

ONeworld

Modern French Philosophy

**From Existentialism
to Postmodernism**

Robert Wicks



Praise for Modern French Philosophy

“Robert Wicks has done us all a great service with his *Modern French Philosophy*. It is a book that we have needed for many years, and Wicks has done a superb job in summarizing the history of philosophy in France from surrealism, existentialism and structuralism to the virtual surrealism of recent postmodernism. Obscure and difficult texts are ‘translated’ into comprehensible English; cross connections and historical references, many of them unexpected, are laid out for our appreciation. Focussed and cautious criticisms, interspersed with the exposition, are offered for the student’s consideration. For those of us who teach courses in modern French philosophy but despair of making the material readily accessible to our students, Wicks’ book is a welcome pedagogical gift.”

Robert C. Solomon, University of Texas at Austin

“This book surveys the complex and bewildering field of twentieth-century French philosophy and manages to pick out significant trends without sacrificing attention to detail. Existentialism, structuralism, poststructuralism and postmodernism are important components of our own intellectual context, but they are more often than not only loosely understood. Robert Wicks remedies this situation by providing a lucid, comprehensive account of French thought in the last century. The book is written with admirable clarity, and the analyses of both individual thinkers and broader movements are impressively accessible and authoritative. This book can be recommended wholeheartedly to anyone interested in the subject.”

Colin Davis, University of Warwick

“The book is an extremely readable account of a vast panorama of thinkers, presented in a clear and comprehensible fashion without sacrificing too much in the way of detail or complexity. Relationships, as well as differences are brought out, historical affiliations and influences are lucidly explored, and the analysis is carried out with a keen eye for the whole as well as its parts.”

Christina Howells, University of Oxford

RELATED TITLES

Descartes, Harry M. Bracken, ISBN 1-85168-294-5

God: A Guide for the Perplexed, Keith Ward, ISBN 1-85168-323-2

Kierkegaard, Michael Watts, ISBN 1-85168-317-8

Moral Relativism: A Short Introduction, Neil Levy, ISBN 1-85168-305-4

Nietzsche, Robert Wicks, ISBN 1-85168-291-0

Philosophy and Religion: From Plato to Postmodernism, Max Charlesworth, ISBN 1-85168-307-0

Sartre, Neil Levy, ISBN 1-85168-290-2

Wittgenstein, Avrum Stroll, ISBN 1-85168-293-7

Modern French Philosophy

From Existentialism to Postmodernism

Robert Wicks



O N E W O R L D

Oneworld Publications
10 Bloomsbury Road
London WC1B 3SR
England
www.oneworld-publications.com

This ebook edition published in 2013

©Robert Wicks 2003

All rights reserved.
Copyright under Berne Convention.
A CIP record for this title is available from the British Library.

ISBN 978-1-85168-318-5

eISBN 978-1-78074-456-8

Cover illustration by Andrzej Klimowski;
cover design by Perks-Willis Graphic Design
Typeset by Saxon Graphics Ltd, Derby, UK

Stay up to date with the latest books,
special offers, and exclusive content from
Oneworld with our monthly newsletter

Sign up on our website
www.oneworld-publications.com

Contents

Preface

Introduction: Time, Progress, and Disillusionment

Part 1 Surrealism, Existentialism, and Vitalism

- 1** The Surrealistic Setting: 1916–38
- 2** Henri Bergson, Philosopher (1859–1941)
(Nobel Prize in Literature, 1927)
- 3** Jean-Paul Sartre, Existentialist (1905–80)
(Nobel Prize in Literature, 1964, declined)
- 4** Albert Camus, Absurdist and Novelist (1913–60)
(Nobel Prize in Literature, 1957)
- 5** E. M. Cioran, Nihilist and Ecstatic (1911–95)
- 6** Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, Priest and Paleontologist (1881–1955)

Part 2 Structuralism

- 7** Ferdinand de Saussure, Linguist (1857–1913)
- 8** Claude Lévi-Strauss, Anthropologist (1908–)
- 9** Jacques Lacan, Psychoanalyst (1901–81)
- 10** Roland Barthes, Literary Critic (1915–80)
Structuralist Views: 1950s–67

Part 3 Poststructuralism and Postmodernism

- 11** Roland Barthes, Literary Critic (1915–80)
Poststructuralist Views: 1968–80
- 12** Jacques Derrida, Linguist and Literary Theorist (1930–)
- 13** Michel Foucault, Historian and Social Theorist (1926–84)
- 14** Jean-François Lyotard, Social Theoretician and Activist (1924–98)

15 Luce Irigaray, Feminist and Psycholinguist (1930–)

16 Gilles Deleuze, Philosopher and Social Psychologist (1925–95)

17 Jean Baudrillard, Sociologist (1929–)

18 Conclusion: Freedom, Language, and Existence

Notes

Acknowledgments

Index

Preface

Much of twentieth-century French philosophy can be understood as a quest for freedom, stimulated by the problem of understanding one's place in the world as both an individual and as a social being. This quest was peculiar, though, because it was formulated against a confusing background, namely, an array of scientific and technological developments that appeared inconsistently to be both supportive and threatening to human well-being. The present study, unlike most surveys of this period, will highlight underappreciated continuities, as well as recall familiar discontinuities, between the various segments and strata of twentieth-century French philosophical thought. The hope is to develop a more satisfying understanding of modern French philosophers, by revealing a greater coherence to this intellectually vibrant time period than is usually noted.

It often happens that wide-ranging histories of philosophical thought sacrifice detailed analysis for argument for expository flow, and are formulated at a level of generality that precludes readers from appreciating the argumentative nuances of the philosophical theories under consideration. In light of this often-encountered condition, the present critical and integrative exposition of twentieth-century French philosophical thought aims to achieve balance in a different way: as a rule, we will examine key arguments from each author, and these will be situated within a broader exposition of the author's viewpoint. The resulting narrative atmosphere will compare to a helicopter excursion: sometimes we will ascend to survey the extensive landscape; sometimes we will descend to cruise along the treetops for a closer and more rapid view; often we will stop to explore carefully, and with some patience, the intellectual gardens and shapes of the tiny flowers of thought. We will continue in this way until we reach the end of the century, when we will look back to formulate a surrealistic and freedom-centered meaning that will comprehend the survey.

French philosophical thought during the twentieth-century is more varied and thematically interesting than some other comparable segments in the history of philosophy, for the influential writers were confined neither to academic settings in general, nor to university philosophy departments in particular. And yet, all of the writers were deeply reflective in spirit. We will consider the ideas of psychoanalysts, artists, novelists, linguists, essayists, literary critics, anthropologists, sociologists, and political activists, in addition to those who worked in academic philosophy departments. A remarkable feature of French philosophical thought during this period, is that its representatives come from every intellectual avenue, influencing the entire scholarly scene, and much of the popular intellectual scene. As a testament to their stature and recognition beyond the French national boundaries, several of these thinkers, namely, Henri Bergson, Albert Camus, and Jean-Paul Sartre, were awarded or were offered, Nobel Prizes in Literature, which indicates their notable place within the wider French, European, Western, and worldwide cultural settings.

The historical and descriptive categories that have applied traditionally and conveniently to this complicated subject – 'French thought,' 'twentieth-century thought,' 'existentialism,' 'structuralism,' 'poststructuralism,' and 'postmodernism,' among others – are useful and familiar schematic designations. As rigid and abstract terms, however, they also tend to mislead us into overlooking the complexity, multidimensionality and multi-interpretability of the cultural and philosophic

phenomena at hand. To take a small example, consider how conventional calendar markings such as '1900' and '2000,' along with related designations such as 'twentieth-century French thought' or 'twentieth-century European thought,' can generate the expectation that major calendar divisions will match significant cultural and intellectual transitions. We can easily question, though, whether there are any clear 'joints' within the cultural sphere which naturally correspond to calendar divisions, not only because so many momentous discoveries and important historical events happen unpredictably by accident, and on arbitrary dates.

At the same time, conventional manners of marking time are not without substantial influence. Most people organize their lives according to determinate calendars, and cultural transitions sometimes issue from the template of calendar divisions in the manner of a self-fulfilled prophecy: one acts and anticipates the future, as if a major event ought to happen, simply because the calendar indicates the arrival of a new year, decade, centennial or millennium. The European calendar is only one among many alternative ways of measuring time, and to the extent that our expectations rest upon this particular structure, they rest, and also noticeably float, upon a socially constructed foundation.

Adding to the complication of understanding a long-term philosophical episode such as modern French philosophy, is how historical change can be slow and subtle: a cultural group could be living at the dawn of a new era without having a clear awareness of their world-historical place, merely because it is too early to realize the significance of what is happening. The widespread social implications that accompanied the discoveries of the wheel, gunpowder, the stirrup, Roman and Gothic style arches and interchangeable parts, the telescope and microscope, the photographic image, the telegraph, antibiotics, the telephone, the motion picture, the motor vehicle, the steel girder, the airplane, the television, atomic energy, and the computer, among other innovations, were not clearly imagined when these items first appeared on the social scene. The full significance of some historical events emerges only with long-term hindsight, and examples abound of individuals whose later cultural influence remained unanticipated by the majority of their contemporaries.

Such interpretive restrictions temper every study of the present kind, which aims particularly to comprehend the highlights of philosophical thought in France during the twentieth century. Prevailing intellectual categorizations have been adopted, hoping that this does not prevent us from appreciating some of the wider, along with the more subtle, currents that helped shape the century's philosophical concerns. In contrast to a strongly interpretive, abstract, and topical history of the period, the following pages present a selection of philosophical authors who frequently speak for themselves, to allow a more open-ended and revisable conception of the time period. Excerpts from the major philosophical texts of each selected author will be quoted and summarized to convey the author's crucial propositions, and these expositions will be augmented by critical reflections. The authors will speak for themselves as much as possible, to set the context for drawing independent thematic connections between the ideas as they appear in the original texts.

The selection of representatives from twentieth-century French philosophical thought has been determined according to the variably weighted criteria of respective historical influence, philosophical depth, comprehensiveness of vision, contemporary relevance, available writing space, and possible future relevance, in conjunction with a desire to illuminate thinkers who have been partially obscured by traditional conceptualizations of the philosophical era. The authors chosen vary in the degree to which they embody these criteria, but underlying this study is a conviction that the Dada and Surrealist movements of the early twentieth century exercised a strong, and still-underappreciated influence upon French thought throughout the century. For this reason, the study begins with a short account of Dada and Surrealism, focusing upon their intellectual aspects as expressed in their various

manifestos. The influence of Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis is also of important note within the context.

Owing mainly to the limitations of space, some twentieth-century French thinkers do not appear in the following pages with chapters of their own, such as Louis Althusser, Georges Bataille, Simone de Beauvoir, Guy Debord, Julia Kristeva, Emmanuel Lévinas, Gabriel Marcel, Jacques Maritain, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Paul Ricoeur, and Simone Weil. My hope is that these theorists will nonetheless be rendered more understandable, if only indirectly, since the ideas represented by the authors in the present volume constitute either a close background or an immediate development of their respective theories, and therefore an intellectual entrée into their outlooks. In two instances, I have chosen to include Emil Cioran and Teilhard de Chardin in place of more mainstream figures, because they effectively represent the extremes of individualistic nihilistic pessimism and global social optimism in the early part of the century. During any turbulent times, de Chardin's hopefulness continues to be inspiring, both psychologically intriguing and refreshing. And Cioran unforgettably expresses the dismal view of life whose hard realism touches, if only briefly, upon everyone at some point in their experience.

This study originated as a guide for students of twentieth-century French philosophy at The University of Auckland, New Zealand. Their enthusiasm for the subject has been a major inspiration, and this book would not have been written had it not been for their academic presence and dedication. I would also like to thank the following individuals for their scholarly advice on various chapters, and for discussions of some of the ideas contained herein: Thomas Christiano, Fred Kroon, Chris Martin, Timothy Rayner, Geoffrey Roche, Maree Scarlett, Martin Schwab, Jeremy Seligman, Ivan Soll, Kaaren Steven, Mel Thompson, Paul Warren, Thomas Wartenberg, Terry Winant, and Julian Young. Particular thanks are due to Lisa Guenther and Stefano Franchi, who commented extensively and informatively on large segments of the manuscript, along with an anonymous reviewer. I would also like to acknowledge a more wide-ranging intellectual and professional debt to Charles McCracken, Ronald Suter, and John F. A. Taylor†, who originally set me properly upon a philosophically directed road. Finally, I would like to thank Robert C. Solomon for his continual encouragement over the years in connection with this project.

Auckland, New Zealand
May 2000

Introduction: Time, Progress, and Disillusionment

To appreciate twentieth-century French philosophical thought, we can begin by recalling that a general feeling of progress inspired the nineteenth-century Western cultural spirit. Although the roots of this attitude trace back to the biblical idea that the world is unfolding benevolently according to a divine purpose, in more recent times this sense of cultural advancement was intensified by the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century developments in scientific and technological thinking. Together these helped stimulate the industrial revolution of the mid-to-late eighteenth century and they contributed to reinforcing a stronger awareness of historical development that emerged near the end of that century.

The wider themes of twentieth-century French philosophy reveal how the nineteenth-century faith in human progress became tempered, if not close to undermined, by the tragic experience of two World Wars, and by the grim realization that dehumanization and authoritarianism can also follow in the wake of technological progress. Twentieth-century French thinkers became keenly aware of how both rationalistic and irrational styles of thought can be disfigured to undermine human dignity, even though these thinkers frequently retained enough optimism to look back upon the nineteenth century in an effort to find inspiration for social improvement and liberation from what they perceived to be increasingly oppressive authoritarian regimes and doctrines. With such hopes, French thinkers often cited the works of German-speaking theorists such as Karl Marx (1818–83), Friedrich Nietzsche (1844–1900) and Sigmund Freud (1856–1939) – theorists whose influence emerges repeatedly throughout the complicated history of twentieth-century French philosophical thought.¹

Among the late eighteenth-century theoreticians who expressed the optimistic view that human society is inevitably progressing towards a more perfect condition was the Marquis de Condorcet (1743–94),² who believed that progress towards a thoroughly democratic condition is inherent in human nature, and that scientific and technological advances will inevitably assist this progress. Condorcet also maintained that we can discover the rational principles of human nature through the science of psychology, arguing that the tools of mathematical probability are the best for understanding human behavior.

Similarly, Auguste Comte (1798–1857) – the founder of ‘sociology’ and an advocate of a novel, familiar position which he labelled ‘positivism’ – believed that the quest for knowledge is essentially progressive and scientifically aimed.³ In the 1830s, Comte claimed that the development of human knowledge involves a gradual process of demythologization whereby cultural expressions of what is ultimately true pass through three stages: first, there is the ‘fictitious’ or theological stage, typical of many religious outlooks; second, there is the ‘abstract’ or metaphysical stage, typical of most traditional philosophical expression; third, there is the ‘positive’ stage, which is expressed by the most advanced scientific views of the time. For Comte, religion transforms into philosophy, and philosophy gravitates into science. Anthropomorphic and mythological visions tend to become more precise, logical, observation-based standpoints, and literary modes of expression tend to solidify into literalistic ones.⁴

With an optimistic spirit akin to Condorcet and Comte, among the most famous and influential

the nineteenth-century thinkers who expressed a faith in human progress, and who also significantly influenced twentieth-century French thought, was the down-to-earth materialist and theorist communism, Karl Marx (1818–83).⁵ According to Marx, human beings organize themselves in social groups, and inevitably enter into interpersonal relationships that stem from their elemental and natural activities of producing food, providing shelter, creating tools, making clothes, transporting goods, etc. – relationships which when taken as a whole, constitute the economic structure of the social organization. Marx believes that this economic structure of the society is basic, and that we can understand a good part of any society's legal system, religious system, philosophical system, forms of art, and forms of politics – the society's ideologies, as he called them – as expressions of economic conditions and relationships within the society.⁶ In his later years, Marx developed an extensive mathematically grounded economic theory, and believed that upon its basis, he could scientifically understand social tendencies and thereby foresee the potentials for social transformation and progress.⁷

But Karl Marx was not only an economically focused social theorist. He began as an advocate of human freedom who dedicated his writings to the elimination of exploitation and self-estrangement. For Marx, it is of utmost importance that human beings feel at home in the world, and he believed that social conditions and social systems that interfere with this realization should be revealed for the dehumanizing systems that they are. Hence his continuous criticism of the capitalistic system of exploitation and the institution of private property, which he believed alienated workers from the products of their labor, and alienated people from one another. As a remedy, and as what he believed to be a foreshadowing of the future, Marx formulated a communal social vision wherein ownership of factories and the means of production is shared by all of the workers, wherein exploitation is eliminated, and wherein people have the freedom to develop their potentialities, whether these involve writing poetry, going fishing or working at a craft. In Marxist thought, revolution and rebellion are put into the service of human freedom, community, social harmony, and the feeling of being at home in the world.

In conjunction with Marx, further overtones of progress reside in the more sober evolutionary biology of Charles Darwin (1809–82). In *The Descent of Man* (1871) Darwin claimed that human beings, having risen to the summit of the organic scale, have reason to hope for a still higher destiny in the distant future, even though our bodily frames carry the stamps of our less-exalted origins in the lower primates. Each of these theorists – Condorcet, Comte, Marx, and Darwin – shared the general view that the scientific mode of inquiry, as one based on detached and objective observation, and guided by the use of logical or mathematical reasoning, is the main intellectual discipline for proper understanding of the individual human being and human society. In association with their faith in the scientific method, they variously recognized a developmental, or progressive dimension to human life in particular, to life in general, or to the universe as a whole.

During the initial years of the twentieth century, up until the First World War, advances in theoretical physics, the visual arts, and mathematical logic⁸ – radical advances that undermined many centuries-old assumptions – further supported the nineteenth-century anticipation that the twentieth century would mark a genuinely new and culturally-advanced era.⁹ For instance, the scientific revolution in theoretical physics blossomed at the beginning of the twentieth century, even though it had some of its important sources in the mid-nineteenth-century work of the mathematician, G. F. B. Riemann (1826–66). Riemann's achievement was to be among the first to develop a coherent, not to mention revolutionary, non-Euclidean geometry that took as its model, not the relationships between

straight lines drawn on a flat surface, as had been the tradition since the times of Euclid, but the relationships between the straight lines drawn upon a spherical, as opposed to a flat (i.e., Euclidean) surface.¹⁰

It took some time for Riemann's geometrical theory – first formulated in 1854¹¹ – to be applied to problems in theoretical physics by far-seeing scientists such as Albert Einstein (1879–1955), but the applications of Riemann's non-Euclidean geometry were astounding, not to mention paradoxical and challenging to the imagination. In the history of physics, it was momentous to discover that this non-Euclidean geometry of curved space – a geometry that had been initially not much more than a mathematical curiosity – more precisely describes our physical universe, in contrast to the Euclidean geometry of flattened space.¹²

With respect to reinforcing the idea of progress, this realization led to a revolutionary transition in theoretical physics at the beginning of the twentieth century, namely, from the Newtonian conception of physical relationships that had developed in the 1600s¹³ to a more contemporary relativistic Einsteinian conception.¹⁴ Physicists began to speak of a single entity called 'spacetime,' instead of two independent entities – 'space' and 'time' – and they no longer assumed that space and time were absolute and invariant. As is known, the sublime power of this new model of the physical universe eventually contributed to the capacity of the human being to recreate the atomic energy of the sun upon the surface of the earth, thus marking a double-edged, Promethean advance in power for humanity. Upon discerning the almost godlike possibility of harnessing atomic energy, the faith in the effectiveness of scientific styles of inquiry was further strengthened.

Comparable in cultural magnitude, and similar in imaginative spirit to the early twentieth-century revolution in theoretical physics, was a revolution in the visual arts that stemmed from the French avant-garde world. This, in particular, was the development of the cubist style of painting by Georges Braque (1882–1963) and Pablo Picasso (1881–1973) which challenged the longstanding tradition of the Renaissance perspective.¹⁵ Rather than representing objects as seen from a single observation point taken at a single time, Braque and Picasso painted objects as seen imaginatively from several points at once, generating a multi-aspected, fragmented image, where an object's front-view could be immediately juxtaposed to, or combined with, a side-view or back-view in a mosaic-like disconcerting fusion. By coalescing together in a single, tension-ridden image, a set of multiple perspectives upon an object taken at different times, the Cubists artistically represented what it would be like to see an object all at once, as if one were somehow located at a vantage point which stood above the passing of time from moment to moment.¹⁶

The enthusiastic attitude sparked by these, and other scientific and artistic developments, was soon questioned. Although the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century optimism that science would help create a better world initially shaped the twentieth-century spirit of the times, there soon arose a distinct uneasiness about the positivistic promise of scientific, and especially of technological, advancement in light of a further observation: scientific thinking also has the capacity to dehumanize people and turn them into mere cogs in the social machine. Such reservations towards science and technology were not altogether new,¹⁷ but they intensified significantly as a consequence of the devastation of the First World War, where men fighting on horseback in the nineteenth-century style battled alongside armored units, aircraft, machine guns and poison gas.

Philosophically, we can locate the seeds of distrust towards scientific thinking that sprouted later during and after the First World War, to the beginnings of the nineteenth century and the emergence of a closer attention to the sheer passing of time. For during the late 1700s and early 1800s, a mo-

distinct awareness of time's passing led to a more intense sense of the train of history, and a sharper sense of history's linear progression. With this intensified sense of time came an accompanying difficulty in conceptualizing time's passing in rational, logical or mathematical terms. The early calculus of Newton and Leibniz did much to achieve this understanding, but it could do so only by regarding time atomistically as a series of infinitesimal points, rather than as a pure flow. A way to understand time in a manner that captured its continuous nature remained resistant to mathematical reason, and this was noted by the first theorist in our survey, Henri Bergson.

In reaction to what boiled down to the problem of understanding the nature of flowing time, early nineteenth-century theorists such as G. W. F. Hegel quickly developed a new style of logic that modeled itself on the melting together of opposites (e.g., in the way metals are fused together in an alloy). Other theorists, finding the idea of a logic grounded upon the blending of opposites to be either too much in conflict with mathematical thought, or, at the other extreme, still too insensitive to the seemingly non-logical reality of human emotional life, rejected Hegel's attempt to understand time in a rational, and yet fluid and 'living' manner. Having found Hegel's middle-ground objectionable, some theorists adamantly retained an allegiance to the more traditional mathematical forms of rationality in conjunction with a commitment to the idea of historical development, while others rejected the idea that history has an ultimate goal at all, advocating instinct, emotion, and chance aligned with a conception of time as a force of destruction and endless revolution.

So during the nineteenth century, alternative ways to understand the nature of time issued from the growing awareness of time's passing, and these ways were embodied in the scientific rationalism and empiricism that remained committed to mathematical reason and the scientific method of the eighteenth century, in the dialectical rationality that took both idealistic and materialistic forms, and in a more extreme anti-rationalism that appeared as romanticism, instinctualism, and mysticism. A representative of these diverse intellectual forces – sometimes appearing in a complicated intermixture – we can associate the three thinkers mentioned above who significantly influenced the course of twentieth-century French philosophy: Sigmund Freud, who embodied the scientific mentality tempered with an awareness of the importance of human instinct, Karl Marx, whose dialectical materialism preserved the idea of a harmonious goal for human society, and Friedrich Nietzsche, whose intense respect for life and instinct led him to challenge the value of pure rationalistic and mathematically centered approaches to the world.

On the whole, the nineteenth century preserved a prevailing faith in human progress along with an accompanying enthusiasm for scientific inquiry as a way to achieve this progress. But this faith in progress was never total, since almost from the very start of the industrial revolution, dehumanizing forces were also associated with the forces of science and technology, and the notion of time itself remained puzzling. As the century wore on, a gradual questioning of the unqualified value of scientific inquiry increased, giving rise to more distinctively intuitive and poetic ways of understanding the nature of existence. So upon arriving at the initial years of the twentieth century, we witness a growing ambivalence towards science, for almost simultaneous with one of the greatest advances in theoretical physics was one of the most devastating of wars – a war fueled by the newest technologies of destruction.

Throughout twentieth-century French philosophy, we find an ambivalence towards science expressed in a series of reactions against scientific, and especially technological, thinking – reactions which, ironically enough, sometimes ground themselves upon mechanical models of analysis that reflect the very technological mentality under criticism. We encounter repeated pleas for greater social responsibility, side-by-side with expressions of futility in recognition of human irrationality.

and the overall irrationality of the world. Numerous rejections of authoritarianism in general punctuate the century, some of which are accompanied by an appeal to be guided by the authority of 'language itself,' and some of which deny the absolute validity of all theorizing, while yet acknowledging an inexpressible reality beneath the appearances.

PART 1

SURREALISM, EXISTENTIALISM, AND VITALISM

The Surrealistic Setting: 1916–38

It is a recurring historical phenomenon that individuals who find themselves initially located in society as outcasts, radicals, subversives, criminals, and other kinds of non-mainstream types, often later become legitimated and honored as culturally vital heroes who once stood among the avant-garde. Once-obscure poets, novelists, and playwrights emerge to assume places at the center of the prevailing literary canon, fringe-party political revolutionaries rise to become world-historical heads of state, once-underappreciated musicians move into fashionable current to begin a previously unimagined cultural sound, and people who were once frowned upon by the social elite become overnight sensations as they are ushered into the limelight. On the negative side, the public recognition of protest-groups sometimes undermines the protesters by rendering their cause legitimate, as they slowly become redefined, digested, assimilated, and disarmed by the terms of acceptable language and acceptable media.

Such was the dual fate of the Dada artistic group which originated in the midst of the First World War, during the end of 1915 and the beginning of 1916. This artistic circle established itself in Zürich, Switzerland, as an attempt to raise a voice against the ongoing war in Europe, not by arguing positively for peace, but by protesting against the general cultural scene – one that they perceived to be responsible for the war. The Dadaists comprehended the established cultural atmosphere, as noted in the introduction above, in reference to an alienation-generating amalgam of rationalistic thinking, science, and technology that adhered to the preservation of order, systematicity, and methodicality. They opposed the standing arrangement of the social (dis)order during their time, and they believed firmly that European cultural values were not worth preserving, given how they were fueling the war that was then devastating Europe.

The most frequently encountered label that has been attached to the Dada movement is ‘nihilistic,’ the Dadaists have been perceived, and indeed they perceived themselves, as being against ‘everything,’ as they joked, recited nonsense poetry, danced around on stage in absurd costumes, and insulted their audiences. They embodied outrage and negation, gathering together regularly at the Cabaret Voltaire on Zürich’s Spiegelstrasse, where it was possible to witness escapades such as the following:

On the stage, keys and boxes were pounded to provide the music, until the infuriated public protested. Serener,¹⁸ instead of reciting poems, set a bunch of flowers at the foot of a dressmaker’s dummy. A voice, under a huge hat in the shape of a sugar-loaf, recited poems by Arp.¹⁹ Huelsenbeck^{20,21} screamed his poems louder and louder, while Tzara²² beat out the same rhythm *crescendo* on a big drum. Huelsenbeck and Tzara danced around grunting like bear cubs, or in sacks with top hats waddled around in an exercise called *noir cacadou*. Tzara invented chemical and static poems.²³

The Dada scenes conveyed a feeling of chaos, fragmentation, assault on the senses, absurdity

frustration of ordinary norms, pastiche, spontaneity, and posed robotic mechanism. They were scenes from a madhouse, performed by a group of sane and reflective people who were expressing their decided anger and disgust at the world surrounding them. The Dadaists organized a steely-toned carnival in their Swiss café, mimicking the chaotic insanity of the First World War in an effort to criticize it. But in place of bloody violence, they substituted zaniness, absurdity, laughter and jokes, they tried to defuse the seriousness of the general cultural chaos. They criticized the cultural scene by making light of it, perhaps in an effort to psychologically diffuse for themselves the horror it was generating.

To comprehend the Dada mentality, we can note its close and usually unrecognized coincidence with what Hegel described a century earlier as the 'skeptical' attitude. In his *Phenomenology of Spirit* (1807), he wrote the following:

[The skeptical attitude] declares the nothingness of seeing, hearing, etc., but it sees and hears, etc.; it declares the nothingness of moral principles, and yet it behaves in accord with these very principles. Its actions and its words continually contradict one other ... If likeness is pointed out to it, then it points out unlikeness; and then if one indicates that it had just pointed out unlikeness, then it turns around and points out likeness. Its talk is in fact like the quarrelling of obstinate children, one of whom says A when the other says B, and then says again B, when the other says A, and through the contradiction *with themselves* buy for themselves the fun [*Freude*] of remaining in contradiction *with each other*.²⁴

In tune with this skeptical and contrary attitude, the Dadaists claimed that in times of war, the slogan of Dada is peace, and in times of peace, the slogan of Dada is war.²⁵ Whenever they encountered a positive thesis, they immediately defined themselves against it. And predictably in tune with this form of skepticism, self-contradictory phrases sprinkle themselves across the Dada manifestos – phrases which proclaim that everything is false, that Dada is nothing, that there is no ultimate truth, that everything is absurd, that everything is incoherent and that there is no logic. They are phrases that present themselves in the manifestos as being true, meaningful, coherent, and logical, while they deny all truth, meaning, coherence, and logic.

When conceiving the Dada movement as a form of active-and-antagonistic skepticism, as a form of playful contrariness, and also as a form of intellectual violence, rather than as a kind of hopeless and indifferent nihilism, this artistic movement's influence upon subsequent French thought is more readily perceivable. We shall see, for example, that Hegel's discussion of skepticism also resonates well with the definitively poststructuralist conception of deconstruction advanced by Jacques Derrida in the 1960s. A Dada influence colors the 1970s writings of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari as well. And more generally, a skeptical attitude characterizes the wider sphere of twentieth-century French thought, insofar as there was a continued effort to secure a sense of freedom by taking a stance against the establishment by saying 'no' to the oppressive status quo, as it was conceived in various guises.

As will also become evident, such 'anti-establishment' sentiments appear not only in Derrida, Deleuze, and Guattari, but in Roland Barthes's view that language itself is oppressively 'fascist' in how it determines our styles of thinking, in Michel Foucault's 'negative' conception of power as an external social force of mental and bodily manipulation, in Luce Irigaray's conception of European languages as being inherently sexist and oppressive towards women, and in Jean-François Lyotard's conception of the scientific establishment as a one-dimensional and exclusionary enterprise that violently silences its opposition by denying people the very vocabulary in which to express

themselves. The Dadaists' earlier attempt to free themselves from the cultural array that was perpetuating war throughout most of the European mainland, stylistically parallels later attempts to combat the oppressive cultural arrays that were perceived to be damaging the health of the Western cultural spirit, namely, the forces of capitalism, fascism, sexism, science and technology.

Given that the Dadaists set themselves against whatever happened to come their way – they even set themselves against the art establishment itself –²⁶ it is no surprise that the earlier Dadaist manifestos (c. 1918) are antagonistic to Sigmund Freud's psychoanalysis, which had been growing in popularity. At the time, psychoanalysis remained a kindred spirit nonetheless, for Freud intended psychoanalysis to be subversive: although its critics pointed out that psychoanalytic theory conservatively located its understanding of the human psyche within the contours of the traditional family unit, psychoanalysis still carried an intellectual and revolutionary bite. For perhaps more influentially, Freud maintained that to understand the human psyche, it is essential to understand human instinct, which he believed has a murderous aspect. This Freudian concern with human instinct led to a theory that, for the late Victorian era, involved a radical, upsetting and offensively microscopic and (allegedly shameless) attention to sexual energies and social taboos. Psychoanalysis drew attention to what it believed to be the source of these energies, namely, wild and unconscious states of mind, and this aspect of the psyche soon captured the interests of the surrealists, owing to the connections Freud discerned between unconscious energies, and creativity, spontaneity, dreams, non-rationality, and liberation from civilized norms.

Although Freud eventually refined his theory of mind from a two-aspect 'conscious vs. unconscious' model (c. 1900) to a three-aspect 'ego, superego, and id' model (c. 1923), each component of which could have unconscious aspects, he characterized the core of unconscious life as an aspect of the psyche which he termed the 'id'²⁷ – in a manner that underscored its socially threatening nature:

[The id] is the dark, unapproachable part of our personality ... we call it a chaos, a cauldron full of bubbling excitations ... it has no organization, summons up no collective will, only the endeavor to produce the satisfaction of instinctual needs in accord with the pleasure principle. Concerning the goings-on in the id, the logical laws of thought have no application, above all the law of contradiction. Opposing movements exist next to each other, without reconciling each other or drawing energies away from each other ... In the id, one finds nothing that corresponds to the representation of time ...

One can take for granted that the id recognizes no values, no good and evil, no morality.²⁸

Even to the Dadaists, the subversive nature of Freud's theory of the unconscious soon became clear, and is evident from later Dadaist statements that praise unconscious energies as being inexhaustible and uncontrollable, and that regard creative energies as being among the chaotic and illogical manifestations of life, as they stand in the same spirit as wild tribal dances.²⁹ In the waning phases of the Dada movement, their representatives admitted the importance of unconscious energies, and their own adherence to contrariness and irrationality gradually intermingled with the sentiments of the surrealists, who, as central to their artistic vision, expressly advocated the need for artists to tap into their instinctive, non-rational energies.

Complementing the Romanian Dada-manifesto writer, Tristan Tzara, André Breton (1896–1966) – French poet, essayist, critic, and editor – emerged as the main author of the surrealist³⁰ manifesto during the 1920s. For Breton, Freud's emphasis upon dreams, along with the psychoanalytic

therapeutic technique of ‘free association,’ was of the most striking artistic importance. Seeking to explore the contents of his patients’ unconscious thought-processes more effectively, Freud often asked his patients to relax upon a couch and to associate freely whatever ideas came to mind. This free association was done in relation to some given stimulus idea that was perceived to be central to the person’s troubled mental condition. Freud’s therapeutic hope was to generate a cluster of associations that would emerge without the interference of the filtering and censorship mechanisms that a person ordinarily has comfortably and controllingly in place. His aim was to stimulate the person to ‘dream out loud, to speak from his or her unconscious, in order for obscured and repressed meanings to emerge, thus revealing more explicitly the inner tensions that were troubling the person.

Breton was interested specifically in the nature of artistic creation, and he found the method of free association, or ‘automatic writing,’ to be a method of pure expression. Using it to stimulate his own literary creativity, Breton used this method to generate texts, with results that surprised him in the degree to which they embodied high emotion, a wide-assortment of images, a vivid graphic quality, and periodic levity.³¹ By tapping into his unconscious energies, Breton discovered a more authentic mode of artistic expression – one that conveyed a revolutionary quality as well, for given Freud’s theory, the unconscious was also regarded as being notoriously free from social constraints, censorship, reason, and moral norms, and therefore, as an energy well-suited to dynamite the values of the established society within which he found himself.

By locating the source of authentic and liberating thought in the unconscious, and by understanding dreams to be expressions of the same, the surrealists aspired to integrate these unconscious energies into the social scene at large to illuminate, and also change, the standing social condition. Hence, he originated the term ‘surrealist’ as signifying a resolution and blend between dream and reality into what was hoped to be a truer, more liberated, daily condition. In a manner to be developed in later years by Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Luce Irigaray, one of the surrealists’ aims was to show that prevailing social norms are mostly artificial and fragile, and are therefore eminently changeable and reformable. By dissolving the myth that the standing social order is somehow natural, inevitable, and unchangeable, one opens the door for alternative social arrangements.

During the later 1930s, the French surrealist movement transformed to adopt communistic ideals and its desire for social reform, and it framed its revolutionary aspirations in the Marxist terms of a attack upon both capitalism and fascism, identifying the proletarian workers as among the foremost powers of social liberation. In general, by blending dream with reality, surrealist thinking aimed to stimulate a more passionate and instinctively energized consciousness of the ordinarily experienced world, and it intended to use its thought-provoking imagery to demythologize the illusions upon which rested the capitalist and fascistic social orders. Such socially reforming aspirations were shared by the remnant Dada artists who returned to Germany and who contributed a voice against Nazism during the 1930s; later, they were embodied in Roland Barthes’s thought of the 1950s, when he attempted to identify and undercut the myths supportive of French colonialism.

Contrary to the surrealist’s communistic intentions of the 1930s, there are conflicting revolutionary tendencies in at least one major style of surrealist expression, namely, that which portrays an imaginary scene in a manner that makes it look ‘real,’ as we find in contemporary virtual reality technology, surrealism’s twenty-first-century grandchild. This surrealist style does not obviously render our perception of the ordinary world more realistic, as the communists would have surrealists serve their interests; rather, it substitutes an artificial reality of different content for the ordinarily lived world, by constructing an unnerving blend of dream-imaginary states and the scenes typical

daily life. Just as René Descartes once questioned the veridicality of his immediate experience and wondered whether he might in fact be dreaming, as he actually sat before his fireplace, this virtual reality-centered, or 'photorealistic', style of surrealistic expression can undermine our confidence that what we are experiencing here and now is the true, natural, or actual world.³² Here, for instance, the artists intentionally confuse artistically generated forms with naturally occurring forms such that, in the end, a world which appears at first to be natural, can be revealed to be a gigantic stage-set, and bodies that appear to be living and breathing, can turn out to be robots. The Dada movement's predilection for the bizarre and the insane comes into play within this form of virtual reality, or photorealistic, surrealism.

This mode of photorealistic–surrealistic portrayal can nonetheless be appreciated as a revolutionary style of expression on those occasions when it stimulates people to question a particular political regime or social situation that has been previously accepted as 'normal.' This is the result desired, although they often use other means, by thinkers such as Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, and Irigaray – all of whom argue that our daily world is more artificial and socially constructed, than it is naturally given. The photorealistic–surrealistic style can, as noted, also foster a more private, idiosyncratic, disconnected and alienated relationship to the prevailing social world, for it can simulate a world of madness. And yet, when its devices are known and recognized as such, it can also be used in a merely entertaining and healthy way, as it plays less deceptively upon the difference between illusion and reality.

Despite its various employments, the influence of the surrealistic mentality in popular culture throughout the twentieth century – especially in the form of 'photorealistic' surrealism – can be seen to have continued long after the art-history-named movement entitled 'surrealism' transformed into an allegiance with communism during the late 1930s in France, and after its representatives migrated to other countries during the Second World War. If we consider the art-form of the motion picture, for instance, examples are present in the 1950s that offer a blend of dream and reality, and even more numerous examples of the surrealist spirit emerged thereafter to accumulate to the present day. All of which requires us to consider the extent to which surrealistic thinking runs throughout twentieth-century French philosophy.

To appreciate the presence of this surrealistic spirit in Western popular culture in general – one whose intensity appears to be sharply increasing – we can consider movies such as *Forbidden Planet* (1956), *Kwaidan* (1964),³³ *Juliet of the Spirits* (1965), *Solaris* (1972/2002), *The Sacrifice* (1986), *Jacob's Ladder* (1990), *Lost Highway* (1997), *The Matrix* (1999), *Existenz* (1999), *Vanilla Sky* (2001), *A Beautiful Mind* (2001), *Memento* (2001),³⁴ and *Mulholland Drive* (2002),³⁵ all of which portray how the world of daily life and the world of imagination can be brought into such a close coincidence, that one's confidence in what counts as 'real' becomes undermined. If such a condition is globalized, and one hypothesizes that an entire cultural condition can be describable as 'surrealist' (or in more contemporary terms, 'hyperrealist,' following Baudrillard), then one can wonder, taking Freudian psychoanalysis as the inspiration, whether estimations are in order about whether some governing aspects of the social condition are operating at a stronger level of fantasy and imagination – and hence, at a greater level of confusion and misapprehension of what is objectively happening – than previously has been the case.

That the former can be true, that the standing social condition can be regarded as containing notably disoriented and disorientating aspects, is a central theme expressed by the psychiatrist and social phenomenologist, R. D. Laing (1927–89). He wrote in *The Politics of Experience* (1967) that the

process of socialization whose result is the accepted definition of normality, can be construed as a series of variously structured processes that deform human experience, rather than actualize it into a condition of maturity and fulfillment. Which is to say that, given the lead of our above examples, what is accepted as 'normal' in a photorealistic-surrealist culture, namely, inversions, confusion, transformations, and blends between the rock-hard, physically tangible world and the imaginary world of social construction, can be regarded as 'abnormal' when seen from a more down-to-earth condition. For the latter standpoint tempts one to conclude that the contemporary powers of imagination, fabrication, and rhetorical 'spin' are operating in excess. Those who can perceive the social order as being disconcertingly 'surrealistic,' are in a position to understand the degree to which the social order has been artificially constructed, just as a psychiatrist can understand 'from the inside' the mental states of his patients, but also contrast those states with his or her own states of mind which are presumably more reflectively perceived and soberly understood.

In the pages that follow, we will note the influences of Dada and Surrealism upon key twentieth-century French thinkers, and implicitly introduce the question of whether present-day, early twenty-first-century Western culture, to the extent that it displays surrealistic qualities, remains therapeutically open to the style of demythologizing social criticism that was advanced in the 1950s and 1990s by thinkers such as Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, Irigaray, Deleuze, Lyotard, and Baudrillard. With this suggestion, we will underscore the phenomenon of how an intellectual movement which was once revolutionary, can become socially entrenched to the point where it has assumed the role of the status quo, and where, in turn, it stands itself in need of criticism and reform. By pointing out the surrealistic undercurrent in twentieth-century French thought, some illumination, and a potential critique, of twenty-first-century surrealistic-hyperrealistic culture can be brought to the surface. In the latter respect, this fundamentally historical survey and analysis of the various French theorists serves as a signpost for social criticism in the spirit of those French theorists. By wondering about the degree to which mainstream Western society has become surrealistic, we can begin to discern the degree of artificiality, and thereby, the degree of potentiality for revolutionary reform, that characterizes our present cultural situation.

Henri Bergson, Philosopher (1859–1941)

Life and works

Henri Bergson was born in Paris on October 18, 1859: his mother was English and his Polish father was a composer and music teacher. During his youth, Bergson received an education of excellent quality, and after graduating from the prestigious *École Normale Supérieure*^{36,37} at the age of twenty-two, he was appointed to teach philosophy in a *lycée*³⁸ in Angers. For nearly the next twenty years Bergson taught in various *lycées*, mainly at the Lycée Henri IV, where he worked from 1890 to 1899 (ages 31–39). When Bergson was thirty-nine, he was appointed to teach at the *École Normale Supérieure*, and two years later (1900) he became a Professor of Philosophy at the Collège de France (founded in 1520), where he worked until his retirement in 1921 at age sixty-two. During the course of his career, Bergson wrote a series of philosophical works which became widely known, and which eventually brought him the status of being one of the most highly respected philosophers in France. In connection with this achievement, he was awarded the 1927 Nobel Prize for Literature. At the age of eighty-one, Bergson died from pneumonia on January 4, 1941 during the German occupation of France, after having stood for hours in line in the cold weather, as he waited to register with the authorities as a person of Jewish heritage.

Evolutionary theory and Bergson's ambivalence towards science

Bergson accepted the evolutionary theory of his time to the extent that he regarded the human intellect as having emerged from the adaptations of our primate ancestors to their natural environment. Specifically, he maintained that the human analytical intellect is primarily a bodily capacity for solving practical problems, such as those involved in finding food and in securing a means of protection from environmental threats. This practical and puzzle-solving feature of the intellect's workings led him to question whether this capacity of the human mind is naturally well-suited for other, more speculative, activities, such as apprehending the ultimate truth of the world.

Bergson believed that the intellect, along with the styles of scientific–mathematical inquiry that issue from it, may help us physically survive, but he was skeptical about its effectiveness in acquiring knowledge of the universe's core realities. He wondered whether the mathematical, analytical, practically oriented intellect – the kind of intellect that would be useful if one were an engineer – was appropriate for philosophical knowledge. There was a serious question in his mind regarding the power of the analytical, logical understanding with respect to its ability to answer questions about the nature of reality.

Bergson's philosophy consequently explored the powers of the calculating, practical-problem-solving intellect (he is comparable to Immanuel Kant in this respect)³⁹ to discover exactly what kind of knowledge the intellect can provide. He reasoned that if analytical thinking is not powerful enough to illuminate metaphysical problems, then we must find some other way to grasp the basic truths of existence, if they are accessible at all. To begin his inquiry, and to distinguish more precisely between the discursive intellect and that part of the mind which he believed can allow us to apprehend metaphysical truth, Bergson contrasted two kinds of knowledge, namely, absolute knowledge and relative knowledge.

Knowledge: absolute vs. relative

According to Bergson, there are two ways of knowing a thing:

If we compare the various ways of defining metaphysics and of conceiving the absolute, we shall find, despite apparent discrepancies, that philosophers agree in making a deep distinction between two ways of knowing a thing. The first implies going all around it, the second entering into it. The first depends upon the viewpoint chosen and the symbols employed, while the second is taken from no viewpoint and rests on no symbol. Of the first kind of knowledge we shall say that it stops at the *relative*; of the second that, wherever possible, it attains the *absolute*.⁴⁰

When I speak of an absolute movement [i.e., absolute knowledge of movement], it means that I attribute to the mobile an inner being and, as it were, states of soul; it also means that I am in harmony with these states and enter into them by an effort of imagination.⁴¹

It follows that an absolute can only be given in an *intuition*, while all the rest has to do with *analysis*. We call intuition here the sympathy by which one is transported into the interior of an object in order to coincide with what there is unique and consequently inexpressible in it.⁴²

The above remarks assert that we can acquire absolute knowledge of something only when we enter into it, as opposed to merely circling around the outside of it. We can acquire this knowledge when we become the thing itself, or are that thing in some sense, such that we perfectly coincide with it. Supposedly, such absolute knowledge does not use symbols, representatives or substitutes of the thing we wish to know; absolute knowledge is a direct, immediate, internal, experiential and intuitive knowledge of the thing itself.

Bergson's conception of absolute knowledge might seem to be easily understandable and achievable, and it has implications for how we should address philosophical questions. It implies, Bergson believes, that answers to philosophical questions will not be found in any book. Philosophical answers will only be found in having a certain kind of direct experience that is recognizable as authentic, truthful, revealing, and foundational. In this connection, he introduces the idea of sympathy (or, more precisely, empathy) as a means of grasping absolute truths. If one can empathize with another being fully, then one becomes that other being, understanding from the inside what it is like to be that being and thereby dissolving all alienation and feelings of otherness with respect to that being. Achieving this coincidence in sentiment is to achieve absolute knowledge of the being in question.

As we can see, Bergson's focus upon empathy differs from the attempt to understand something

- [download online Curtain \(Hercule Poirot, Book 39\) pdf](#)
- [Basic Writing online](#)
- **[download French Business Situations A Spoken Language Guide here](#)**
- [read Religion Without God](#)

- <http://aneventshop.com/ebooks/Philosophy--Psychoanalysis-and-Emancipation--Collected-Papers-of-Herbert-Marcuse--Volume-5-.pdf>
- <http://unpluggedtv.com/lib/Alice-Adams.pdf>
- <http://www.freightunlocked.co.uk/lib/French-Business-Situations-A-Spoken-Language-Guide.pdf>
- <http://www.gruppoacusma.com/?freebooks/Rockin---Out--Popular-Music-in-the-U-S-A--6th-Edition-.pdf>