shoves us quickly into the horrors of trench warfare but lacks a focal figure like Garbo.

This is Pabst's first attempt to score trauma with various sounds, including speech, a method that works especially well, producing what could be called a hybrid silent/sound film. Discrete unexpected sounds create a feeling of the "present," a fabric of auditory chaos. Bryher offers a sensory illustration of such an experience: "Trenches, mud, hurried orders. *Sound only with a blank screen*. Men fling themselves on wooden bunks. Equipment bumps against planks. A sudden order is shouted against incidental noise. Men race out again into mud. Explosions punctuate whistling shells. And helplessly against it from time to time, harsh hardly audible words" (108). *Westfront 1918* strove to exert a horror effect, a return of the repressed, as implied by the film poster (Figure 3), with its apocalyptic, fractured yet "group" dynamic:

Figure 3: Poster for *Westfront 1918* (1930)



During “the interval of storms,” this German poster itself advocates thinking through trauma of the First World War, and in 1930 eerily anticipates another war.

Psychoanalysis, Transference, and the War Film

Its very nature as a visual medium allows film to exteriorize war trauma. At the same time, film provides the viewer with the experience of a stimulus shield, a concept Freud developed in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920). The stimulus shield is a metaphoric incarnation of what protects our ego from collapsing in response to either the excessive demands of the super-ego or the unacceptable urges of the id, as well as from *traumatic intrusions from without*; Freud poetically describes the ego as a fragile isthmus fending off the demands both from within and without. Understanding the literal and metaphoric meanings of the “shield,” Macpherson advised H.D. on decorating her London apartment, urging her to cultivate a “silver curtain” and “to leave it down. Let it be a portcullis to your vulnerability”; Bryher, he observed, needed a “fort” (Letter to H.D., October 1927). Macpherson’s evaluation of the respective metaphoric shields of each woman mirrors their characters in *Borderline*: H.D. played the hysteric, acting out the community’s breakdown; Bryher played the manageress, keeping the café books and violence under control.

Whether “silver curtain” or “fort,” the internalized shield makes transference “safe.” How else can a war-shocked person negotiate the shocks emitted by the externalized silver screen? Bryher situated film as an ideal concretization of the crossing between subject and object, one of her pressing questions being: what does it mean to annihilate others (in the representation of war film, for instance), or to create militant borders between self and other? Both Bryher and H.D. suffered, as so many others who came of age during World War I, from what I call a macerated stimulus shield, though they responded quite differently.

For the core group of *Close Up* writers (including Bryher, Sachs, Macpherson, and H.D.), the screen functions like an externalized, more malleable representation of the “shield.” Yet one wonders how the skein of a film screen aids in filtering disavowed materials, or offers protection from them? This is precisely where my notion of film transference comes in, as evidenced in Bryher’s writing. Transference (and the transfer between shots), to greater or lesser degrees, makes a more fractured subjectivity visible. It also acts as a means to negotiate the interactions between a spectator and screen, the images, in this case, of war representation.

In H.D.’s case, *Joyless Street* imaginatively recreated a love fantasy, with her perseverance upon the screen image of a broken war-torn yet beautiful Garbo. By contrast, in her *Close Up* review of Carl Dryer’s *The Passion of Joan of Arc* (1928) that transference is not always a means

of ego-protection; H.D. criticizes the director's "remorseless cruelty"—his cutting ("the remorseless rhythm of a scimitar") as too intense, so much so that, as a spectator, she felt physically tortured ("Joan" 19). Given what we know of H.D.'s war-shocked state, such "remorseless cruelty" was too much: she has "curious nerve reactions" and must "clench her fist" ("Joan" 16). In a hypothetical "successful" transference process, beyond mere identification, she might have been able to simultaneously identify with the tortured Joan and negotiate the viewpoint of the punishing tribunal, including the wielding of its cutting devices (Joan is literally shorn of her hair in an incredibly painful scene). It is notable that H.D. supported the volatile cutting she cited in her *Borderline Pamphlet* with its "jagged lightening effect," so it may seem peculiar that the cutting of Dryer's film had such a negative effect: one answer is that in *Borderline*, H.D. (as Astrid) wields her own scimitar, making small cuts in her lover's face as she tries to keep him from her rival. This cutting scene is metonymic with the film's cutting method. What distinguishes her place vis-à-vis such frenetic small cuts assaulting the viewer is that in *Borderline*, H.D. is an agent or character wielding the knife; she also helped in the film's editing.

For Bryher, on the other hand, transference operates through internalized metaphors of shield and screen in war films. Echoing Sachs's thinking, she wrote that the cinema was a locus where spectators could relive primal fears, anger, trauma, and somehow emerge with their "shield" reinforced or, if not, productively challenged. In other words, for Bryher the ego maintains its resilience even as it lives through or repeats traumas either imagined or directly experienced. According to Bryher, the most effective war films urged the awakening of a self-conscious spectator, enmeshed in irrational nationalism or unbounded patriotism. *Westfront 1918* works so well, according to Bryher, because as in *All Quiet*, enemy and friend exchange final words, die in the same trench, collapsing the borderline between clearly defined others, the binary of the elevated versus the abject or despised.

The Big Parade, like Pabst's *Westfront 1918*, represented for Bryher an effective war film because the spectator is initially sutured into the transfer of shots, or transference effect, through the long march to the Front. King Vidor's film is not nearly as avant-garde in method as Pabst's. Yet the camera methodically fuses physiology and psychical, pulling the viewer along with the combatants. It is not merely through identification, finding a character to idealize, but through a greater motility between spatial and temporal positions that invites the spectator entry into the montage experience itself. The ego may thus take up several different positions, as one might in analytical transference. Interestingly, in "The Dynamics of the Method of Transference" (1930) Ella Sharpe Freeman (a British lay analyst whose work Bryher was familiar with) wrote: "I would remind you

of the unconscious dramatization that one would wish to play itself out in an analysis, of the different roles that become accessible if this dramatization occurs" (54).¹⁶ Thus, with *The Big Parade* in mind, a spectator can be split in his or her identification: between "hero" leaving for war or lover staying behind; the soldiers are conveyed by our tracking gaze, characteristic of Vidor, in the rhythmic "parade," which literally extends to a march directly into chaos, deprivation, and dismemberment. The opening of the film recreates for Bryher the "sweeping of everyone into something they did not clearly understand, the enlistment through sheer mass hypnotism" with a kinetic rhythm ("The War From Three Angles" 17): the foot-tapping "parade" extends to a lengthy long shot of a snaking convoy to the front (almost a third of the film), and finally, to bodies in close-up pulled into no-man's land. The panoramic shots of ambulation ironically foreshadow the hero's loss of a leg. After the long opening sequence securing our immersion (perhaps through the "half-tones" H.D. cultivates), the spectator is riveted to the machinery of shock (large tanks, barbed wire, trenches, explosions in no man's land) through visceral transference. Not far into *All Quiet*, another war film Bryher admired, there is a shot of men mobilizing for war, abruptly followed by "the image of two severed hands gripping barbed wire after an explosion has torn an advancing soldier apart" (Kelley 9). Both filmic methods—the long accreting view of *The Big Parade* and the immediate shock of a close-up—interfere with the general impulse to turn away from shattered bodies.

With Bryher's ideal spectator, our entire nervous system is called upon to answer and stitch together such colliding, differing shot transfers. The film screen itself is a vested surface, open to the mobility of a spectator's transference. In her "Survey of Pabst," Bryher describes the effect of Pabst's *Jeanne Ney*: "For actual threads of thought appear in front of one, actual life, actual pain, actual moments of beauty, passed through a mind that is as the machine that records heart beats or the sensations of a leaf" (60). The role of the spectator, likened to the mechanics of filmmaking, becomes co-creative, caught up in the act of piecing together the montage. The screen may indeed be flat, but through the spectator, becomes rounded, a fourth dimension; or as Kaja Silverman contends of the screen—it can "talk back" and also function as a "repository" for cultural mythologies, regulating the limits of subjectivity.¹⁷

Even as her post-war experience led Bryher to greater psychic and aesthetic awareness of the irrational as well as the "borderline," she assumed that human beings could be recuperated through the transference cultivated by psychoanalysis, education, and cinema. In this light, "stimulus" and "dope" become two poles of judgment in her film criticism. Film must, for Bryher, be necessarily "difficult" (like *Ten Days*) to provoke extreme bodily and psychic responses; viewers should come to film, "not

to forget but to live" ("Dope or Stimulus" 61). Film works through a communal unconscious, yet is also mechanical and conditions the embodied spectator (for good or ill). Bryher worried that viewers would merely "surrender" to whatever material was presented. "Nobody protests," writes Bryher ("Dope or Stimulus" 59); no wonder Eisenstein was a key model for Bryher, for it is precisely in his films that the spectator becomes embroiled, through his montage methods of transference and shock, in acts of protest.

Bryher devoted a detailed chapter to Eisenstein's work in *Film Problems of Soviet Russia* (1929), recognizing war experience as almost conducive to filmmaking:

Only a volunteer [Pudovkin] who had been through the successive phases of war hysteria and destruction could have recorded the marvelous war sequences in *The End of St. Petersburg*. And perhaps imprisonment tends to develop concentration of the visual sense, for it is interesting to note in this connection that the greatest of German directors, G.W. Pabst also spent several years in France as a prisoner of war. (46)

Pabst's war experience led, it would seem, to *Westfront 1918*. While Bryher thought silent film generally more mobile in crossing the border between self and screen both as externalized film-viewing and as the crossing that takes place between the unconscious and the ego (i.e. through the psychic structure of the "stimulus shield"), she describes this work as "not a war film in sound so much as the possibility of developing a new sense, a balance of ear, eye and brain with all its exciting problems" ("Westfront 1918" 105). More to the point, her 1930 *Close Up* article on *Westfront* suggests that sound accentuated psychic disturbance and a "new sense" of the "Great War," comporting with Bryher's persistent caution that the world was moving headlong towards another war.

Further, *Borderline* is suggestively a film that draws together many of the concepts Bryher and her cohorts were developing throughout the run of *Close Up*. Multiple scenes zoom in upon disjointed gazes between characters, not creating the continuity of shot/reverse shot. There is no main hero or heroine. Studies in Pabst's "realism" and Soviet cutting, the film presents multiple images of thresholds and borders, layered as erotic and political, transferring shock into the jerky, fragmented movements of most of the characters. Bryher acts alongside H.D. and Paul and Eslanda Robeson, where the latter three characters are involved in one of several interracial love triangles: H.D. as Astrid is fighting to win back her lover, the white Thorne, who at the beginning of the film has thrown over Eslanda (in the film, the wife of Paul, who plays her estranged husband).

This is just one instance of triangulated desire in the film, but suggests how desire is not unilateral, taking up a more rounded, even three-dimensional space where conflict is played out. "Queer" desire circumnavigates between bodies (as in *Westfront* no central character presides), and engages spectators in transference, seeing their own desire mediated, extended, and laid bare by meticulous camera angles and montage experimentation.¹⁸ It exposes how we become bodies as such, the sexual and racial marking of the bodily ego (framed, projected, and dissected) by the transference of desires; in effect, the film doesn't allow identifications to attach to coherent, singular identities. For instance, Thorne (the film's racist antagonist) stands at a doorway with his rival Pete, acted by Robeson, in a mirror shot that suggests there exists no purist identity.

The Lost Generation of *Close Up*

It seems to me that modernist critics understand *Close Up* primarily as an H.D. vehicle (though Marcus, to some extent has dispelled this myth in her recent book). Still Bryher is admittedly read only as part of the context and content of these works (namely *Borderline* and *Close Up*) rather than as part of a collaboration that generated Taylor's "radical forms" for film criticism and viewing. By following a strand in *Close Up* of Bryher's archive, with its attempt to link psychoanalysis with activism, Bryher's magnetic, coherent thinking in the journal's pages and her supplementary *Soviet Film Problems* come to the fore. Rather than merely writing film reviews, she consolidated competing, if convergent, theories of an embodied spectator (i.e., H.D.'s "half-tones") and Bryher's own activist viewer through the mechanisms of the screen which can accomplish non-exclusive aims: offering *stimulus* as well as healing solace, not to be confused with the more popular "dope" Bryher identified.

In "Dope or Stimulus," Bryher describes British audiences: "English take theatres, games, papers, cinemas even as dope" and "[t]hey surrender to this, all logical faculties in abeyance, and achieve complete gratification whatever the material set in front of them . . . Nobody protests" (60). This self-satisfied, unprovoked viewer imagined by Bryher imbibes his or her films without co-creation. In contrast to "Dope," Bryher's *Close Up* articles traced an arc of anxiety from her first piece on *The Big Parade* to her June 1933 valedictory piece, "What Shall You Do in the War?" In this last piece, she uses cinematic condensation of image to describe fascist conditions, as though the two are imbricated: Berlin transmuted into "a city where police cars and machine guns raced about the streets, where groups of brown uniforms waited at each corner. The stations had been crowded with people whose bundles, cases or trunks bulged with household possessions" ("What Shall You Do" 188). She tells of concentration camps and informs her readers that Pabst's films have all been banned,

and relentlessly attacks apathy: "Let us decide what we will have. If peace, let us fight for it. And fight for it especially with cinema" (192).

Referring to a visit to Pabst in Paris in 1937, Bryher writes about "[Pabst's] despair over filmmaking. It was all rather depressing, like the final death of the Berlin I knew, with rain pouring down outside, and the realization that one does, one's self, belong to a lost generation" (Letter to Walter Schmideberg, April 22nd, 1937). In 1933, Bryher began helping refugees, mostly psychoanalysts and Jews, to escape Nazi Germany, an activity that included her efforts to aid Walter Benjamin whom she had met through their mutual friend, Adrienne Monnier, in Paris at Shakespeare & Company Bookstore. Her political work of shepherding refugees did not end until she left Switzerland herself, in fear for her life, in 1940. Her melancholy yet activist words in "What Shall You Do In the War?" still resound: "It is for you and me to decide whether we will help to raise respect for intellectual liberty in the same way, or whether we all plunge, in every kind and color of uniform, towards a not to be imagined barbarism" (190).

Bryher is not credited appropriately in modernist literary or film history. Her material contributions are appreciated, but her creative orchestration and synthetic development of *Close Up*, her collaboration on every level, are generally ignored. Bryher was essential to the magazine's spirit, outlining a film theory governed by the terms of shock, trauma and transference, complementary to H.D.'s desire for film experience to temporarily cocoon the war-shocked self. *Close Up* paved the way for Bryher's new career as an historical novelist, where she takes the point of view of the conquered, the failed, in order to awaken, educate, and train her readers to watch history flare up, and to resist, following Benjamin's point of view, the effort of victors to wrap history in a snowy forgetfulness.

Notes

1. From Virginia Smyers's interview with Bryher, December 1979, on two CD-Roms.
2. All citations from *Close Up* come from the complete volumes.
3. Issue 7.5. See H.D.'s "Borderline Pamphlet" in Donald, Friedberg, and Marcus.
4. See my "Bryher's Archive: Modernism and The Melancholy of Money."
5. The anthology *Close Up 1927-1933: Cinema & Modernism* (1998) renewed engagement with the journal, featuring key articles including Bryher's report of the omnipresence of brown shirts in Berlin and the displacement of refugees. The anthology captures the journal's ambitious and multifaceted scope, selecting from the shelf-long ten volumes of *Close Up*, which usually must be summoned, if available, from a library's off-site "grand repository."

6. When *All Quiet* premiered, it met with a riot in Germany when Goebbels made a speech to the audience, ordering stink-bombs and white mice released in the cinema; this led to "suspension of the performance" and six days after opening night, the film was banned by the Supreme Film Censorship Board (Kelly 122-23).
7. Suggestive of her growing sense of how non-combatives had been shocked by the First World War, Bryher published *Civilians* with POOL in 1927 to delineate the multiple conditions of women on the home front, including a portrayal of a worker in a censorship office and of the unfair treatment of a woman of German descent in Great Britain.
8. See Morris's "The Concept of Projection."
9. Sachs was the most frequent contributor to *Close Up*, founder of *American Imago*, and one of Freud's "seven" disciples (Marcus 496).
10. Bryher sponsored (and commandeered) the analysis of many of her friends. In a letter written in pencil of 1934 (no day or month specified), Macpherson outlined to Bryher his vociferous objections to analysis with Freud: "not Freud, not God will make me stay a day longer than I have to"; "Vienna highly dangerous and the last spot I'd want to find myself if the old war bomb explodes again." Besides, he writes, analysis "bore[s] the pants off me." See Macpherson, Letter to Bryher.
11. The folder "Notes on Berlin" contains an amalgam of Bryher's fragmented impressions of the late twenties and the early thirties; she also includes a number of her favorite quotations from Sachs, including this phrasing of film as "second sight."
12. See Veronika Fuechtner's *Berlin Psychoanalytic*.
13. Bryher's excitement over movement across boundaries in a plane from Switzerland to see four Russian films anticipates her phenomenology of film viewing. She thrills over a perspective of the "whole," where "the colors in a landscape become new and the earth is flat as a screen upon which shadow and wind and the aeroplane itself project pictures" (*Film Problems* 9).
14. H.D. will later expand her focus upon Helen in the epic poem *Helen in Egypt* published in 1961.
15. It is unclear who first theorized film and psychoanalysis as "twins" as Teresa de Lauretis implies in *Alice Doesn't: Feminism, Semiotics, Cinema*: "The twin birth of cinema and psychoanalysis around the year 1900 has been often noted" (67). Bryher was likely not the first to note the twinship and their joined fate in film criticism, but she was certainly in touch with the zeitgeist.
16. H.D. mentions Freeman ("a British lay analyst well known for her papers on artists and creativity") in her letters to Bryher during her analysis with Freud in 1931, but Bryher could well have been aware at an earlier date of Freeman's work (Friedman 121-22).

17. See Silverman's *Threshold of the Visible World* where in Silverman's reading the cultural "screen" functions as the "repertoire of representations by means of which our culture figures all those many varieties of difference," images that "do not always facilitate the production of a lovable body" (19).
18. For a more extensive reading of the film, see my "Borderline Modernism: Paul Robeson and the Femme Fatale."

Works Cited

- Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." 1936. *Illuminations*. Ed. Hannah Arendt and Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1968. 217-51.
- . "Theses on the Philosophy of History." 1950. *Illuminations*. Ed. Hannah Arendt and Trans. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken Books, 1968. 253-64.
- . *Borderline*. Dir. Kenneth Macpherson. Perf. Paul Robeson, Eslanda Robeson, H.D., Bryher. Prod. POOL Group. 1930. *Paul Robeson: Portrait of an Artist*. Criterion, 2007. DVD.
- Bryher. *Civilians*. Riant Chateau, Territet, Switzerland: POOL, 1927.
- . "Dope or Stimulus?" *Close Up* 3.3 (1928): 59-61.
- . *Film Problems of Soviet Russia*. Riant Chateau, Territet, Switzerland: POOL, 1929.
- . "G. W. Pabst: A Survey." *Close Up* 1.6 (1927): 56-61.
- . *Heart to Artemis: A Writer's Memoirs*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962. London: Collins, 1963.
- . Letter to Amy Lowell. October 11, 1919. MS. Lowell Papers. Houghton Lib., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA.
- . Letter to H.D. March 20, 1919. MS. H.D. Papers.
- . Letter to Walter Schmideberg. February 18, 1937. MS. Bryher Papers.
- . Letter to Walter Schmideberg. April 22nd, 1937. MS. Bryher Papers.
- . "Notes on Berlin." N.d. MS. Bryher Papers.
- . *This January Tale*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1966.
- . "The War from Many Angles." *Close Up* 1.4 (1927): 45-48.
- . "The War from Three Angles." *Close Up* 1.1 (1927): 16-32.
- . "Westfront 1918." *Close Up* 7.2 (1930): 104-11.
- . "What Shall You Do in the War?" *Close Up* 10.2 (1933): 188-92.
- Bryher Papers. Beinecke Rare Manuscript and Book Lib., Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Close Up*. Ed. K. Macpherson. 10 Vols. Riant Chateau, Territet, Switzerland: POOL, 1927-1933.
- De Lauretis, Alice. *Alice Doesn't: Feminism, Semiotics, Cinema*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1984.
- Donald, James, Anne Friedberg, and Laura Marcus, eds. *Close Up 1927-*

- 1933: *Cinema and Modernism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1998.
- Eisenstein, Sergei. "Fourth Dimension in the Kino." *Close Up* 6.3 (1930): 184-94.
- . "Dialectic Approach." *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*. Ed. and Trans. Jay Leyda. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1949.
- Eshman, Aaron H., ed. *Essential Papers on Transference*. New York: New York UP, 1990.
- Freeman, Ella Sharpe. "The Dynamics of the Method of Transference." 1930. *Collected Papers on Psychoanalysis*. London: Hogarth Press: 1950: 53-66.
- Friedman, Susan Stanford. *Analyzing Freud: Letters of H.D., Bryher and Their Circle*. New York: New Directions, 2002.
- Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. 1920. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Vol. 18. New York: Macmillan, 1961: 7-66.
- Fuechtner, Veronika. *Berlin Psychoanalytic: Psychoanalysis and Culture in Weimar Republic Germany and Beyond*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2011.
- H.D. "Borderline Pamphlet." 1930. Donald, Friedberg, and Marcus 221-36.
- . "The Cinema and the Classics: Beauty." *Close Up* (1927): 22-33.
- . "Joan of Arc." *Close Up* 3.1 (1928): 15-23.
- . "Mask and the Movietone." *Close Up* 1.5 (1927): 18-37.
- . *Tribute to Freud*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1956.
- H.D. Papers. Beinecke Rare Manuscript and Book Lib., Yale University, New Haven, CT.
- Kelly, Andrew. *Filming All Quiet on the Western Front*. New York: St. Martin's P, 1998.
- Macpherson, Kenneth. "An Introduction to 'The Fourth Dimension in the Kino.'" *Close Up* 6.3 (1930): 175-84.
- . "As Is." *Close Up*. 7.5 (1930): 293-98.
- . Letter to Bryher. 1934. MS. Bryher Papers.
- . Letter to H.D. October 1927. MS. H.D. Papers.
- . Letter to H.D. October 27, 1927. MS. H.D. Papers.
- . Letter to H.D. October 29, 1927. MS. H.D. Papers.
- Marcus, Laura. *The Tenth Muse: Writing about Cinema in the Modernist Period*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007.
- Marek, Jayne E. *Women Editing Modernism: "Little" Magazines and Literary History*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1995.
- McCabe, Susan. "Borderline Modernism: Paul Robeson and the Femme Fatale." *Callaloo* 25.2 (2002): 640-53.
- . "Bryher's Archive: Modernism and The Melancholy of Money." *English Now. Selected Papers from the 20th IAUPE Conference*. Ed. by

- Marianne Thormählen. Sweden: Lund UP, 2008: 118-25.
- Morris, Adalaide. "The Concept of Projection: H.D.'s Visionary Powers." *Contemporary Literature* 25.4 (1984): 411-36.
- Richardson, Dorothy. "Continuous Performance--The Film Gone Male." *Close Up* 9.1 (1932): 37-38.
- Sachs, Hanns. "Film Psychology." *Close Up*. 3.5 (1928): 8-16.
- Silverman, Kaja. *Threshold of the Visible World*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Smeyers, Virginia. *Interview with Bryher*. Prod. Virginia Smyers. 1979. CD.
- Stevens, Wallace. "The Noble Rider and the Sound of Words." *The Necessary Angel: Essays on Reality and the Imagination*. New York: Knopf, 1942.
- Taylor, Georgina. *H.D. and the Public Sphere of Modernist Women Writers, 1913-1946*. New York: Oxford UP, 2001.