

Providence College

DigitalCommons@Providence

Phillips Memorial Library Undergraduate Craft
of Research Prize

Phillips Memorial Library

Spring 2015

The Little Magazine That Did Big Things

Jacquelyn Kelley
Providence College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/research_prize



Part of the [English Language and Literature Commons](#)

Kelley, Jacquelyn, "The Little Magazine That Did Big Things" (2015). *Phillips Memorial Library Undergraduate Craft of Research Prize*. 7.
https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/research_prize/7

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Phillips Memorial Library at DigitalCommons@Providence. It has been accepted for inclusion in Phillips Memorial Library Undergraduate Craft of Research Prize by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Providence. For more information, please contact dps@providence.edu.

Jacquelyn Kelley
May 16, 2015

The Research Process

In my final research paper for my Modern American Fiction course, I chose to explore the world of the *Little Review*, the magazine in which parts of Sherwood Anderson's novel *Winesburg, Ohio* first appeared. I was so intrigued by the revolutionary publication and wanted to learn more about its content as well as its editor, Margaret Anderson. I therefore turned to the primary documents of the *Little Review* which I got my hands on in the Special Collections of the Hay Harris Library at Brown University. I found it incredible that I was able to hold in my hands the same copies of the magazine that were held back in 1914. Although I enjoyed examining the physical copies of the magazine, there were periods of time during my writing process in which I could not get over to Brown, so I consulted their Digital Collection online and downloaded PDF versions of the *Little Review*.

To find secondary sources for my paper, I searched through the HELIN catalog and found books not only from Phillips Memorial Library but also from other college libraries in the area. I therefore requested books from these other libraries. I initially checked out a number of books that seemed beneficial to my paper, knowing that some would be more valuable to my project than others. To decipher which books would be helpful and which would not be, I skimmed through them while simultaneously creating a Word document with the title and author of each book as well as any useful facts or passages that came from it. When I began composing my paper, I consulted the information that I had compiled in this document and threaded it together with my own thoughts. I found that this method gave me creative reign over my paper as I only looked to the outside sources when I needed additional support for my own thesis.

I conducted research for this paper from the midpoint of the semester on as half of the paper was due during midterms and the other half during finals week. When my professor reviewed my work halfway through the semester, he suggested several other directions in which I could take the paper. Therefore, the final list of sources included at the end of this document is reflective of the research I did both before and after the midpoint of the semester. In order to pay respect to some of the suggestions of my professor, I had to conduct a new HELIN catalog search and acquire sources not on Margaret Anderson, Sherwood Anderson, or the *Little Review*, but on Emma Goldman and Joseph Hill, two individuals who greatly influenced the content of the magazine. I must say that although my paper juts out in several different directions, I am quite happy that I was able to cover so many different aspects of the *Little Review*. I think each section examines a new outlook on the magazine and ultimately contributes to its incredible legacy.

The Little Magazine That Did Big Things

It may have been called the *Little Review*, but this revolutionary magazine was a big deal. From the moment Margaret Anderson decided to construct the publication, it was clear that it would be unlike any other magazine of the time period. It was not only her unique vision for the magazine that set it apart, however, as it was also the avant-garde work of its contributors. The magazine featured talented artists from all different disciplines—writing, painting, sculpting, photography, architecture, music. Sherwood Anderson was one of these artists as he submitted some of his best literary work to the *Little Review* over the years. In fact, Sherwood Anderson's work was incredible not only because of his style but because the content of his stories supported the overarching mission of the magazine. He exposed how modern American society isolated the individual via public opinion, a process that editor Anderson detested and hoped to discourage through her magazine. Furthermore, in his first commentary for the publication, Sherwood Anderson reinforced how important a youthful spirit is to modern American society which is important to the *Little Review* seeing as Margaret hoped to target the youth and future artists of America. In Sherwood Anderson's stories, he also explored the relationship between the younger and older generations, a relationship that changed drastically at the turn of the century. Finally, Anderson, like his editor, was interested in exploring the issue of sexual freedom. His work ultimately fit the *Little Review's* profile because, like Margaret, he hoped to expose the greater problems of humanity in modern American society.

A Little About the *Little Review*

In order to understand the essence of the *Little Review*, one must first understand its unique creator, Margaret Anderson. Margaret was nineteen when she realized that her estranged relationship with her family was not worth sticking around Columbus, Indiana for (Mott 166).

So, she fled her hometown for Chicago and it was in the windy city that she gained crucial literary experience at two small magazines, the *Dial* and the *Interior* (Mott 166). These journals did not excite Anderson, however, and she could not help but envision her own periodical that would encourage what she believed to be most important in life—conversation (Mott 167). "The thing I wanted—would die without was conversation. The only way to get it was to reach people with ideas" (Anderson qtd. in Mott 167). The first issue of the *Little Review* was published in March of 1914, and Anderson's dream became reality. According to Frank Luther Mott, "The content of the *Little Review* itself, the mood, was that of animated conversation—informal, personal, unacademic" (Mott 167). Although Mott claims that the *Little Review* produced casual conversation, its content was far from simple as Anderson hoped that her publication would offer readers an enlightening interpretation of the art and literature of the time period.

In an "announcement" that she included in the very first issue of the *Little Review*, Anderson stated that her intention for the magazine was to provide an exciting and educational presentation of the artistic movements of the time period:

"Its ambitious aim is to produce criticism of books, music, art, drama, and life that shall be fresh and constructive, and intelligent from the artist's point of view... Also, we mean to print articles, poems, stories that seem to us definitely interesting, or —to use a much-abused adjective —vital" (*Little Review*, 1:1, p.2)

Anderson used these words to describe to her very first readers what the *Little Review* was all about and she could not have chose better ones. Her passion for art in all of its forms jumps off of the page as does her dedication to sharing these disciplines with others. She does not merely describe the art she published as praiseworthy. It is "vital." She sincerely believed that people needed to experience such artwork because they would otherwise be unable to live or at the very least unable to live a beautiful and worthwhile life. Anderson was not only passionate about

sharing great works of art with others, but about fostering discussion and understanding of them. Therefore, the *Little Review* included critical analysis of art. In fact, sometimes the magazine would publish a piece and include a critique of that piece within the same issue. The mix of art and commentary allowed for the open dialogue Anderson had hoped for. The *Little Review* did a lot more than just that though. It sparked a revolution.

Anderson's *Little Review* fueled the modernist movement in America because it published the avant-garde work of both American and European artists who ultimately inspired others to jump on the modernist bandwagon. This, however, seemed to be Anderson's intention as she made it clear that her publication was meant to serve other artists (Golding 69). In 1917, one of the magazine's headlines proclaimed that it was "read by those who write the others" (*Little Review* qtd. in Golding 69). By including this headline, Anderson insinuated that it was her magazine artists turned to for the latest trends, even if they were affiliated with other competing magazines. The line may come off as conceited on Anderson's part, but it essentially captured her goal of fostering conversation among various readers. Alan Golding argues that in specifically targeting other artists, "the *Little Review* sought to influence the art of the future—to influence production as well as reception" (Golding 70). The magazine had no trouble achieving this goal as its radical content nearly eliminated an apathetic reception. Anderson in her autobiography admits, "Practically everything the *Little Review* published during its first years was material that would have been accepted by no other magazine in the world at the moment" (*My Thirty Years War* 44). Why would other magazines hesitate to publish that which the *Little Review* did? They did not share Anderson's zeal for politically charged material bound to push the envelope as it often featured an "explicit and enthusiastic embrace of feminist and anarchist principles" (Golding 68-69). It was after Anderson became acquainted with anarchist Emma

Goldman that she described the magazine as "Applied Anarchism" and began contributing her own insurgent editorials. Her daring inclusion of such material certainly established the *Little Review's* identity, but it also got Anderson and the magazine in a great deal of trouble.

Applied Anarchism

Many Americans of the early 20th century feared anarchism because it jeopardized their beloved structure of democracy and often did so through violent demonstrations. In 1901, for example, a follower of Goldman assassinated President McKinley (Birmingham 5). The devastating attack moved President Roosevelt to decree two years later that the government could ban and expel any foreign anarchists (Birmingham 5). His threatening legislation persuaded the infamous Goldman to go off of the grid for a few years, but when she surfaced again, she was a force to be reckoned with. Beginning in 1906, Goldman traveled the country giving talks to large gatherings of people (Birmingham 5). When the possibility of war arose in 1914, her lectures became even more popular because in a time of immense uncertainty, she seemed to be the only one willing to offer concrete information. According to Kevin Birmingham, "She spoke in stirring absolutes: The individual was spontaneous and free. Governments were coercive and violent" (Birmingham 5). For example, Goldman said, "The State is organized exploitation, organized force, and crime" (Goldman qtd. in Birmingham 5). Although her statements were unsettling because they completely undermined the American government, they strangely offered relief to her followers. They were frightened because they were uncertain of what the outcome of war may be, but Goldman gave them something to be sure about. In "Anarchism, What It Really Stands for," Goldman established that it was "the philosophy of a new social order based on liberty unrestricted by man-made law; the theory that all forms of government rest on violence, and are therefore wrong and harmful, as well as

unnecessary" (Goldman qtd. in Falk 1). Goldman bashed not only American government, but all bureaucracy because it limited the freedom of the individual and did so by threatening violence.

In 1914, Anderson made an appearance at two of Goldman's talks in Chicago and was very impressed by her speeches (Birmingham 5). According to Goldman, "Art was an individualist deed as integral to anarchism as a bomb or a labor strike" (Birmingham 5). Anderson took these words to heart as she began using her magazine as a platform for her own anarchist messages. It became clear that she too viewed government as oppressive and dangerous in her editorial on the controversial Joe Hillstrom trial. Referred to as Joe Hill, he was an Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.) member found guilty of murder in Salt Lake City, Utah only because of circumstantial evidence. Hill was accused of being one of two gunmen who opened fire on John G. Morrison and his son as they were closing his grocery store in January of 1914 (Foner 18). Both men were killed in the shooting, but the younger son, Merlin, who was hiding in the back of the store, witnessed the entire scene unfold (Foner 18). Merlin claimed that his brother Arling managed to get his hands on a revolver and that he had shot back at the men, striking one of them (Foner 18-19). However, because Merlin altered his story so many times during the investigation, it is difficult to say whether or not this information is accurate (Foner 18). Nonetheless, blood was found outside of the store as well as along what must have been the path the two suspects took when fleeing the scene (Foner 19).

On the same night as the shooting, Hill visited a doctor to get treatment for a gunshot wound and explained that he had received the injury in an altercation with a man over a woman (Foner 20). When the authorities learned about his injury, they immediately considered him a suspect in the other shooting and set out to take him into custody on the charge of first-degree murder (Foner 21). From that moment on, Hill became the victim of slander. In fact, the false

stories began with the police's fantastical account of his arrest. The authorities claimed that upon arriving at his residence, Hill aggressively started out of bed to retrieve his gun which prompted them to open fire on him, injuring his hand indefinitely (Foner 21) Hill, however, had a very different story and claimed that he woke up groggy and confused as to why the police were there (Foner 21). Furthermore, he reminded people that having been shot so recently, he was in no condition to act as aggressively as the police claimed (Foner 21). The prejudice against Hill only mounted though as Merlin, who originally said that Hill did not resemble either of the men he had seen in the grocery store, recanted his statement at the preliminary hearing and accused Hill of murdering his father and brother (Foner 23). As if his testimony was not damaging enough, the prosecution went on to ask the witnesses particularly leading questions in hope of incriminating Hill in one way or another (Foner 23).

By the time the trial rolled around, the prosecution only had circumstantial evidence against Hill which included the fact that he was shot and injured on the same night as the grocery store shooting, although the police never recovered a shell casing to prove he was shot at the scene (Foner 25). The only other piece of circumstantial evidence the police had was the fact that Hill owned a red bandana, an item of clothing Merlin claimed one of the gunmen was wearing. What the prosecution did not consider is that most laborers of the time period wore red bandanas (Foner 25). The general public and the jury did not need concrete evidence to convict Hill though. "A campaign to find him guilty had already been under way outside the courtroom from the moment Joe Hill was arrested" (Foner 25). The police department as well as the prosecution in Salt Lake City sought a better understanding of the life Hill led in his hometown of San Pedro, California, so they reached out to the authorities there (Foner 26). The response was this:

"The chief of police informed them that Hill was an undesirable citizen, an alien in this country without warrant of law, and that he was a dangerous character. To prove which

the chief stated that Hill was an I.W.W. agitator and the author of I.W.W. songs. What more is needed to convict him?" (Foner 26).

Hill actively participated in the I.W.W., an organization that was considered by most Americans as an anarchist threat to their social, political, and economic order because it "eschewed all political participation, stressed direct action at the workplace, and like the French 'syndicats,' combined a commitment to immediate improvements in wages and working conditions with a long-range commitment to the overthrow of capitalism" (Wexler 125-136). Hill's association with the I.W.W. left him little room for vindication in the public eye. "The press coupled Hill's reputation as a writer of 'inflammatory' and 'sacrilegious' songs with his career as a criminal" (Foner 26). It is very likely that the jurors who later served in Hill's trial were exposed to these unfair media presentations of Hill and were therefore biased when making their final verdict (Foner 27). Ultimately, although the case lacked solid evidence, Hill was executed on November 19, 1915 (Foner 97).

For Anderson, the Hill trial exemplified exactly what Goldman had preached in her lectures. The structure of American society lent itself not only to the oppression of individuals, but also to violent crimes against them. She fired back not only at the jury's decision, but at the public's lack of response in the *Little Review* when she wrote, "Why didn't someone shoot the governor of Utah before he could shoot Joe Hill...For God's sake, why doesn't someone start the revolution?" (Margaret qtd. in Birmingham 6). The controversial editorial landed police investigators on the steps of the *Little Review's* office to conduct an investigation (Birmingham 6). Although Anderson did not face severe consequences, this would not be her last run-in with the police.

Challenging American Censorship

When Congress first enacted the Espionage Act in 1917, it outlawed any actions or speech that interfered with America's wartime objectives (Birmingham 14). A few years later, Congress extended the law and proclaimed that "any disloyal, profane, scurrilous, or abusive language about the form of government of the United States" was illegal (Espionage Act qtd. in Birmingham 14). The postmaster general was responsible for ensuring that newspapers and magazines did not tarnish the reputation of the American government or its military forces (Birmingham 14). The restrictions did not end there, however, as publications were also still subject to the Comstock Act of 1873 which outlawed "any obscene, lewd, or lascivious book, pamphlet, picture, paper, print, or other publication of indecent character" (Comstock Act qtd. in Birmingham 18). Both of these laws in combination were bad news for Anderson's anarchist project the *Little Review*. The magazine was accused of violating both laws in October of 1917 as that month's issue featured an allegedly inappropriate story about a British soldier (Birmingham 21). Because of that story, that issue of the *Little Review* was sent for review to higher authorities and was not distributed to subscribers (Birmingham 21). Although this was a setback for Anderson and the magazine, it was nothing in comparison to the persecution they faced for publishing segments of James Joyce's *Ulysses*.

When Anderson published part of *Ulysses* in March of 1919, the story was criticized for its absurdity, but was still published (Birmingham 30). Authorities decided to keep an eye out for James Joyce's work, however, and in January of 1919 when yet another installment of *Ulysses* was published, the authorities refused to publish the edition because they found the romantic scene too obscene (Birmingham 31). From then on, several issues of the *Little Review* were banned because of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. The controversy reached its climax, however, when John Sumner, in 1920, visited the Washington Square Book Shop "to purchase incriminating

copies of the *Little Review*" (Birmingham 39). The owner of the shop, Josephine Bell, was charged for selling the banned material, prompting Anderson to ask lawyer John Quinn if he could acquit Bell and instead take on a case defending the magazine itself (Birmingham 40). Anderson wanted to use the trial to build up publicity and said, "This trial will be the making of the *Little Review*" (Anderson qtd. in Birmingham 40). Quinn ultimately lost the case and Anderson was sent to jail, but awarded a bail of twenty-five dollars (Birmingham 47). Although the case was lost, the trial fulfilled Anderson's goal. *The Little Review* was widely discussed in the midst of the controversy and gained publicity. Despite being sent to jail, Anderson only dedicated herself to the cause of the *Little Review* more and continued on with her project.

Defying the Disapproval of Society

Anderson constructed the *Little Review* as a revolutionary magazine at odds with society, so it is no surprise that she included the work of Sherwood Anderson who shared her sharp criticism of public opinion. Thanks to Goldman and the death penalty case in Utah, Anderson knew of human suffering in America, but was horrified that it came at the hands of other humans:

"I became increasingly anarchistic. I began to find people of my own class vicious, people in clean collars uninteresting...Anarchism was the ideal expression for my ideas of freedom and justice. The knowledge that people could be put into prisons and kept there for life had the power to torture me. That human beings could be sentenced to death by other human beings was a fact beyond human imagination. I decided that I would make my life a crusade against inhumanity" (My Thirty Years War 74).

These words from the autobiography epitomized her frustration with modern American society. She in turn used the *Little Review* as a spring board for thoughts like these as evidenced by "Reversals" published in the September 1915 edition of the magazine. "What do you call this awful place where every great spirit walks not only in rebellion and misunderstanding and

isolation but in persecution?" (*Little Review*, 2:6, p.2). This telling question indicated how individuals within her society were cut off from one another as they lacked the ability to comprehend one another. She explained that such disconnection led not only to loneliness but also to misguided punishment like that of Hill. For Anderson, society was severely flawed in its quick judgment and condemnation of people.

Sherwood Anderson in his work similarly suggests that individuals end up misunderstood and unsociable because of their struggle to communicate with one another. Cleveland B. Chase claims, "Anderson incidentally shows the loneliness, the essential isolation of all people, however far they may or may not have gone toward orienting themselves toward life" (Chase 34). Anderson exposed the difficulty members of society had interacting with one another in the work he contributed to the *Little Review*. His story, "Paper Pills," was published as "The Philosopher" in the June/July issue of 1916 and alluded to the societal judgment that an old doctor faces in Winesburg, Ohio. The doctor becomes an outsider in his own town because of his odd habit of writing down notes on bits of paper that become balled up in his pants pockets. Aside from this unusual tendency, the doctor's elderly appearance renders him unappealing to most of the town around him. "The apples have been taken from the trees by the pickers. They have been put in barrels and shipped to the cities where they will be eaten in apartments that are filled with books, magazines, furniture, and people. On the trees are only a few gnarled apples that the pickers have rejected. They look like the knuckles of Doctor Reefy's hands (*Winesburg, Ohio* 19). Anderson makes a direct comparison between the rotten apples and Doctor Reefy's decrepit hands because both have been rejected by the mainstream society characterized by stylish apartments, popular literature, and those who fit into this lifestyle. Unfortunately, for the doctor, however, "Winesburg had forgotten the old man" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 18). Society has

judged him and cast him aside like the apples. In these passages, Sherwood Anderson has captured the society that Margaret Anderson describes in "Reversals." It is one "where reputation is more vital than character" (*Little Review*, 2:6, p. 2). She therefore included Anderson's stories in the *Little Review* because he explored human suffering at the hands of society, an injustice that she was also moved to write about in her own contributions to the magazine.

Anderson's story "A Man of Ideas" was published in the June 1918 edition of the *Little Review* and also explored the theme of isolation in modern American society. The story chronicles Joe Welling, a man prone to seizures that frighten his fellow townspeople. "Men watched him with eyes in which lurked amusement tempered by alarm. They were waiting for him to break forth, preparing to flee. Although the seizures that came upon him were harmless enough, they could not be laughed away. They were overwhelming" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 94). In this novella, Welling, like the doctor from "Paper Pills," exhibits unusual outward behavior that not only perplexes other people, but scares them. David Stouck asserts that this inclusion of off-putting details is characteristic of Anderson. "Typically, a story begins with a physical description of the central character, emphasizing some grotesque feature or trait" (Stouck 39). Anderson included these physical details to show the ways in which society will judge them. In Welling's case, society not only condemns his odd behavior but also fears him. By regarding only his unorthodox actions and in turn overlooking his true character, Welling becomes cut off from the remainder of society. "A Man of Ideas" therefore emphasized Anderson's interest in depicting "the struggle to communicate, the effort and the frustration of individuals to explain who they really are" (Stouck 46). Anderson's work reflected the isolation individuals experienced in modern American society and how they were abused by public opinion. Margaret Anderson was similarly concerned with such maltreatment of individuals in society and made the rejection

of popular belief a main proponent of her magazine, rendering Sherwood Anderson's work an especially appropriate choice for inclusion.

His work also fit into the *Little Review* because in its challenge of public opinion, it abided by one of the magazine's most significant slogans. "Making no compromise with the public taste" (*Little Review* Vol.4, No. 2: p.1). In order to inspire original thought and creation like its editor hoped, the magazine could not advocate for popular opinion. It had to challenge it and become "a popular periodical that would differ from mass market magazines only in that mass appeal would not serve as the basis of its editorial decisions" (Morrison 134). Because the *Little Review's* audience was comprised of other artists and not the general public, pieces like that of its editor and Anderson that criticized social norms and popular belief were meant to inspire other artists to defy public opinion and think for themselves. They were meant to engage in enlightening conversations that were not tainted by public opinion and to create avant-garde art that was not accepted by other publications.

The Youthful Spirit of America

Although the *Little Review's* editor appreciated Anderson's criticism of society in his later pieces for the magazine, she was impressed by Anderson even before he composed the stories of *Winesburg, Ohio*. Anderson dazzled her with his impressive conversation skills and story-telling ability. "I liked Sherwood—because he, too, was a talker and of a highly special type. He didn't talk ideas—he told stories... I knew by Sherwood's look that he would do something even better. I asked him to give me an article for the first number of the *Little Review*" (*My Thirty Years War* 38-39). In her own first editorial for the magazine, editor Anderson confessed, "We take a certain joyous pride in confessing our youth (Anderson 1:1 p. 2). It is therefore no surprise that the first

piece she accepted from Anderson, "The New Note," emphasized the importance of maintaining a youthful spirit:

"Simply stated, it is a cry for the reinjection of truth and honesty into the craft...and in the craft of writing there can be no such thing as age in the souls of the young poets and novelists who demand for themselves the right to stand up and be counted among the soldiers of the new. That there are such youths is brother to the fact that there are ardent young cubists and futurists, anarchists, socialists, and feminists; it is the promise of a perpetual sweet new birth of the world" (Sherwood qtd. in *My Thirty Years War* 50).

It is evident even from Anderson's first publication in the *Little Review* that youth is significant. He explained that if writers wanted to matter in the literary movement of their time, they had to let go of their old ways. In Anderson's opinion, youths who clung to old traditions impeded the proper youthful spirits of the revolutionaries that he listed above. Finally, he believed that channeling one's youth, especially in the arts, would propel the world forward.

Anderson's commentary on youthful spirit could not be more characteristic of the time period or the editor's mission for the *Little Review*. According to Mark S. Morrison, a new concept of adolescence arose in the late 19th and early 20th century that was defined by the years in one's life immediately after childhood, but preceding mature adulthood (Morrison 136-137). G. Stanley Hall described adolescence as a time period where individuals are especially excited about life and energetic in their endeavors (Hall qtd. in Morrison 137). Hall believed that the adolescent years shaped the individual and therefore prepared them for either failure or success in future years (Hall qtd. in Morrison 137). Most importantly, Hall advocated for "repose, leisure, art, legends, romance, idealization and in a word humanism" as he believed that all of these things would allow for adolescents to eventually find great success in the creative world (Hall qtd. in Morrison 137). It is no surprise that editor Anderson admired Hall's ideas as they are prevalent in the *Little Review's* published work like that of Anderson above (Morrison 137).

Morrison therefore argues, "The *Little Review* tried to create a public institution for youth to exchange ideas freely about the nature of modern life" (Morrison 158). This is exactly what Anderson's fictional episodes in the *Little Review* were to be—exploration of modern life for the youthful generation of *Winesburg, Ohio* in comparison to their older counterparts.

In his own diary, Anderson acknowledged that the future generations of America would be responsible for creating even more radical writing than what was being published in his prime. "To our grandchildren the privilege of attempting to produce a school of American writing that has more delicacy and color may come as a matter of course...And that is why, with so many of the younger Americans, I put my faith in the modern literary adventurers" (Notebook 200). Anderson understood that youthful Americans paid close attention to the modernist writers included in magazines like the *Little Review*. He even suggested that they are so devoted to them that they ultimately put their "faith" in them. Anderson also admitted that he too had "faith" in the pioneers of the modernist movement because he knew that they ultimately played a significant role in the development of future works. One could therefore say that he had put a great deal of faith in editor Anderson who made it her life's work to educate and influence the future artists of America.

Aside from acknowledging that the youth of America are responsible for the future of art and culture, he emphasized in his fictional work for the *Little Review* that old age and wisdom had gone out of fashion. In "Paper Pills," for example, Dr. Reefy is not only cast aside because of his odd habits, but because he is old and out of touch with modern society. The story goes to great lengths to portray him as a very old man, opening with the words, "He was an old man with a white beard and huge nose and hands" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 18). In the following sentence, his old age is emphasized yet again as it reads, "Long before the time during which we will know him,"

and then goes on to describe what happens in the years of his youth (*Winesburg, Ohio* 18). At one point, the doctor is referred to as "an old-fashioned country practitioner," indicating that his practices are outdated (*Winesburg, Ohio* 21). It is no coincidence that Dr. Reefy is both old and cast aside in the community of Winesburg. Anderson observed that in modern American society, old age was no longer associated with wisdom. It rather signified a disconnection to modern America and a lack of vitality and freshness.

Love, Sex, and Freedom

In the early 20th century, there was a movement for sexual freedom. For example, Goldman who was a major influence on the *Little Review*, advocated for "women's emancipation, sexual freedom, birth control, voluntary motherhood, and homosexual rights" and fought against the "oppressive nature of marriage" (Falk ix). Her ideas concerning love and sexuality certainly permeated editor Anderson's thinking as evidenced by her editorial in the March 1915 edition of the magazine. Anderson, in an unprecedented move, published an offering of support for the homosexual community. She explained that gay individuals were "tortured and crucified every day for their love—because it is not expressed according to conventional morality. With us, love is just as punishable as murder or robbery" (Anderson qtd. in Birmingham 2). Aside from advocating for homosexuals in this statement, Anderson again alluded to the evil of American society and the way in which it condemned certain behaviors and lifestyles.

The topic of sexual freedom did not only arise in the editor's opinion pieces but also in Sherwood Anderson's fictional work for the magazine. According to Irving Howe, one of the "critical labels" Anderson's collection of short stories received was "the espousal of sexual freedom" (Howe xi). In "An Awakening," Belle Carpenter engages in an affair with George Willard even though she claims to truly love Ed Hanby. She lets George Willard "kiss her to

relieve a longing that was very insistent in her nature" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 179). The blatant promiscuity in this sentence shows that Anderson was willing to push the envelope and supportive of activists like Goldman who advocated for sexual freedom. The sexual nature of the story becomes even stronger when it references George Willard's sexual longings, saying, "In the scene that lay about him there was something that excited his already aroused fancy" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 184). Sexuality is finally referenced out loud in the story in the final pages as George openly whispers, "Lust...lust and night and women" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 188). Editor Anderson chose to publish this story even though it contained blatant sexuality, showing that she supported Anderson's insight on intimate relationships and that she was truly dedicated to the sexual freedom cause.

Anderson's "Paper Pills" also had a sexual quality to it. In the story, the tall dark girl is courted by two different men and describes both them as overcome with sexual desire for her. "They talked to her of passion and there was a strained eager quality in their voices and in their eyes when they looked at her" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 20). Just as the topic of sex is not taboo for the men in the story, the topic of sex was not taboo for the *Little Review*. The story's sexuality builds as one of the men speaks "continually of virginity," which seems to suggest that they are eager to rid the girl of her chastity. The story suggests this too as it says, "Beneath his talk of virginity she began to think there was a lust greater than in all the others. At times it seemed to her that as he talked he was holding her body in his hands" (*Winesburg, Ohio* 21). Just as activists chose to support sexual freedom in America, Anderson chose to freely include incredibly sexual scenes in his writing. By accepting his work, the *Little Review* encouraged conversation about the sexual freedom it depicts as well as the much larger movement for sexual freedom and free love occurring all over the country.

Leaving Behind a Legacy

It was Anderson who established the *Little Review*, but it was ultimately the culture of the early 20th century that shaped it. Anderson envisioned a magazine filled with the best conversation that life could offer and luckily for her, the time period lent itself to just that. With avant-garde work surfacing from Americans and Europeans alike, she had plenty of unique material to work with. In an age in which Emma Goldman reigned as the queen of anarchism, she had radical politics to consider. When society subjected her to censorship, she simply had even more motivation to stand up for the artwork she believed was vital to the people. When she realized that American society was oppressing, isolating, and harming the individual, it became her mission to expose such injustice and to motivate others to take action. As Americans became fixated on maintaining a youthful spirit, Anderson found that she not only had the power to appeal to the youth, but to make them into informed and innovative future artists. Finally, when she observed that social norms frowned upon free love and sexual freedom, she used her magazine to retaliate against such rigid standards. It may seem fantastical that all of this came out of a little magazine, but it did. With the help of contributors like Anderson, the editor was able to create a publication that epitomized modern American society.

Annotated Bibliography

Anderson, Margaret. *My Thirty Years War*. New York: Horizon Press, 1969. Print.

Anderson's autobiography sheds light on her motivation in creating the Little Review and what her vision was for the magazine. It also describes her first encounter with writer Sherwood Anderson as well as the potential that she saw in him.

Anderson, Sherwood. *Notebook*. Mamaroneck: Paul P. Appel, 1970.

This book is a collection of entries from Anderson's personal notebook. Although the notebook includes segments of stories and essays, the selections most helpful for my research purposes are Anderson's most candid thoughts. His seemingly random, but insightful commentary on American writers of his time helped me see the connection between his view of American art and literature and that of editor Anderson and the Little Review.

Anderson, Sherwood. *Winesburg, Ohio*. New York: New American Library, 1919.

This collection of vignettes forms one brilliant novel that I read in my Modern American Fiction course this past semester. Within this novel, I have chosen to hone in on the stories "Paper Pills" (The Philosopher), "A Man of Ideas," and "An Awakening" because it was these three stories that were originally published in the Little Review in 1916 and 1918. I have decided to closely examine the major themes of these three short stories to see how they align with the themes the Little Review aimed to present to its audience.

Anderson, Margaret. *The Little Review*. The Little Review: Literature Drama Music Art. Chicago: Margaret C. Anderson, 1914-1918.

In reviewing the primary documents of the Little Review, comparisons can be drawn between its varying content, especially of Margaret's editorials and Sherwood's commentary and short stories. This kind of examination leads to an overall understanding of what themes and messages the magazine wished to communicate.

Birmingham, Kevin. *The Most Dangerous Book: The Battle for James Joyce Ulysses*. The Penguin Press, 2014.

In "Little Modernisms," Birmingham begins by describing the birth of The Little Review, but eventually transitions into describing its struggle for survival in the midst of intense censorship within the United States. I think Birmingham's work will be important to my paper as it illuminates the nature of what The Little Review was publishing and what kind of editorial statements it was making.

Chase, Cleveland. Sherwood Anderson. New York: Robert M. McBride & Company, 1927.

In this biography of Anderson, Chase's section titled "Winesburg, Ohio" details each novella including the ones that first appeared in The Little Review. His most useful reflections are on how others have received Anderson's work. He explains that others have found "sordidness" in the sexual nature of Winesburg, Ohio and that he has been called "ignorant, perverted, immoral; even his friend Paul Rosenfeld, termed him 'the Phallic Chekhov.'" I found these details in Chase's work of interest because they highlight the risks that The Little Review was willing to take in publishing Anderson and others like him. Furthermore, Chase gives me valuable insight as to how Anderson's work in The Little Review was generally received.

Churchill, Suzanne W. and McKible, Adam. *Little Magazines and Modernism: New Approaches*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2007.

In the section titled "The Dial, The Little Review, and the Dialogics of Modernism," Alan Golding establishes that The Little Review is distinct from other little magazines because of its active participation in the avant-garde movement. Golding then argues that many writers who contributed to both The Dial and The Little Review found the latter to be more "fun." Golding's work helped me establish the unique nature of The Little Review and why authors like Anderson enjoyed being published in it.

Crowley, John W. *New Essays on Winesburg Ohio*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

In "Anderson's Expressionist Art," Crowley likens Anderson to a painter as Anderson in his work was "trying, above all else, to express human emotions." He goes on to say that his endeavors are very much in line with the painters and sculptors of the time period and proves that they had an immense influence on his work. I have included Crowley's work in my research because I believe that his insight on Anderson's work will help me shed light on The Little Review as a magazine and what messages it was aiming to send to its audience.

Falk, Candace. *Love, Anarchy, and Emma Goldman*. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1984.

Falk's work is especially helpful in explaining Goldman's definition of anarchism as well as her opinions on free love and sexual freedom, concepts that editor Anderson explored in the Little Review with the help of Sherwood Anderson's fiction.

Foner, Philip S. *The Case of Joe Hill*. International Publishers, Co., 1965.

In this book, Foner examines the case of Joe Hill step-by-step from his background as an I.W.W. member to the aftermath of his execution. This work is important to my essay as it offers insight

on the case that editor Anderson was so deeply moved by that she had to comment on it in an editorial for the magazine.

Haaland, Bonnie. *Emma Goldman: Sexuality and the Impurity of the State*. Black Rose Books: 1993.

Haaland elaborates on the life of Emma Goldman, explaining her goals as an anarchist activist and defining her values. Her work also specifically cites what aspects of free love and sexual freedom Emma Goldman promoted.

Howe, Irving. "Introduction." New York: New American Library, 1993.

In Howe's introduction to the Sherwood Anderson's collection of short stories, Winesburg, Ohio, he introduces Anderson's biographical sketch and briefly examines critical analyses of Anderson's work while also adding his own. His work will be crucial to my understanding of the major themes of the short stories.

Morrison, Mark S. *The Public Face of Modernism: Little Magazines, Audiences, and Reception*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 2001.

In the section called "Youth in Public," Morrison gives a detailed account of how America's sudden obsession with appearing and feeling young plays a role in commercial advertising. Morrison specifically quotes advertisements from The Little Review and even includes pictures of them. He also asserts that the youthful spirit of America is captured in The Little Review's publications by Sherwood Anderson and Ben Hecht. Morrison's work will help me prove the ways in which The Little Review perpetuated America's obsession with youthful appearances and spirits.

Mott, Frank Luther. *A History of American Magazines*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

In the section titled "The Little Review," Mott, like all others, summarizes the magazine's roots. He goes on, however, to make a more intriguing argument that the majority of space in The Little Review was given to foreign contributors. He then claims that aside from Anderson's snapshots of Winesburg, Ohio, the American writers in The Little Review only represented the nation's major cities. This statement caught my eye as I immediately wondered if Anderson was indeed the only one representing small town American life and if so, why? Mott then goes on to argue that the same case can be made for painting and sculpture. He claims that The Little Review preferred to introduce its readers to European artists as opposed to American.

Wexler, Alice. Emma Goldman: An Intimate Life. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

Wexler explores the life of Emma Goldman, offering valuable insight on her motivations as an anarchist organizer. In reading about Goldman's work , I will ultimately learn how her work fit shaped the ideas of editor Anderson and the content of the Little Review.