

SIGMUND'S ASIAN FAN-CLUB? THE FREUD FRANCHISE AND INDEPENDENCE OF MIND IN INDIA AND JAPAN¹

CHRISTOPHER HARDING

This field of science is still in an embryonic stage, which is why it provides the best opportunity to say anything one wishes to.
—Rabindranath Tagore, 1931; qtd. in Biswas: 717

Not long after Sigmund Freud's death an enormous map of the world entitled *The Growth of the Psycho-Analytic Movement* was created, on which cities where psychoanalysis had taken root were proudly marked out and numbered.² Calcutta, Tokyo and Sendai were recorded as the first Asian hubs for the discipline, organised interest emerging there in the 1920s and 30s as part of a first generation of psychoanalytical societies to sign up to the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) following its founding in 1910. Grand cartography was in keeping with Freud's own recognition of quasi-colonialist dimensions to the psychoanalytic movement and his personal role as a sort of human metropole, receiving visitors in Vienna from across the world and writing to the Indian psychoanalytic pioneer Girindrasekhar Bose of his pleasure at the "proud conquests" made by psychoanalysis overseas (Freud 1931a), including in Bose's "far-off country" (Freud 1921).

In addition to Freud's celebration of European centrality in psychoanalysis, the chauvinistic tone of Ernest Jones and the early IPA, and a series of now infamously defamatory psychoanalytical "discoveries" made about non-European peoples, early psychoanalysis bore one further mark of its inception in the modern colonial era. It faced a dilemma familiar both to the idealistic end of colonialism and to many Western Christian mission societies: how to spread and to maintain a certain power of direction over a set of ideas—psychoanalytic technique and theory, "civilised" socio-political structures, various Christianities—while at the same time, for the sake of universalist claims made for those ideas,

needing them to resonate naturally and independently around the world and to develop there with a degree of spontaneity.

Early psychoanalysis was particularly challenging in this regard: a rapidly expanding universe of insights and concepts—part science, part philosophy, part medicine and part cultural critique—seemingly limited only by the ambitions, interests and problems motivating a first generation of practitioners. In Japan and India this highly personal dynamic in the development of psychoanalysis was enhanced by the pioneers' geographical, linguistic and cultural distance from professional colleagues in Europe and America, and by the imperfect nature of communications amongst Indian and Japanese pioneers themselves. Nor did the tendency for Asian scholarly appreciation of Freud to emerge via the world of psychiatry seem to supply natural boundaries for the development of the new discipline: the hostility towards psychoanalysis inherited by Indian and Japanese psychiatric establishments from their (mostly German) foreign mentors was so fierce that psychoanalytic pioneers felt themselves for the most part relieved of any pressure to rein in their work in the hope of achieving respectability amongst such colleagues. At meetings of the Japanese Society of Psychiatry and Neurology, presentations on psychoanalysis were often timetabled for the end of the afternoon as a form of entertainment, where they could be relied upon to descend into colourful rancour (Takeda 124). And it is significant that of three key figures in Asian psychoanalysis who began their work in university departments—Kiyoyasu Marui and Heisaku Kosawa at Tohoku Imperial University in Sendai, and Girindrasekhar Bose at Calcutta University—only Marui seemed to be at home in such an environment. Kosawa would eventually leave Tohoku and set himself up in private practice in Tokyo, while Bose's real centre of creative activity was the Indian Psychoanalytical Society, with its intimate, cosmopolitan gatherings of doctors, academics, writers and other interested parties. (On *adda* and "sociality" in the context of groups like these, see Chakrabarty; Kapila). The Tokyo Psychoanalytical Society attracted a similarly diverse cross-section of middle-class society, some of its members simply glad to have found a forum where topics regarded as taboo—such as homosexuality—could be freely and intelligently discussed (Angles 4, 250, 270).

This comparative freedom from constraints meant that the small band of doctors and intellectuals who first took to the discipline in India and Japan were able to wield, early on at least, an unusual degree of influence over its public understanding and professional development. Precisely how such processes of local influence operated—key individuals acting through their psychoanalytic societies, publications, popular press articles, public

lectures, university courses and clinical practice—is the focus of an emerging area of study in Asian social and medical history (Hartnack; Basu; Nandy; Kapila; Blowers and Yang). The present paper focuses on a single dimension of this larger story; exploring major themes in Freud’s relationships with some of the principal Japanese and Indian pioneers of psychoanalysis, as a way of illuminating the “practically mediated relations” (Thomas 3) upon which the projection, manipulation and distortion of celebrity turns.

The potentially profound and intimate nature of the ideas involved in the discussion and practice of psychoanalysis helped to ensure that Freud’s celebrity—both Freud’s use of it and, perhaps more crucially, its appreciation and deployment by Asian practitioners—evolved through relationships between Freud and these Indian and Japanese practitioners in which the precise balance of power and diverse self-interest is difficult to discern. Freud hoped to use his celebrity to guarantee the success in Asia of an approved form of psychoanalysis, at a time when his movement was suffering in Europe at the hands of critics from without and dissenters from within. Asian practitioners had quite distinct expectations of Freud. Each succeeded in creating a useful “Freud,” in personal, professional and popular terms, which is detectable in their personal correspondence with and reminiscences about Freud and which spilled out from there into their professional lives. The outcome resembled a *de facto* franchise arrangement whereby “Freud” remained central and coherent but with a crucial necessary flexibility in the hands of a small group of practitioners upon whose enthusiasm the success of psychoanalysis depended. They rarely behaved as a “fan-club” in any slavish way, but in the truer sense of a group of people whose relationships with celebrity are characterised by a blend of respect, identification and the substitution of myriad unknowns about the man himself with something fashioned to meet their own needs.

Early Asian psychoanalysis seems to stand apart from the deep and insipid form of epistemic colonialism seen in the misuse of European psychiatric ideas and institutions in colonised Asia and Africa. The relationships of India and Japan with Europe in this period were in any case vastly different: India under direct colonial rule, Japan emerging as a regional colonial power (albeit a form of imperialism with strong European cultural and political roots). In both contexts deep forms of self- and cultural-assertion in the way that Asian pioneers of psychoanalysis approached their relationships with Freud point not so much to a hand-in-hand relationship of celebrity and colonialism but to the capacity of the former to circumvent and to undermine the latter.

Ambition, Inquiry, Confession: Freud's Japanese Correspondents

Freud's principal Japanese correspondents and acquaintances in the world of psychoanalysis were Kiyoyasu Marui, a professor of psychiatry, his pupil Heisaku Kosawa, and Yaekichi Yabe. All exchanged letters with Freud, as well as meeting him in person. Marui had been using psychoanalysis in his clinical work in Sendai by the time he began writing to Freud in 1927 (in English, usually receiving replies in German). Marui initially appeared from his writings to be interested simply in apprising Freud of early developments in Japan and in gaining publication rights to disseminate Freud's ideas in Japanese. Freud happily obliged, expressing the hope that Japan was sufficiently free of the "prejudices that have caused difficulties for analysis in Europe and America" (a likely reference to prudishness) to allow psychoanalysis to make strong progress there (Freud 1927). It was only when the situation became more complicated, with other Japanese enthusiasts including Yaekichi Yabe coming onto the scene, that a remarkable degree of personal ambition on Marui's part revealed itself, together with the role that Marui expected Freud to play.

Having received Freud's translation permissions and publishers' contact details in 1927, Marui did not write to Freud for three years. Freud seems to have assumed that Marui was one of many correspondents whose interest in psychoanalysis was rather fleeting, and so granted a request by Yaekichi Yabe, based in Tokyo, for publication rights and permission to establish a Japanese branch of the IPA. Marui was irate when he read of all this from Freud in 1931, penning a long letter in reply in which he staked his claim to leadership of the psychoanalytic movement in Japan and demanded Freud's backing. Marui implied that he had been in at, or near, the beginning of the movement worldwide, developing an interest in psychoanalysis while studying psychiatry with Adolf Meyer in the US during the time of the First World War (Marui 1931)—Marui had initially planned to go to Germany but was thwarted by the outbreak of hostilities in Europe. In support of his contention Marui cited his publications of Freud's works which were already on shelves or in press, in addition to his teaching and popular publications (towards the "enlightenment of the Japanese public") and his Sendai clinic's high scientific standing. Marui warned Freud that although he realised it would "contribute much to the prosperity of the psychoanalytic movement" in Japan if he contacted Yabe and the psychoanalytic society in Tokyo, his "pride in life as a scientist, especially [a] psychoanalyst" prevented him from joining the Tokyo group.

For Marui, Yabe was a nobody; simply someone “said to have studied psychoanalysis somewhere in the United States,” who had (albeit with Freud’s blessing) applied the name Japan Psychoanalytical Society to a casual grouping of like-minded and similarly unqualified friends. Marui, for his part, saw psychoanalysis in terms of a line of legitimacy flowing ultimately from Freud through his circle in Europe, and had hoped to be analysed by Freud prior to establishing a Japanese Psychoanalytical Society. “I waited and waited for the time to come, when the Imperial Japanese Government [would] send me for a second time to foreign lands” (Marui 1931). Under the present circumstances, Marui could only push Freud to let him form an alternative psychoanalytic society, to be called the Sendai Psychoanalytical Society (an innovation for which, as Marui pointed out, a precedent existed in the New York Psychoanalytic Society).

Marui was clearly desperate to convince Freud of his case and to bring him onside: Marui’s early correspondence with Meyer contains no mention of any interest in psychoanalysis (Blowers and Yang, “Freud’s Deshi” 116), and although Marui claimed to have tried to visit Freud on his way back to Japan from the US in 1918/19 (political complications prevented him from doing so), strangely he did not contact Freud for nearly ten years after that. Marui’s silence after receiving Freud’s publication permissions in 1927 is also rather suspect. By way of explanation to Freud he said only that he had been too “lazy” to endure the “difficulty” of writing letters in foreign languages (Marui 1931).

Not only did Marui appear to be unaffected by Freud’s celebrity, but even at the more modest level of legitimacy as a psychoanalyst he appeared to regard Freud’s personal value not as intrinsic—he practiced and published quite happily for many years without feeling the need to contact Freud—but rather as functional, in a Japanese context where ideas with a strong European connection, particularly when linked to a big name, were at an advantage in garnering respectful intellectual interest. Makoto Takeda, once a student of Heisaku Kosawa, notes with regret in his book on Japanese psychoanalysis that even Japanese ideas about mental health in this period tended to find a larger audience in Japan once they had been exported to Europe and America and had returned to Japan with a stamp of approval. He cites Shōma Morita’s “Morita Therapy” as an example (Takeda 84). Marui hoped that a meeting with Freud would eventually solidify his position once and for all. He begged Freud in 1930 to “let me study on some subject, and take me as a pupil of yours” (Marui 1930), and noted in his diary not long after finally meeting Freud in 1933: “I am pleased to have met Freud [...] upon returning to Japan there will be no criticism accusing me of promoting a non-orthodox school of

psychoanalysis” (Blowers and Yang, “Ohtsuki” 31). Such concerns overrode any direct interest either in Freud or in the progress of psychoanalysis internationally, and Marui was not prepared to be pushed around by Freud if it ran against his ambitions.

Freud sensed as much; his replies were gently cajoling—expressing “regret” and “wonder” to Marui that “you never in all these years attempted to get in touch with me.” He gave permission for the Sendai Society to go ahead but urged Marui to merge with the Tokyo group. At the same time he expressed sympathy with Marui’s desire to be “at the head of the [psychoanalytic] Movement in Japan” but asked him to keep in mind the wider “interests of our science.” In an endearingly paternalistic gesture, Freud thanked Marui for a gift of money he had received for his 75th birthday but commented that the best present he could receive would be Marui’s co-operation (Freud 1931a).

Marui’s idea of Freud and attempts to deploy him to his professional advantage in Japan stand in contrast to a more personal yearning apparent in letters to Freud written by Marui’s pupil at Tohoku, Heisaku Kosawa. Kosawa contacted Freud in 1925,³ two years before Marui, writing in faltering and rather eccentric German: “I have a burning desire, like that of Christendom for holy Jerusalem, to meet you and to come into contact with your great mind, although it sometimes seems to me as though I already know you from studying your work” (Kosawa 1925).

Kosawa appears to have been motivated primarily by a nagging awareness that despite the “profundity” of Freud’s thought and its universal applicability—Kosawa likened Freud’s keen insights into the human mind to someone observing cell-structures under the microscope—linguistic and conceptual barriers were compromising Kosawa’s study of psychoanalysis. He hoped that a personal relationship with Freud would mitigate the difficulty “for us Japanese to penetrate the way of thinking of the European” (Kosawa 1925), and in contrast to Marui’s apparent lethargy where writing in foreign languages was concerned, Kosawa persevered in German to describe to Freud the points on which he had so far failed to understand his meaning.

It would be unwise to infer too much solely from Kosawa’s letters to Freud when so much key information about Kosawa has yet to come to light (his diaries and case notes remain un-archived and have long been off-limits), but from an account given by Kosawa’s pupil, friend and biographer, Makoto Takeda, it seems clear that Kosawa was searching for an understanding of human behaviour which offered an appropriately contemporary and scientific dimension to the Buddhist leanings he had developed during his school days. Kosawa’s interest in both Buddhism

and psychoanalysis was very much focused around personal relationships. One of the key friendships of his life was with a Shin Buddhist priest, Chikazumi Jōkan, with whom he discussed everything from the writings of Shinran to the findings of psychoanalysis. Kosawa's son, Yorio, remembers as a boy running messages across Tokyo between Chikazumi Jōkan and his father (Kosawa "Personal Interviews"). Heisaku Kosawa hoped for a similarly close and fruitful relationship with Freud, apprising him of links he had found between psychoanalysis and Buddhist teachings (connecting, for example, Freud's theory of a repetition compulsion to the problem of human clinging identified by Buddha) and putting a series of questions and suggestions to him in his letters.

So keen was Kosawa to strike up this kind of relationship with Freud by 1931, and so disillusioned was he with Marui as a mentor—despairing, in fact, of finding anyone in Japan who could help him progress in his studies (Kosawa 1932)—that he persuaded his brother to fund him on a trip to Europe rather than wait for the Japanese Ministry of Education to approve a foreign study application. Kosawa's first-hand recollections of his two meetings with Freud, in February and November 1932, await the de-restriction of Freud Archive files and the opening to scholars of Kosawa's own papers, but Takeda's biography offers a written account by Kosawa most likely derived from some of these materials.⁴

Kosawa was excited about meeting "a genius gaining in world popularity," but this aspect of Freud's celebrity interested him far less than the way Freud's personal achievements as a human being shone through his advancing years, his modest physical stature, and the lack of clarity in his speech (the result of a recent operation for maxillary cancer). Kosawa saw and described Freud's virtues rather idealistically, through a Japanese Buddhist lens: Freud appeared free from any desire to manipulate Kosawa, such that his very presence cleared Kosawa's mind of the mundaneness of "pretence," "ambition," and "vanity" (qtd. in Takeda: 141). Kosawa later wrote to Freud of his wish "to experience my perfection through you" (Kosawa 1932). So keen was Kosawa to know as much about Freud as possible over the course of a short interview that he applied his understanding of psychoanalysis to interpret slips in Freud's conversation and in his actions—particularly when, at the end of the interview, Freud went to press a bell and switched off the light by mistake, which Kosawa attributed to an unconscious desire on Freud's part to have him stay longer (Takeda 143).

Kosawa's account of his meeting with Freud contrasts with Marui's short and slightly hubristic account of his own meeting with Freud a year later, in August 1933: in a single paragraph written in 1952 for the benefit

of the Freud Archives, Marui offered just a brief description of Freud's incapacity, mentioned his "friendliness and cordial attitude," and claimed that Freud had been "deeply moved" to meet him, "his eyes glisten[ing] with tears" (Marui 1952). And yet Freud's attitude towards the two men was similar. There is no evidence that Freud reciprocated Kosawa's attempts to establish a meaningful personal relationship, instead impressing upon Kosawa the importance of undergoing analysis himself, of learning German properly (Freud went as far as to suggest the "company of a lady" as a study aid), and of co-ordinating the psychoanalytic effort in Japan (Takeda 143). Since Freud's critique of Kosawa's idea of the Ajase Complex, intended as a Japanese variation on the Oedipus Complex, is currently unavailable it remains an open question as to how far Freud seriously engaged Kosawa even on a professional theoretical plane.

Invention, Ambivalence, Telling Tales: Freud's Indian Correspondents

In India the most important correspondent of Freud's was Girindrasekhar Bose, a middle-class urban Bengali who received the first Indian doctorate in psychology in 1921 and went on to found the Indian Psychoanalytical Society (IPS) the following year. Elements of both Marui and Kosawa are mirrored in Bose's attitude towards psychoanalysis and Freud; Marui in Bose's keen sense of the discipline's progress in his own country, Kosawa in Bose's attraction to Freud's work in part because it offered fresh methodological possibilities where cherished philosophical ideas were concerned.

Bose's correspondence with Freud across twenty-four letters revolved largely around disagreements about Bose's approach to psychoanalysis. Neither Kosawa nor Bose had much time for a dichotomised science vs. philosophy view of the world or of the mind, and Freud himself was less hostile to the philosophical outlook than is often appreciated.⁵ But Freud strongly criticised Bose's "opposite wish" theory of repression, professing himself—in typically proprietorial style—"glad to testify to the correctness of the principal views and the good sense appearing [in Bose's *Concept of Repression*]" but perturbed by the "great part" played in Bose's work by "theoretical reasoning and deduction, [which] with us is rather treated empirically" (Freud 1921). For Freud, "us" was of course the European vanguard of the psychoanalytic movement, and as with Kosawa Freud moved quickly to prescribe a good dose of German psychoanalytic literature to put Bose on the right track (Freud 1921). Elsewhere, Freud

contrasted his own “practical” approach with Bose’s “philosophical” one (book review included with Freud 1922), and it is arguable that only the distance between Europe and India and the lack of a meeting between the two men prevented a significant breach occurring between them. Like Carl Jung, Bose could claim to have been working on similar ideas to Freud before ever hearing of him, including the use of hypnosis with patients. Even after 1909, when Bose first heard of Freud, he initially had only “magazine articles and scrappy references” to go on, such was the lack of English translations of Freud’s work at the time (Bose, *Concept of Repression* v).

Given the colonial context, it is unsurprising that serious questions have been asked about a possible political dimension to the relationship between the two men, with attempts made to read into Bose’s forthrightness in the face of Freud’s criticisms some hint of anti-colonial struggle. It is by no means reliably clear that Bose was moved in this way, however, nor that he was interested in deploying Freud in order to enhance his professional standing locally, as Marui tried to do (this was partly because Bose never faced any serious challenge as leader of the psychoanalytic movement in Calcutta, establishing the IPS in January 1922 and receiving regular mentions in the proceedings and journals of the IPA)⁶. Despite the near-simultaneous births of Indian psychoanalysis and a mass Indian nationalist movement (*The Concept of Repression* and the IPS emerged at the same time as Gandhian non-cooperation), Bose’s writings contained nothing in the way of sustained social or political commentary, and he seemed content to suggest to Freud that Indian and European patients exhibited slightly differing psychological traits—he had worked with both sets of patients, whereas Freud had not⁷—and that Indian philosophy offered universally relevant insights into the human mind. He never pushed either idea very far in his letters to Freud.

In addition, while other intellectuals in India drew vigorously on the country’s cultural heritage in order to bolster a process of political assertion, the opportunities provided here by psychoanalysis went largely unexploited by Bose. It is possible that he feared for the progress of psychoanalysis in Calcutta University and for the IPS should the British come to associate the discipline with anti-colonial ideas and propaganda, but it seems more likely that Bose was simply uninterested in either politicising or personalising his disagreements with Freud, and preferred a back seat where politics in general was concerned.⁸

Instead Bose was interested first and foremost in the utility of psychoanalysis, in a country where, as he noted at the first meeting of the IPS, mental illness had so far barely received medical attention and a

diverse socio-religious culture ensured an intriguing psychological plurality worthy of serious study (“History” 1923: 250). It is in a context of promoting psychoanalysis—Bose wrote about dreams, “Sex in Psychoanalysis,” and “Crime and Psychoanalysis” (Bose 1929a)—that Bose’s dealings with Freud make the greatest sense. Bose was happy to use Freud’s synonymy with psychoanalysis and his growing global fame to stir public interest in a local version of psychoanalysis which, as Amit Basu has suggested, placed Freud’s insights side by side with Bose’s own critiques and modifications (Basu 36-54). This mood of original scholarship and public education was abroad in Bose’s circle more generally, and when Bose’s performance as a “psychological expert witness” for the defence in a murder trial sparked a popular interest in the psychopathology of murderers, a paper on the topic was quickly put together by his colleague Sarasilal Sarkar (see “History” 1925: 240-2; “History” 1926: 292).

Bose was not without a modicum of respect and affection for Freud—requesting a photograph of Freud in 1921 for which he claimed “myself, my relations and friends and a wide circle of admirers have long been eager” (Bose 1921a), and sending Freud for his 75th birthday a magnificent carved statue of Vishnu—but in Bose’s thinking psychoanalytic ideas themselves, which were no-one’s possession and which in any case resembled closely the insights of ancient Indian philosophers, clearly came first. Freud, like Bose, was simply a conduit for these ideas, albeit particularly visionary. It was in this spirit that Bose sought from Freud official comments on books (Bose 1921a), thoughts on university psychology courses (Bose 1921b), and even a visit to India to give a series of lectures at Calcutta University (Bose 1922a). Like Marui, Bose’s commitment to the progress of psychoanalysis in his own country eclipsed Freud’s concerns about the movement internationally. Ashis Nandy and Amit Basu have both noted Bose’s intellectual fluency and flair in Bengali and his comparative reticence when writing in English. Moreover, Bose took only a limited interest in the IPA and never made the pilgrimage to visit Freud in Vienna,⁹ even though he shared with Kosawa the financial advantage of a wealthy and understanding brother.

Correspondence between Bose and Freud dried up completely for nearly seven years after 1922, prompting Freud to express his regret to Bose in 1929 that “since you joined our Association [...] our Indian group did not attain closer contact with the others” (Freud 1929). Freud may have wished that Bose was as willing a fan and as keen a letter writer as D.L. Datta, another resident of Calcutta and an (unanalysed) amateur enthusiast of psychoanalysis. His series of letters to Freud in the late 1930s

were little more than uncoordinated ponderings on various aspects of human life about which he thought psychoanalysis might have something to say, from the question of why the “civilised world [considers] dark to be the inferior colour”—Datta suggested that “dark” was actually a repressed preference, originating in the child’s desire for the mother’s dark nipple (Datta 1938a)—to attitudes towards homosexuality (“I cannot understand why homosexuality is considered hateful,” he wrote; Datta 1938b). Datta did, however seek a certain closeness to Freud, which he tried to establish by informing Freud conspiratorially of the personal “psychoanalytical *Weltanschauung*” which Bose was in the process of putting together, “deviat[ing] from you no less than Jung and Adler. [...] He is always preaching his doctrine and everyone believes it. [...] I wish this should be subjected to criticism” (Datta 1938a).

Datta seems not to have been aware of the contacts between Freud and Bose’s IPS, and frustratingly Freud’s replies to Datta’s letters are lost to us. Datta himself refers to one such reply from Freud, however, dated 19th July 1938. Possibly fed up with the nature and frequency of Datta’s correspondence, Freud had cautioned him “not to rely on speculation” and not to treat psychoanalysis as “intellectual sport” (Datta 1939).

Conclusion

Would the likes of Heisaku Kosawa and Girindrasekhar Bose have been so attracted to psychoanalysis had they been born a generation later, when the discipline had hardened, institutionalised and become more technical, its initial openness—together with its founder—long gone? The very personal interests and concerns that drew such people to psychoanalysis in its early years clearly governed their dealings with Freud to a significant extent, resulting in the range of constructions of “Freud” and the uses of his celebrity explored in this chapter. The best Freud could do in this situation, where the need for control sat uneasily with the need for local resonance and spontaneity, was to point to Asian interest in psychoanalysis as a sign of his discipline’s universal appeal, and then, when it came to the details, simply to hear and humour, and hope for the best from his Japanese and Indian correspondents, who did at least claim to be flying his flag. Nevertheless, the short shrift Freud dished out in letters and meetings appeared to have little effect upon the ways in which key Asian pioneers thought about and used him.

And yet, just as Freud’s celebrity would never be something that Freud himself could simply mould and wield as he pleased in Asia—to the benefit of the discipline that he fought so hard in Europe to secure—Indian

and Japanese pioneers were subject to constraints of their own. Anyone seeking single-handedly to conjure “Freud” out of thin air for their own comfort, or as a marketing tool for their evolving psychoanalytic ideas, was destined to be disappointed in some way; by other psychoanalysts—Marui by Yabe, Datta by Bose—by Freud’s writings and influential position as a natural hub for early communication between psychoanalysts across the world, and finally by the man himself.

If this was truly a case of practically mediated—at times contested—relations, politics seemed rarely to be a factor. Against the backdrop of diplomatic and cultural internationalism after the First World War, this is perhaps understandable, but even the souring of global relations and the retreat into protectionism and belligerence of the late 1920s and early 1930s appeared not to affect Freud’s “fan-club” very greatly. Those disappointed by the lack of an anti-colonial dimension to early Asian psychoanalysis might find comfort, however, in the thought that possibly the highest act of resistance in a colonised context is to ignore it completely and simply get on with other things. In this sense, celebrity circumvented and undermined colonialism, by opening up an alternative universe of meaning and action for people like Kosawa and Bose and by inspiring new forms of self-assertion.

Works Cited

- Angles, Jeffrey. “Writing the Love of Boys: Representations of Male-Male Desire in the Literature of Murayama Kaita and Edogawa Ranpo.” PhD diss., Ohio State U, 2003.
- Basu, Amit. “The Coming of Psychoanalysis in Colonial India: The Bengali Writings of Dr. Girindrasekhar Bose.” *Culture and the Disciplines: Papers from the Cultural Studies Workshops*. Ed. Tapati Guha Thakurta. Calcutta: Calcutta Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, 1999.
- Biswas, S. “Rabindranath Tagore and Freudian Thought.” *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 84 (2003): 717-32.
- Blowers, Geoffrey, and Serena Yang Hsueh Chi. “Freud’s Deshi: The Coming of Psychoanalysis to Japan.” *Journal of the History of the Behavioural Sciences* 33.2 (1997): 115-26.
- . “Ohtsuki Kenji and the Beginnings of Lay Analysis in Japan.” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 82 (2001): 27-42.
- Bose, Girindrasekhar. *The Concept of Repression*. Calcutta: G. Bose, 1921.

- Letter to Sigmund Freud, undated, 1921a. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Sigmund Freud, 24 Nov. 1921b. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Sigmund Freud, 26 Jan. 1922a. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Sigmund Freud, undated, 1922b. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Sigmund Freud, 31 Jan. 1929a. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Sigmund Freud, 11 Apr. 1929b. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Datta, D.L. Letter to Sigmund Freud, 19 June 1938a. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Sigmund Freud, 2 July 1938b. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Sigmund Freud, 27 Jan. 1939. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Freud, Sigmund. Letter to Girindrasekhar Bose, 29 May 1921. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Girindrasekhar Bose, 20 Feb. 1922. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Kiyoyasu Marui, 10 Nov. 1927. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Girindrasekhar Bose, 2 Jan. 1929. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Kiyoyasu Marui, 15 Mar. 1931a. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Letter to Girindrasekhar Bose, 13 Dec. 1931b.
- Hartnack, Christiane. *Psychoanalysis in Colonial India*. New Delhi: OUP, 2001.
- “History of the Indian Psycho-analytical Society.” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 3 (1923): 249-52.
- “History of the Indian Psycho-analytical Society.” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 6 (1925): 240-2.
- “History of the Indian Psycho-analytical Society.” *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 7 (1926): 291-3.
- Kapila, Shruti. “The ‘Godless’ Freud and his Indian Friends: An Indian Agenda for Psychoanalysis.” *Psychiatry and Empire*. Ed. Sloan

- Mahone and Megan Vaughan. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. 124-52.
- Kosawa, Heisaku. Letter to Sigmund Freud, 15 Apr. 1925. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . Letter to Sigmund Freud, November 1931. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . Letter to Sigmund Freud, 13 Feb. 1932. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Kosawa, Yorio. Personal Interviews, December 2007 and April 2008.
- Marui, Kiyoyasu. Letter to Sigmund Freud, 13 Dec. 1930. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . Letter to Sigmund Freud, 2 Feb. 1931. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- . Letter to K.R. Eissler, Secretary of the Sigmund Freud Archives Inc., New York, 8 Dec. 1952. Sigmund Freud Archive, Library of Congress, Washington, DC.
- Nandy, Ashis. "The Savage Freud: The First Non-Western Psychoanalyst and the Politics of Secret Selves in Colonial India." *The Savage Freud and Other Essays on Possible and Retrievable Selves*. Ashis Nandy. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995.
- . *Bonfire of Creeds: The Essential Ashis Nandy*. New Delhi: Oxford UP, 2004.
- Takeda, Makoto. *Seishin Bunseki to Bukkyo* [Psychoanalysis and Buddhism]. Tokyo: Shinchosha, 1990.
- Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*. Oxford: Polity P, 1994.

Notes

¹ For financial support towards research conducted for this paper the author wishes to thank: the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland, the University of Edinburgh, the Japan Foundation Endowment Committee, and the National History Center (American Historical Association). For assistance with translations from Japanese and German, thanks are owed to Kae Susuki, Jorg Arnold, Fabian Hilfrich, and Margaret Ries. Yorio Kosawa, Makoto Takeda, and Nachiko Nagai were exceptionally generous in giving their time for interviews, while at Waseda University I am grateful to Messrs Fujiwara and Matsushita. For support and advice, sincere thanks go to Amit Basu, Crispin Bates, Ivan Crozier, Christiane Hartnack, Dane Kennedy, Janice Matsumara, and Akihito Suzuki.

² Map entitled "The Growth of the Psycho-Analytic Movement," held at the Library of Congress as part of the Freud Archives [no call number].

³ There is some confusion on this point, since, although a letter exists in the Freud Archive dated 15 Apr. 1925, there is also a typescript dated November 1931 which contains some of the same material. It is possible that Kosawa re-sent the letter, with new sections, not having received a reply from Freud to his first letter. Kosawa to Freud (re-typed, dated November 1931).

⁴ Geoffrey Blowers has come to a similar conclusion about the basis of Takeda's reportage on Kosawa's impressions of Freud (Blowers and Yang "Freud's Deshi" 125). It is important to note, however, that while Takeda's writings on Kosawa are indispensable, they do not always make clear precisely where Kosawa's experiences end and Takeda's own speculations about them begin.

⁵ Ashis Nandy suggests that Freud entertained "certain insecurities and ambivalences [...] towards the relationship between science and philosophy" (386). Useful outlines of Bose's theories may be found in Hartnack.

⁶ This, at least, is the current understanding of the situation. However, this apparent lack of competition may be due simply to a lack of evidence about interest in psychoanalysis elsewhere in India, even elsewhere in Calcutta.

⁷ Bose offered Freud what could be seen as a double-edged compliment here, referring to the latter's "unique" experience (Bose 1929b).

⁸ Ashis Nandy suggests that Bose had a "vague patriotism" but was basically apolitical (Nandy 359).

⁹ When Freud wrote to Bose asking him to come over to Europe, Bose replied that he would like to do so and that "probably time will come for such an opportunity" (Bose 1922b).

