The Double Dealer was a monthly magazine published in New Orleans from January 1921 to May 1926. Like most literary magazines of the Nineteen Twenties, The Double Dealer was started with the explicit purpose of promoting culture and fostering new authors and their creativity. This New Orleans magazine, as Virginius Dabney points out, “was devoted exclusively to fiction and poetry and essays on subjects of a literary nature” 1. The editorials were witty comments mainly about American social life and literature. Although they were meant as secondary pieces, the editorials play a very important role: they mark the development of The Double Dealer and make it emblematic of the Twenties by an apparent conflict between the intellectual life of a “civilized minority” and the dynamics of American society at large. Besides this the editorials represent the direct voice of the editors themselves and confirm what F. Hoffman writes, namely that “the little magazines were firstly expression of single minds and single personalities and were limited by the intellectual purpose and division of their founders” 2.

The Double Dealer editors were a vibrant, eclectic and yet well-balanced group. Julius Weis Friend, who in the Thirties would become a philosophy professor at Tulane University, was joined by Albert Goldstein, a fellow Jew. Artistic variety was injected into the group by two already well-known poets, Basil Thompson and John McClure. Thompson was considered “the collegial hub around which the other members/editors revolved”. McClure, instead, was an Oklahoman who had opened a bookstore in the New Orleans French Quarter in 1919 and was not inexperienced in the printing

world. With his subtle perceptions in poetry and the criticism thereof, he was the one who set the tone of the magazine, so far that he was considered "the guiding genius" of the group. Just after coming back from their war experience, the editors had planned the publication of a scandal sheet, modeled on the New Orleans Mascot (1882-1895). Shock was to be their primary purpose. The idea was changed, however, as a reaction to Mencken's attack on the South, defined "the Sahara of the Bozart". The young editors settled therefore for a more serious literary periodical, "whose content would be of the highest caliber".

The shocking witticism which was in their original plans was not abruptly substituted by seriousness, it underwent instead a progressive change from youthful enthusiasm to sedate maturity. It was this maturing process that emphasizes the importance of The Double Dealer as an avant-garde magazine. This change is a reflection of the growing spirits of the editors themselves as well as of the age they represented.

During the first two years the editors of The Double Dealer were actually prone to a youthful facetiousness, wherein they wished to exhibit themselves as "properly and mellowly scornful of all popular ideas and pretensions". One must read the Notes on the Con-

---

3. Albert Goldstein, "The Creative Spirit", in The Past as Prelude: New Orleans 1718-1968, Hodding Carter ed., New Orleans, Pelican Publishing House, 1968, p. 177-178. Mrs Bowen gives us precious information also concerning the relatively widespread circulation of this monthly little magazine. Although it addressed its articles to "a limited group of intelligent people" as did every little magazine (Charles Allen, "The Advance Guard", Sewanee Review, v. 51, July-Sept; 1943, p. 411), The Double Dealer was read also in Canada, France, England, some copies reached even India, Tasmania and the African Gold Coast and it had an average circulation of 15,000 to 18,000. Some comparable examples among the little magazines of those years could be Mencken and Nathan's Smart Set, reaching about 22,000 readers, and The Fugitive, with not more than 500 copies. Within the United States, instead, this New Orleans magazine "at all times did better in other sections of the United States than in the South" (Durrett, op. cit., p. 229).
tributors, the humorous squibs and ballads scattered throughout the magazine and especially the editorials to fully understand and appreciate this attitude.

The Notes on the Contributors were printed on the back covers. Some of them were serious, some others just funny. The more hilarious notes referred to the editors themselves, who camouflaged their presence as contributors (a consistent one, in the first years, due to an initial lack of good material) under pseudonyms, the more ridiculous the better.

The 103 editorials appeared regularly only in the first twenty issues until October 1922, in an average number of four or five at a time. They were consciously written, as Friend writes in his manuscript, “in a baroque almost Euphuistic style, as though to mock themselves as well as the objects of their attacks” 7. And, indeed, they were nothing but caustic remarks on various topics, from social and political issues to literary ones, in Mencken’s style. They used his language of invective, but theirs was less due to aggressiveness and “bellicosity”, as Mencken called it, than to a tendency to ridicule contemporary fads or personalities, no matter if they were famous literary critics or the U.S. Presidents themselves 8.

The editors’ attitude toward satire and humor was generally shared by the vanguard intellectual minority, with which the Double Dealer editors had much in common 9. The Twenties were a vital age of new and “unconventional” attitudes which were fighting their way out of the heavy bulk of traditional conservatism. In such a turmoil,

---

7 Ibid., p. 597.
8 Because of his poems, the iconoclastic Mencken was called “a blown in the glass Utopian, the incorrigible sentimentalist”, (“The Sentimental Mr. Mencken”, Aug.-Sept. 1921, v. 2, p. 50). Definitely more sarcastic are the appellatives given to Woodrow Wilson, now at the end of his mandate: “erstwhile Coiner of Catchwords, moral White Hope of the World and President of the United States”. The disappointing outcome of the war he himself had promoted made the editors consider his popularity only as a demonstration of “the efficacy of advertising”, (“Valedictory”, Feb. 1921, v. 1, pp. 37-38). The Double Dealer editors cynically questioned President Harding’s policy, too: “Is normalcy a possible condition; or is it but a delusion?” (“Back to Normalcy”, Feb. 1921, v. 1, p. 38).
9 The Double Dealer had a network of direct and indirect contacts with the world of the avant garde editorship of those years. Among the editors who contributed to the magazine we could mention: Malcolm Cowley, Lola Ridge and Alfred Kreymborg (Broom), Gorham Munson (Secession), Hart Crane (Gargoyle), Ben Echt (Chicago Literary Review), Vincent Starrett (who was the editor of The Wave and also acted as the Double Dealer Chicago correspondent), the Southerner Charles Finger of All’s Well and the staff of The Fugitive.
satire and humor were felt as an expression of the sense of disharmony in man’s existence on the one side, and also a weapon against the oppression of the narrow-minded, repressive “genteel” tradition on the other. The perception of a conflict between body and spirit, man, both as an individual and as a social being, and nature was reflected in a fundamentally pessimistic view of human life. According to Maxwell Bodenheim, whose book of poems Introducing Irony was reviewed in the November 1922 issue of The Double Dealer, irony becomes a surrogate for wisdom, which is considered in itself impossible. Irony too, like wisdom, is seen as a cosmic view of things, but only irony allows men to see “the pathos of our existence as one, the humorous tale of our self-pity” 10. Not by any chance the Double Dealer editors opened the very first issue of their magazine claiming their affinity to Schopenhauer’s and Voltaire’s sceptical visions of the world, and to Mark Twain’s conception of humor as “man’s only adequate weapon” 11. The disillusion about individual and social life, typical of the Lost Generation, turned out to be, in these young men, a positive energy in the cultural life: as Julius Weis Friend points out, it was with “cool superiority” that he and his friends decided to “assume the task of leading American Literature towards something ‘new and vital’” 12.

It is worth to analyse the editorials because they let us understand some of the elements which actually shaped the first years of this New Orleans magazine. As a matter of fact, the editors of The Double Dealer differentiated themselves from the New York, Chicago and European vanguard intellectuals by the presence, side by side with the above-mentioned innovative tendencies, also of more conservative and traditional attitudes, which can also be seen as a hereditary trait of the old Southern society. “Moderation” could then be a key-word to the understanding of the editorials, no matter what their subject was. The editors asserted their intention always “to deal double, to show the other side”, remaining only themselves who could “deceive them both by speaking the truth”, which became their slogan until September 1922 13.

The prevalent themes of the editorials were based on social and

12 Op. cit., p. 589. It was because of that that Friend felt they were part of a “Found Generation” rather than of the “lost” one.
13 The quotation is taken from Congreve’s comedy, The Double Dealer (1693), from which the New Orleans magazine got its name.
literary issues. Cataloguing the editorials in definite categories is impossible, but we can roughly state that those commenting on social and political questions are slightly dominant in 1921, the first year of publication, with a rate of 28 editorials to 20. It was only in 1922 that comments on literary matters, and with it a purer form of literary criticism, took the leading role, with 25 editorials to 13. These figures explain the importance of the editorials in the evolution of this New Orleans little magazine from the “Magazine for the Discriminating” of the first year to the well-established literary journal of the following ones.

Like Mencken the editors started out under the strong influence of the moral and esthetic relativism of the art-for-art’s-sake school dating back to England’s 1890s. The principles of estheticism determined the choice for the editorial policy of the magazine: no political affiliation was claimed, nor any moral purpose whatsoever, nor any literary preference besides that for a product of good quality.

Evidence of this interest in the 1890s is given on the one hand by the publication in The Double Dealer of several original pieces and reviews respectively by and on Ernest Dowson, Oscar Wilde and other authors of the 90s and on the other hand by the decadent covers of this little magazine. “Here”, Julius Friend writes, “are nymphs and satyrs aplenty done in the Beardsley manner, suggesting I know not what naughtiness and challenge to Mrs. Grundy”. These black and white figures, drawn by a friend, Olive Leonhardt, and printed on the magazine yellow (in the Yellow Book style) or red covers until February 1922, must have been very shocking and desecratingly provocative for an average bourgeois public, if we consider that most of them represented lusty female bodies with naked breasts and serpents crawling around them. It is interesting to point

---

13 Literary themes also include notes on popular art and on Southern literature (these last were 6 in 1921 and just 2 in 1922).

14 As for the consideration The Double Dealer enjoyed among the contemporary intellectuals, a paragraph of a review can be quoted, which was written about the February-March 1924 issue of the magazine: “Touching upon every field of literature, The Double Dealer possesses a pleasing balance, enough of erudition, and enough of modern thought to take a leading place among today’s magazines. It has a voice of authority, not just the ‘murmur’ which even H. L. Mencken grants it to be” (“Literary Magazine of New Orleans Has Large Circulation”, in Julius Weis Friend’s unprinted papers, article n. 138. These papers were given to the Howard-Tilton Library of Tulane University, New Orleans, in 1963, the year following Friend’s death, and were kindly provided to us in photocopies by the same Library, which still holds them).

out how also Faulkner’s early drawings for his long-unpublished allegory *Mayday* (1926), his one-act play *Marionettes* (1920), and his first novel *Soldier’s Pay* (1926) were in the same style. The 1890s are known to have had a general influence on the literates of the second decade of the twentieth century.

The main *fin de siècle* influence came from Nietzsche, who in the Twenties was interpreted essentially, as Hoffman writes, “as a spokesman for the artist, who saw in his work justification for the artist’s taking a stand against the errors and stupidities of his civilization” 18. The editors followed Mencken, referred to as “Nietzsche Americanized”, and his doctrine of the elite: with a strong sense of superiority they deplored the “mediocrity” of the mass. Although they were middle-class, like most intellectual contemporaries, they “prided themselves on being literary aristocrats” 19, and could write: “I am more inclined to believe that the bourgeois flavor which the populace insists upon will never vanish, and to agree with one of my colleagues who avers that our very civilization is built upon mediocrity”, which they saw in men smoking cigarettes, reading sex periodicals, “filling themselves in expensive restaurants where the food is bad and the service worse” 20.

Women were not exempt from their criticism. Some editorials were published in April, May and June 1921 about women’s changes in the 1920s. The editors showed a very condescending, rather conservative male attitude when criticizing women for wearing those “ridiculous gowns which reveal their nudity”; their daubing their faces; their voting at the polls showing “their ignorance in public matters”, and, last but not least, their dabbling “in art for no other reason than that they have good servants to manage their affairs” 21. Very similar to theirs is Faulkner’s negative vision of women in his New Orleans novel *Mosquitoes* (1925), especially concerning women’s limited mental capacities and their fundamental essence as mere physical entities. 22. The *Double Dealer* editors, however, dif-

22 Faulkner makes “the Semitic man, alias Julius Weis Friend himself, define
pered from Faulkner in the fact that they always remained more composedly rational and never treated the sexual element in women as obsessively as their friend did in his early novels Mosquitoes and Soldier's Pay, as well as he would do later in such novels as The Sound and the Fury or Light in August.

By criticizing women's outward changes these young men did not even express any moral or prudish concern. They were worried at the thought that, instead of letting the individual express himself more freely against any form of repressive imposition, these changes were only becoming instruments in the hands of speculators. The "vogues" of those years were a sign that common people's need for conformity and social approbation was still greater than the desire to assert an original personality. Taking a stand for individual freedom, the editors cast their witticism to debunk contemporary fads and to warn against the danger of "the speeding up and the standardization of life and thought" in America, as Sherwood Anderson himself wrote in the March 1922 issue of the magazine 23.

As for women's presence in the world of art, on the contrary, the Double Dealer editors should not be taken too literally. They actually claimed: "We have, dear girls, no contention to make with your sex. As a sex you are a delight and a necessity. As mothers, wives and mistresses you are beyond compare, but, as creative artists, we reaffirm, complete failures, pathetic nonentities" 24. This must have been just a pose, since it would otherwise be impossible to think of any woman positively contributing to the magazine, not only with very fine poetry or prose pieces, but also with their financial support and managerial services, as actually happened 25. The editors may have meant their words only as spurs for the awakening of Southern women artists in the modern manner, to get rid of "the treacly sentimentalities with which our well-intentioned lady fictioneers

women as "shrill and stupid", to which the character Fairchild (alias Sherwood Anderson) objects: "Women are never stupid. Their mental equipment is too sublimely sufficient to do what little directing their bodies (italic mine) require". See the 1985 edition, New York, Washington Square Press, p. 199.

23 "New Orleans, The Double Dealer and the Modern Movement in America", v. 3, p. 119. Sherwood Anderson's words and support of The Double Dealer were considered so important that Albert Goldstein described him not only as a contributor but also as a "drumbeater" for the magazine. See "Discoveries of The Double Dealer", Magazine section of the Times-Picayune, Jan. 21, 1951, p. 6.


25 Many women appeared in the list of the guarantors, and it is worth mentioning the important presence of Friend's sister, Lilian Marcus, who voluntarily devoted all her time to the upkeep of The Double Dealer.
regale us” 26, referring to all those novels with a pre-Civil War setting and style.

As a matter of fact, for the modern American intellectuals of those years “the feminine element” itself had a negative connotation. As Harold Stearns wrote in a successful book he edited in 1922, *Civilization in the United States: An Inquiry by Thirty Americans*, reviewed in *The Double Dealer*, femininity and masculinity *per se* do not really pertain to women or men as sexes, but are traits possessed by an individual, and are “almost as much the result of acquired training as of native inheritance” 27. In those years a battle was fought among the intellectuals over the differences between these traits, not only in the literary field, but also in the moral, religious and political ones. “Feminine” was synonymous with Philistine bigotry and intolerance, Puritanical prudishness and repression, whereas “virility” stood for the quality of the modern intellectual, his disposition to thinking and reasoning, his vitality and his creativity. What mostly worried the modern intellectuals was an awareness of a “feminization” of American life and culture 28. Stearns actually identified “the intellectual life of women” as “practically the intellectual life of the nation” 29. And our editors wrote: “The world is, indeed, ruled by women ... They have the vote. Subtly they run the country” 30.

The prohibition law, approved in 1920, was considered an actual consequence of this disguised power of women. While scornfully looking at the “jelly-bean” generation, as at the most evident product of prohibition 31, the *Double Dealer* editors questioned in the same editorial: “What is prohibition but the product of the female mind?” Sadness was another outcome of prohibition. These last two elements, however, need to be defined within the peculiar environment of the city of New Orleans.

Because of its easy-going atmosphere, the prohibition law was less observed there than elsewhere 32. To all the young friends who

---

31 “Jelly-bean”, is the nickname given by the editors to what they criticised as the feminized youth of the jazz age. The “jelly-bean” is described as “tender, bold, distrait, cut, callow and self-sufficient” (Oct. 1921, v. 2, pp. 122-123).
32 See *Thomas Ewing Dabney, The Story of The Times-Picayune From its
gathered around the *Double Dealer* two-room office, just outside the French Quarter, New Orleans was the American Paris, the best center, second to none in America, as they proudly pointed out, to incarnate and promote the concept of culture and the "Modern Spirit". New Orleans inspired Sherwood Anderson with a significant definition of culture: "Culture means first of all the enjoyment of life, leisure and a sense of leisure. It means time for a play of the imagination over the facts of life, it means time and vitality to be serious about really serious things and a background of joy of life in which to refreshen the tired spirits".

After focusing on the objects of criticism and on the ideal of culture of the New Orleans editors, as well as of their contemporary "modern" intellectuals, the positive qualities of the literate person, according to these young men, must be brought to light. Actually the real intellectual was not so much defined by his/her being a woman or a man, as, rather, by his/her incarnating the traits of "virility". "Masculine" qualities were mainly disinterestedness and subjectiveness, and of course originality and creativity. Disinterestedness was primarily driven by "the love of truth", as also Stearns wrote, and implied that art, to be pure, could not serve any political, religious or moral purpose, such as middle-class pragmatism, Fundamentalism, or the Neo-Humanism of Babbitt and Sherman. S.P. Sherman was labeled by Smith as "the most vindicative and bellige-

*Founding to 1940*, New York, Greenwood Press, 1944, p. 407. According to Fred E. Hamlin, the prohibition law, however, caused much damage to New Orleans as a tourist resort, as it "was held responsible also for the dying out of the old carnival spirit that had won for the city the title 'The City Care Forgot'" ("King Carnival Done to Death", *The New York Times Magazine*, Mar. 13, 1921, p. 16).

"Hamilton Basso, a New Orleanian historian and close friend of the *Double Dealer* staff, writes: "If I never much hankered after Paris during the expatriated years, it was because, in the New Orleans of that era, I had Paris in my own back yard" ("William Faulkner, Man and Writer", *Saturday Review*, July 28, 1962, v. 45, p. 11).

""New Orleans, The *Double Dealer* and the Modern Movement in America", p. 125. The group openly supported, and were supported by, the several cultural institutions of the city, such as the Delgado Museum of Arts, the Louisiana State Museum, the Little Theatre and the Arts and Crafts School. It is to note how in New Orleans they fostered an upper-class kind of art. Never but once there was a hint at the richness of its creole "lower-class" jazz music: in one of McClure's poems, for the October 1921 issue, jazz figured just as a mix of dissonant jongleurs' sounds. See also Berndt Ostendorf, "Creoles and Creolization: Notes on the Multicultural Origins of New Orleans Music", *Rivista di Studi Americani*, anno V, n. 7, 1989, pp. 289-302.
rent of America’s conservative critics.” He intended American national culture as one of a long tradition of “moral idealism” where “it is impossible to separate art from the service of truth, morals and democracy”. Stearns, instead, interpreted the modern attitude by stressing the “belligerent individualism” of the young intellectual, which, in his opinion, was a hereditary trait of the spirit of the American pioneer bound westwards.

A defense of individualism inside this debated contemporary issue was also the position of the Double Dealer editors. They stressed the importance of a subjective and direct, unmediated approach to art, as the only means toward a renovation of American culture. “If you care to learn: forget all you have been taught and told”, because, they affirmed, “one’s individual reaction to things is all that argues.”

If the world of the artist and the intellectual has been fully defined, there was one point, however, where these editors seemed at odds: how could the abstract and aristocratic ideal of an intellectual life be reconciled with the reality of American business-oriented democratic life? The editors were all engaged in business, it must be pointed out, and the hours they dedicated to “this financially profitless enterprise” were taken from their free time. As a matter of fact the question many intellectuals of the 1920s were concerned about was: how could an artist devote body and soul to the creation of a piece of art, when he was continuously hindered by the necessity of earning a living? With no possibility of getting money from the government, a possible solution could be found in some forms of


17 “Classic Emotions”, June 1921, v. 1, pp. 218-219. “No faith at all in critics!” was uttered as a war cry in an October 1921 editorial, where it was pointed out that “criticism is not a synonym for condemnation”, as “acknowledged” critics let it appear to be, and that personal taste was the only valid criterion for criticism (“Lo! The Critics”, v. 2, p. 124). According to Smith, instead, the Neo-Humanist “pointed out that ... there are more important things for him [the critic] to do than exhibit his personality; that there are sounder, more reliable standards of taste than his whims; that critical anarchy leads to critical anarchy; and that criticism cannot be divorced from philosophy, nor art from moral and social experience” (op. cit., p. 345).

18 See “The Pension Plan”, June 1922, v. 3, p 283. The editors’ ideal was the mecenate/artist relationship of the Renaissance.
private patronage, such as the institution of annual awards to the best artist by some well-off little magazines, as The Dial did. This form of financial support, however, was not exempt from controversies.

The polemics about prize-giving became particularly vivacious after the two thousand dollars of the Dial award were given to the already well-established Sherwood Anderson in 1921. The Double Dealer joined, too, in the wave of comments in 1922. Through the words of its European correspondent, Alfred Kreymborg, it conveyed with other vanguard literary periodicals, such as Broom, and other intellectuals, above all Pound, that “the rewards of writers are in inverse order of merit” and that “current systems of prize-giving are not much satisfactory”. Pound had thought out a plan, “the Bel Esprit”, to support artists in need, and this sounded to the New Orleans editors a very interesting initiative, but as a whole their attitude, although a bit more limiting in scope, was certainly more down-to-earth: having an artist depend on someone else could be extremely limiting for him. Therefore this project was considered “quite honorable and praiseworthy”, but “perhaps not feasible”.

A sort of vicious circle with no apparent way out was in prospect. There seemed to be no reason, therefore, for keeping questioning about it at all, and the Double Dealer editors simply stopped taking the problem into any consideration. Actually, what the Double Dealer editors found themselves doing in their magazine in the fight for self-expression, was to progressively dissociate the social and moral issues from the literary ones, so as to be free to deal exclusively with the latter. The permanent suspension of the publication of the editorials in October 1922 can be interpreted as a part of this process.

Such a radical choice, however, was not easy for the editors, according to what they wrote in an “Editorial Comment” for the September 1922 issue⁴¹, and it is worth considering the various

---

¹ “Bel Esprit”, June 1922, v. 3, p. 326. The Double Dealer editors themselves had tried to find a sponsor to encourage new Southern writers, but they gave it up very soon.

₂ His idea was to form “a co-operation of subscribers (individuals or groups) pledging themselves to give fifty dollars per year for life as long as the artist needs it”. Eliot was to be the first “beneficiary” (ibid.). See also “Comment”, Aug. 22, v. 4, p. 108.

³ “After a lengthy and heated discussion (96 degree Fahrenheit) we, the triumvirate, who turn out this sheet, decided to suspend the production and printing of 'Editorials' over the dog days. It may be, unless of course our worthy readers see it
changes the whole magazine underwent in 1922 in order to understand how it started to concentrate more on contemporary modernist and experimental writings.

As a matter of fact, that year the first and most apparent change was in the covers, from the decadent drawings of the first issues to the choice of a classical image, from the March-April 1922 issue on: “the Beardsley-like covers gave place to a small drawing of a Roman coin revealing the head of the two-faced Janus, while chaste lettering which an architect friend devised was exchanged for the arty letters that had formerly proclaimed the magazine’s title” 42. Also the funny Notes on the Contributors were suppressed, together with the editorials. Friend motivates this change as a sign of maturity. In his opinion both their love for the 1890s and the tendency to a youthful facetiousness were nothing but two “obsessions” to get rid of.

By doing so The Double Dealer definitely started up to perfectly match the tendencies of such experimental artists as Eliot, Pound, Stein, Hemingway and the other vanguard writers and poets of the Twenties. T.S. Eliot explained it as a general issue: “the modern tendency is toward something which, for want of a better name, we may call classicism. ... Art reflects the transitory as well as the permanent condition of the soul: we cannot wholly measure the present by what the past has been, or by what we think the future ought to be. Yet there is a tendency – discernible even in art – toward a higher and clearer conception of Reason, and a more severe and serene control of the emotion by Reason. If this approaches or even suggests the Greek ideal, so much the better: but it must be inevitably very different” 43. From 1922 the editors also definitely abandoned their original purpose of mainly encouraging Southern artists and devoted themselves to sponsoring modernist writing.

Bowen Durrett reports that the last years of the magazine were marked by a cheerless depersonalization of the magazine, that the fun grew less and less, especially after the death of their dear friend Basil Thompson, in 1924, and that the effort to survive became “more and more nerve-racking” 44. Certainly, however, as Friend

otherwise, that this suspension will become a permanent arrangement giving way to a, perhaps, more diverting order of things in the direction of running comment” (p. 147).

42 Friend, op. cit., p. 589. As one can see, however, the core of The Double Dealer did remain, the editors’ aim to “deal double” was not altered, proof of it is the choice for “the two-faced Janus”.


himself writes, and as is clearly shown by the presence of such contributors as Hemingway, Faulkner, Jean Toomer, Thornton Wilder (all of them were “discovered” by *The Double Dealer*), Sherwood Anderson, Maxwell Bodenheim, Elinor Wylie, Hart Crane, Allen Tate and Donald Davidson, “the quality of the magazine continued to improve” 45, until, like most magazines of the Twenties, it died, according to Friend, “of displacement” 46 in May 1926.

By that time the editors and the members of their group had worn out their interest in what Friend had defined “a daring adventure”, and did not have time, nor money to put into it any more. On a more cultural level the American crusade for liberty of expression against Puritanism and complacency could be considered generally won, at least in the literary field, although the South had not seemed to respond to the editors’ provocation to revolt as they had expected. Lastly, the time had come when the need for novels of social consciousness was starting to take the lead against the principle of the autonomy of arts. Until that moment, though, the New Orleans little magazine, by balancing itself between tradition and vanguard, between scepticism and idealism, played its important role, both among contemporary magazines and for those who study the issues of that lively age.

46 Ibid., p. 602.