

2017

Poetry and Anarchism

Margaret Konkol
Old Dominion University, mkonkol@odu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/english_fac_pubs



Part of the [History of Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Poetry Commons](#)

Original Publication Citation

Konkol, M. (2017). Poetry and Anarchism. *Modernism/Modernity*, 24(4), 867-873. doi:10.1353/mod.2017.0067

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the English at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in English Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.



Review Essay

Poetry and Anarchism

By Margaret Konkol, Old Dominion University

***Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century.* Andrew Cornell. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2016. Pp. xiv + 416. \$29.95 (paper).**

***Crisis and the US Avant-Garde: Poetry and Real Politics.* Ben Hickman. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 2015. Pp. 200. \$120.00 (cloth); \$72.84 (eBook).**

***Personal Modernisms: Anarchist Networks and the Later Avant-Gardes.* James Gifford. Alberta: University of Alberta Press, 2014. Pp. xx + 296. \$34.95 (paper).**

During the 20 January 2017 presidential inauguration demonstrations in Washington, D.C., an antifascist protestor identified as part of an anarchist Black Bloc punched white nationalist Richard Spencer, touching off an absurd yet serious national debate: “is it okay to punch a Nazi?” That the video clip gained meme status indicates a widespread frustration, a perceived ineffectiveness of civil political discourse and a readiness to abandon nonviolent means for more violent tactics or, at least, to check the quiet normalization of the far right with a gleefully small-scale action that, though violent, is schoolyard in its proportions. In some sense the protestor’s surprise punch is an avant-garde gesture, an act of radical political guerilla theater. Indeed, scholars of the avant-garde have recognized an intimate link between anarchist and avant-garde tactics. Ben Hickman’s new book begins with a statement from Joshua Clover, reflecting on his 2009 arrest and role in the UC Davis Occupy movement in which he admonished “capital-T Theory” for leading him—as well as so many other poets writing in the wake of Language Poetry—to imagine that poetic language equates to political action, repudiating “ideas which allow activities at the level of language to claim the same material force as a thrown brick.” Clover has since reiterated this sentiment: “Certain things will have to be actively destroyed on the side of capital . . . And they will not be destroyed with

MODERNISM / *modernity*
VOLUME TWENTY FOUR,
NUMBER FOUR,
PP 867–873. © 2017
JOHNS HOPKINS
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Margaret Konkol is Assistant Professor of Contemporary American Literature and Digital Humanities at Old Dominion University. She has published or has forthcoming essays on the collaboration of Robert Graves and Laura Riding, the late poetics of Robert Creeley, and feminist conceptions of nature in Mina Loy’s “Songs to Joannes.”



868 language” (1). Since the 2008 recession and subsequent Occupy Movement, a resurgence of anarchist activity has propelled anarchism to the forefront of the US cultural consciousness. According to Clover, despite this reanimation, avant-garde poetry is not participating. Instead, it has been absorbed into capitalist social formations. By contrast, political anarchism retains the shock of the new. There is historical precedent for understanding anarchist activity as avant-garde strategy. In February of 1967, wearing black masks and hoisting fabricated skulls on the tips of pikes, a group of artists who called themselves Black Mask—whose inspirations included the work of Amiri Baraka—marched along Wall Street with a sign “Wall Street is War Street,” protesting a culture of violence and oppression, specifically the Vietnam War and the treatment of African Americans by the police. A spokesman for Black Mask explained that it had “nothing to do with moral witness, peaceful demonstration or even resistance—this is aggression, the beginning of revolutionary struggle” (Cornell, *Unruly Equality*, 206). This is the first recorded appearance of the “black bloc aesthetic,” but connections or cross-pollinations between artists, writers, and anarchists reach back to the 1920s (*Unruly Equality*, 260). Anarchist philosophy, despite its communitarian values and aesthetic manifestations, has often been reductively perceived as a radically violent antistatist position. For instance, even as Lola Ridge, Edna St. Vincent Millay, Malcolm Cowley, and others mourned the 1927 execution of anarchists Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, their literary commemorations elided the pair’s anarchist affiliation—an attempt to rescue Sacco and Vanzetti from an irreparably maligned ideology. In fact, Dan Colson has argued that the erasure of anarchism from literary history begins with poets and writers themselves. This may explain why there is a relative dearth of literary-historical research on the subject, until now.

The contemporary resurgence of anarchism on the political stage makes the timing of recent investigations of poetry and Left politics opportune. Three recent books offer perspectives on poetry’s relation to anarchist and Marxist politics. In combination, they recover the extent and influence of anarchist thought in the twentieth century, making the case that any history of the avant-garde or of late modernism is incomplete without reckoning with the importance of anarchism. In presenting anarchism’s developments from 1915 to 1972—its continuities and complex social and historical contexts—Andrew Cornell’s *Unruly Equality: U.S. Anarchism in the Twentieth Century* corrects a common perception that anarchism is a peripheral and sporadic movement, by tracking its transformations over the course of the century. This historical recovery work situates contemporary anarchist activity and philosophy in terms of its earlier iterations. Although the word anarchism surfaces but twice in Hickman’s *Crisis and the US Avant-Garde: Poetry and Real Politics*, the book’s focus on “the crisis poem” is a study of avant-garde poets whose Marxist investments led to the individualist utopian lyric. The production of a utopian poetics between 1930 and 1980 that Hickman identifies parallels the personalist anti-authoritarianism treated in James Gifford’s *Personal Modernisms: Anarchist Networks and the Later Avant-Gardes*, which recovers an international network, a lost generation of Canadian, US, and English writers who came of age in the 1930s, and published within a network of like-minded anarchist writers throughout the 1940s, ‘50s, and ‘60s.

Anarchism is one of the most misunderstood and maligned political ideologies. It is commonly misconstrued as hunger for chaos and destruction in a naïve desire for freedom from law. But its origins lie in the altruistic philosophy of mutual aid, developed in the nineteenth century by Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, Peter Kropotkin, and Mikhail Bakunin. Admittedly, anarchism has undergone dramatic reconfigurations, partially as a strategic response to governmental persecution and partly in reaction to a world whose problems are no longer as easily understood as simple class antagonisms but rather as dense and multiple intersecting layers of capitalist patriarchal repression. The avant-garde’s relation to anarchism has largely been missed because the individualism celebrated by the avant-garde can all too easily resemble expressions of bourgeois individualism.

Cornell charts the evolution of anarchism in the US context across the twentieth century as it shifts from an ideological framework motivating the mass organization of industrial workers and acts of insurrection to its reinvention in the 1960s as a movement composed of middle-class participants dedicated to rooting out economic exploitation and *all* forms of social domination, often by engaging in some form of “prefiguration.”¹ There are three categories of anarchist prefiguration, according to Cornell, the first represented by the establishment of counterinstitu-

tions such as the Walden School, farm co-ops such as Sunrise, or nonprofit bookshops such as Reading Frenzy or City Lights. The second category is “prefigurative lifestyle,” personal choices such as Gary Snyder’s decision to focus on spending contemplative time in the woods instead of pursuing high-salaried employment. In other words, this kind of prefiguration is represented in life choices “that deviate from social conventions and expectations” (*Unruly Equality*, 284). The third category is mass organizing. Poetry’s prefigurative effects fall within or between the first and second categories.

Cornell’s *Unruly Equality* extends from 1916 to 1972, the period between the First World War and the Vietnam War, with additional analysis of the contemporary Occupy Movement. *Unruly Equality* offers a compelling historical argument that corrects the misconception that anarchism was crushed before the Second World War, with the union-busting of the thirties, and only resurfaced recently in a radical new configuration. The book has two sections, the first of which traces the movement’s shifting meanings up until the Second World War, the second of which treats the 1940s, ‘50s, and ‘60s, which Cornell identifies as a new phase of radical pacifism, ushered in largely by the addition of avant-garde writers and artists who, together with anarchists, played significant roles in shaping the New Left. Zen Buddhism, environmentalism, feminism, and Gandhian pacifism refigured what had once been a more plainly anti-capitalist agenda.

According to Cornell, there have been six generations of anarchists (he provides a helpful chart in the appendix). It is in the 1940s, with the fourth generation, that “anarchists crafted alliances not only with radical pacifists but also with avant-garde cultural workers” (183). *Unruly Equality* dedicates its sixth chapter to discussion of these literary anarchists—pacifist poets, playwrights, and painters who were active in the 1940s and ‘50s—thereby refuting assessments that during this period anarchism was dead. Kenneth Rexroth dominates this section, followed closely by Gary Snyder, Robert Duncan, and Jackson Mac Low and, to a lesser extent, John Cage, Paul Goodman, Kenneth Patchen, and Philip Lamantia, whom Cornell refers to as “literary anarchists.” The literary anarchists were interested in sexuality, psychology, and environmentalism, and looked critically on postwar abundance. One such group, the Diggers, “drew upon Gary Snyder’s poetic formulations, which linked whiteness with a war-making technical rationality opposed to both “wildness” and “wilderness” (254). *Unruly Equality*’s emphasis on multiple actors gives the kind of perspective Hickman’s and Gifford’s studies are not designed to provide—namely the far-reaching cultural consequences of literary activity—but this scope comes at the expense of engaging in detail with how anarchist ideas translated into an anarchist aesthetics, or addressing whether we can even speak of such a thing. According to Cornell, literary anarchists did not espouse an ideologically coherent Marxist politics so much as a displeasure with moral conventions, technological rationality, and increased separation from the natural world, making them open to anarchist individualism. Although Cornell does not explicitly formulate a category of anarchist artist, he assigns them anarchist status because of their cultural prefiguration activities and because of their participation in explicit anarchist networks. Although *Unruly Equality* focuses on Rexroth and the Libertarian Circle he founded (and in which Duncan participated), Cornell notes that the Libertarian Circle itself was self-consciously indebted to earlier modernist anarchists, namely the sexually forward writers Henry Miller and D. H. Lawrence (although Lawrence never described himself as anarchist). Additionally, Duncan met Mac Low at a *Why?* magazine group meeting around the time that he was frequenting a Gandhian ashram in New York City. Dwight Mac Donald published Duncan’s “The Homosexual in Society” in the anarchist magazine *politics*. This was a deliberate choice on Duncan’s part: he wanted to see gay and lesbian groups unite with other humanist progressive groups in order to “groun[d] gay politics in broader anarchist-personalist efforts” (187). The 1940s saw anarchists broadening their intellectual interests and “beg[inning] to place greater emphasis on cultural strategies of change” (188).

The history of anarchist periodicals—including *Vanguard*, *Man!*, *Road to Freedom*, *NOW*, *Mother Earth*, *Direct Action*, *Why?*/*Resistance*, and *Retort*—usefully links intellectual and aesthetic elements of the movement. After the war, these journals were radically pacifist and anti-statist, seeing the modern nation-state as a dangerous centralized force capable of dropping the bomb. Cornell also pays attention to the magazines’ cross-promotions and networks of mutual aid. Anarchist small press activity looks a lot like midcentury modernist magazine production. For instance, *Retort*, edited by Holley Cantine, described itself as a journal of art

870 and social philosophy and published young writers like Duncan, Patchen, and Saul Bellow. In a William Morris-like act of artisanal reclamation of the means of production, Cantine hand-printed and -bound *Retort*.

By its nature, historiographical work falls short of analyzing aesthetic contributions, but *Unruly Equality* is to be commended for its steady attention to the 1940s to 1960s as a point of convergence of the literary avant-garde and anarchist audiences. Cornell notes that “poetry served the same functions for the movement in the 1940s that music would in later decades . . . by decade’s end, San Francisco poets began to read their poetry aloud over live bands playing the new bebop jazz” (193). Through intensive archival work, Cornell relays University of California professor Mildred Brady’s recollection that poetry was a prominent artform in this new “bohemia”:

Thirty or forty at a time can be found crowded together listening gravely to language patterns that are all but incomprehensible to the uninitiated. Poetry is far and away the most popular medium of these young writers, and their poems make no compromise with old standards of communication. (193)

Although Cornell stops short of discussing the language patterns of Rexroth or Allen Ginsberg or of diagnosing a punk poetry aesthetic—which, as he no doubt surmises, would be a futile effort—the implication is that Beat soliloquy held audiences in rapture. So too, his observation that the ascendancy of punk music in the 1970s is a progression rather than a departure from ‘60s poetry readings is worth further study. Since punk music’s distinctive sound is so intricately associated with anarchism, it is fascinating to consider the possibility of a punk poetry aesthetic of shared stylistic principles while still acknowledging that poets who identified as anarchist vigorously refused a manifesto and instead sought personal expression. To determine whether the conjunction of poetry and anarchist politics produces a distinctive form, or whether it is even possible to speak of a coherent anarchist poetics, one should consult Hickman’s and Gifford’s work.

Hickman’s study challenges Language poetry’s overly utopian vision of poetic language as that which directly “intervene[s] in the fight against capital”; to “in the words of Ron Silliman, ‘carry the class struggle for consciousness to the level of consciousness’ through poems that, in their very form, challenge commodity fetishism and surplus value.” Since *Crisis* rejects the premise that poetry has “formal correspondences with economic processes,” one might expect Hickman’s project to assume a historicist dimension, tracking the ways in which specific poems have been read and received, and the revolutionary change, if any, that follows (2). Instead, the book examines debates within poetry itself about “politically committed poetry” (91).

Hickman explores iterations of what he calls the crisis poem, a specific form of avant-garde production that results from the coupling of poets’ Marxist revolutionary politics with a distinctly American avant-garde utopian lyric practice that invests poetry with political force. The introduction offers a theoretical discussion of the avant-garde and the chapters follow a uniform if not perfunctory structure of intervention in critical interpretation followed by a review of past criticism’s errors, which then transitions into contextualized close readings. Even as *Crisis* surveys the poetry of politically active poets in search of poems that succeeded or at least attempted to act like the brick Clover wishes that someone would throw, it is the first chapter on the effect of Marxism on Zukofsky’s poetry and his final chapter surveying Language Poetry, in which Hickman most compellingly reframes avant-garde poetry’s relation to politics. Rather than political poems, we are talking about crisis poems.

Nineteen-thirties New York and the aftermath of modernism is a good place to start. For Hickman, high modernism would best be defined as the period of greatest formal experimentation in which modernist aims were most closely linked to the project of the historical avant-garde. Hickman identifies a tension within modernism as a movement that is concerned primarily with history yet in search of a universal language of poetry. Call it, as Ezra Pound did, the news that stays news and that which avoids becoming old news. The question of how to write a poem that contains history but that is not tethered to its historical moment, that can transcend it, vexed Zukofsky. Hickman’s treatment of Zukofsky’s early work—including a cogent reading of “Mantis”—nicely elaborates Zukofsky’s revolutionary Marxist politics. As is often observed,

over the course of the 1930s Zukofsky moves away from explicit political expression and his work grows increasingly concerned with the formal musical properties of poetry. Zukofsky scholars will be interested in Hickman's insight that this turn to music is not an indication of a retreat into hermetic lyric formalism so much as an effort to resolve the difference between "what is objectively perfect" and "historical and contemporary particulars" (*Crisis*, 35). Hickman convincingly argues that "Music . . . represents a return to a certain version of modernism in so far as it functions as a de-historicising gesture." It is a common assessment that the reconciliation of objective measures of social economic formations present in Zukofsky's early work are replaced, in his later work, with the nonrepresentational abstractions of music. Yet modernism is set up too simply in this study as the antipolitical in opposition to political poetry. Certainly, Zukofsky was developing his poetics under the sign of Pound, so qualifying this opposition of modernist poetry to political poetry as a dichotomy produced by Pound's modernism eases the problems that attend papering over Marianne Moore's use of the nonpoetic (advertisements and the like) or William Carlos Williams's evocation of the local.

Music as a condition of poetry is one of the most interesting lines of investigation in *Crisis*. Although Hickman's discussion is not attentive to Baraka's anarchist connections, we know from Cornell that in the 1970s the Black Mask group used a line from a Baraka poem for their spectacular garbage-dumping project at Lincoln Center, which puts Baraka in the 1970s-anarchist intellectual network. Hickman is concerned with Baraka's search to "find a poetic language for the mass communication of Marxism" which is to say Hickman focuses on the ways that Baraka composes for the page seeking new Black poetic forms for Black political liberation (123). Hickman observes that

Baraka neither consigns political aesthetics to avant-garde formal disjunction nor collapses art into an instrumental vehicle for content: both rhythmic form and extortive message speak, as the poem urges us to sing *and* fight. This vanguard poetics has its medium as its message in a manner resembling but strongly diverging from his new contemporaries, the Language poets [. . . since the poem] summons a collectivity that 'says fight,' an articulation Baraka had sought since his conversion to Marxism. (138-9)

"Figures of inward: Language poetry and the end of the avant-garde" is one of the best chapters in *Crisis* and in many ways is the bedrock for the book's argument. With the disintegration of the fabric of the left in the 1970s, anarchists splintered into smaller syndicates and high-profile gestures like the Black Mask protest register as extreme disruptions to an otherwise powerful cultural and economic backlash from the right. Hickman's framing here is convincing. He pinpoints two crises that led to Language Poetry. In New York, where most Language poets were based, the government responded to fiscal crisis with the introduction in 1975 of The Emergency Financial Control Board (EFCB). Composed of "business elite," it utterly corrupted the union leaderships with payoff promises and then quietly dismantled the successes of those unions with a series of wage freezes, mass layoffs, and the erosion of social safety nets. In the absence of union agitation or public protest, "Language poetry set out to fill this political vacuum, and to fight a now one-sided political crisis with a cultural formation" (142).

Remember Clover's complaint and his real or imagined brick? Hickman historicizes the appeal of French theory to Charles Bernstein, Lyn Hejinian, Susan Howe, Ron Silliman, Bruce Andrews, and Bob Perelman whose shared Marxism unfolded in the pages of *L=A=N=G=U=A=G=E*. Since Hickman's study is limited to the United States, it is understandable that he leaves out the Canadians (Steve McCaffery and bpNichol, for instance), but one wonders how the argument would change if the account broadened to include sustained consideration of Rae Armantrout, Hannah Weiner, Clark Coolidge, Barrett Watten, Leslie Scalapino, or Carla Harryman. Rather than locating Language poetry in a progression of increasingly hermetic poetic practices, Hickman identifies specific historical conditions that inspire an avant-garde response that is self-consciously Marxist and formally focused. Believing that the scene of revolution had left the street—or rather that it was too late by the time we reach the street—Language poetry returns to the primal scene of language on the page. Language poets saw language as the original site

872 of oppression. A significant insight on Hickman's part is that "it is strange that Language poetry is only ever read in the context [of] the anti-war movement's demise rather than the collapse of anti-capitalism, since Language writing rarely engages with US imperialism but has a great deal to say about economics" (143). "Language poetry's solution to the problematic relation of poetry and politics," he writes, "is to equate the two" (144). In fact, as Hickman points out, Watten called the Bolsheviks an "avant-garde party," which conflates aesthetics and politics. By the mid-eighties and into the 1990s Language poetry "extricated itself from projects of direct political activism and avant-gardism" (140).

Gifford's *Personal Modernisms* begins in the 1930s and 40s with a constellation of US, Canadian, and British writers including Duncan, Elizabeth Smart, George Woodcock, Lawrence Durrell, and Henry Miller, about whose anarchist political views we know relatively little. As with the aforementioned studies, the 1930s represent a pivotal historical moment. *Personal Modernisms* reconstructs that decade as a significant foundational period for this generation, a period in which these writers, though geographically separated, remained connected through a publishing network of little magazines in Paris, Cairo, London, Alexandria, Woodstock, San Francisco, and Big Sur (to name just some of the places touched on in *Personal Modernisms*) through which they articulated their anti-authoritarianism. Rather than seeking defining terms for anarchist aesthetics it might be fruitful to ask "what is not anarchist aesthetics?" *Personal Modernism* concludes "it is impossible to think about American literature since the San Francisco Renaissance and the Beats without recognizing the origins of these groups' inspirations and their aesthetic models in wartime London, Paris, Athens, Cairo, and Alexandria" (126). Anti-fascist ideas developed in Egypt and anti-Nazi ideas had been imported from London. Working beyond European and American comparisons of avant-garde practice as it intersects with revolutionary anarchistic elements, Gifford covers an internationally dispersed group of poets and prose writers who variously identified as surrealist, post-surrealist, Post Apocalypse, Beat, and Personal Landscape. The breadth of affiliation as well as their own reticence to remain under one banner has left these writers awkwardly outside conventional histories of the period. Gifford provides a literary history of this occluded and elided passage from high modernism to kitchen sink realism and Beat bohemianism.

Whereas Cornell orders his book chronologically and Hickman offers author-centered chapters, *Personal Modernisms* is organized into four chapters, with the first chapter evaluating the state of midcentury criticism, the second chapter working as a literary history of the underrepresented period between Auden and the Beats, a third chapter mapping post-surrealist aesthetics and anti-authoritarian thought, and a fourth chapter drawing connections between Miller, Durrell, Smart, and Duncan. Gifford's book seeks to correct decades of neglect of the Personal Landscape poets and Villa Seurat group despite, for instance, the bestseller status of Durrell or Alex Comfort. Gifford attributes this neglect to scholarship's focus on fascist currents in high modernism and the Marxism of the Auden generation—at the cost of acknowledging the later avant-gardes' anti-authoritarian attitudes (ix). In turn, this oversight creates a distorted sense of how much 1950s and 1960s work developed. Rather than reinforcing lineages, *Personal Modernisms* adopts the concept of the network. Networks are social, intertextual, and material in the sense that the relations themselves express as much as the content itself. The study of the circulation of artifacts through these material and social interrelationships means that the production of poetry rather than the poems themselves are of foremost importance for *Personal Modernisms*. Networks are visible through affiliations, cross-promotions of magazines, friendships described in memoirs, partnerships—be they literary, intimate, or corporate—and personal correspondence. The extensive list of works cited records four major nodes, expanding from Herbert Read, Henry Treece, Woodcock, and Duncan. Other figures include Smart and Patchen. The occlusion in literary history of the midcentury avant-gardes owes, as Gifford observes, to a scholarly habit of organizing writers according to region, which does not work very neatly with writers like Miller, who moved from Paris, to Cairo, to Big Sur. Additionally, one loses sight of major facets of Duncan's poetic project if he is only read as a San Francisco Renaissance writer as this would neglect his time on the East Coast, participating in anarchist reading groups and publishing ventures in upstate New York.

Like Hickman, Gifford critiques literary historical frames, expanding the discussion on political poetry. Instead of fixing groups' identities based on their locations, he groups them

under the umbrella term “personalist,” which he defines as “not socialist, not communist, not liberal, not fascist” (x-xi). These writers held to a “politics of the unpolitical” and emphasize the experience of the individual (xii). Personalism is therefore a characteristic of late avant-garde modernism. The surrealist Herbert Read is central to this tendency. In 1937, Read declared himself an anarchist. Influenced by Read, Miller and Durrell shortly thereafter also expressed their belief in the individual over and against the directives of (communist) surrealism. All three felt that “consensus is not necessary, all social visions are political as long as the individual is not subsumed” (xii).

For some readers, this will be an introduction to an array of less-well known poets who published in *Personal Landscape*, *Villa Seurat* group, and *New Apocalypse* magazines and who believed in the “pre-eminence of the individual,” that the “internal, personal struggle is consistent,” and sought to express this in “form, order, organization, and syntax” (133). Gifford appropriately resists making overarching claims about anarchist aesthetic style. As *Personal Modernisms* considers *New Apocalypse*, proto-San Francisco Renaissance poets, and the Libertarian Circle, *Unruly Equality* is a helpful companion text for *Personal Modernisms*. Cornell traces the ways in which communists, libertarians, and anarchists were brought together by shared goals, even as they diverged in their tactics. Gifford highlights Lawrence Hart’s manifesto for the Activist Group, which describes authority as functioning through denotative meanings: “denotation leads to . . . a ‘comprehensive rationalistic philosophy’ that Hart aligns with ideology and socially defined meaning” (137). The manifesto proposes associational poetry as an alternative. This consists of

a personal sense of meaning bound to the individual and interpretation, that is, connotative meanings that are subject to change and revision: “connotative poetry, especially in associational techniques, is often condemned as lacking in logical order—a condemnation quite beside the point. Because order is not necessarily the order of logic, and meaning is not necessarily logical meaning.” (137)

In a similar personalist spirit, Durrell describes poetry as “transcending logic . . . it invades a realm where unreason reigns, and where the relations between ideas are sympathetic and mysterious—affective—rather than causal, objective, substitutional” (138). These direct statements reinforce the objective of Gifford’s fourth chapter, which is a lively series of close readings of primary creative works by Durrell, Miller, Smart, and Duncan intended to clarify their poetic practice. The discussion of intertextual elements in *By Grand Central Station I Sat Down and Wept* demonstrates the pertinence of this study as it recasts Smart’s novel, which is most often read biographically, as a quasi-surrealist critique, lamenting the loss of an era and the troublesome rise of commercialism. By these scholarly accounts anarchist thought figures largely in male white middle class writers, which squares with Cornell’s assessment of the twentieth century anarchist movement as a white male formation. With contemporary anarchism’s ecological, pacifist, and now feminist critique of social hierarchy, one wonders how a feminist history of literary anarchism might extend this timely work. For instance, Smart and Muriel Rukeyser add welcome dimension in Gifford’s and Hickman’s studies of modernism at midcentury.

Throughout this review, the brick has remained in the air. *Crisis* opens with Joshua Clover’s critique of the avant-garde strategy of defamiliarization. Hickman does not resolve this problem but rather purposefully leaves it in crisis. Ultimately, these studies of poetry’s engagement with anarchism provide new genealogies and lines of influence between poets publishing in the 1930s, ‘40s, and ‘50s. Paul Goodman claimed that “there cannot be a history of anarchism in the sense of establishing a permanent state of things called ‘anarchist’” (Gifford, *Personal Modernisms*, 153). So too, of these lines of political and personal commitment are open to more investigation.

Notes

1. See Dan Colson, “Erasing Anarchism: Sacco and Vanzetti and the Logic of Representation,” *American Quarterly* 66, no. 4 (December, 2014): 944–69.

Copyright of Modernism/Modernity is the property of Johns Hopkins University Press and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.