

added; indeed, whether something has not been subtracted in the transition—it has *been* a transition, one can't deny that—from the master's principles and practice to those so much in favour with a later generation. I think there has been a narrowing of the vision, accompanied by a good deal of mystification, a tendency to doctrinaire attitudinising, and in some of the poetry a peculiar rigidity or inertness—all of this totally at odds with Pound's thinking and his art, and equally at odds with the language of liberation and renewal affected by some of our born-again young poets.

There is another tendency or disposition (I shall merely notice it in passing) which appears in the critical polemics of 'projectivism'; something like a nervous nose for heresy. Olson himself, 30 years ago, declared T. S. Eliot (he nicknames him O. M. Eliot) to be '*not projective*'—and he adds, 'having considered how each of us must save himself after his own fashion and how much, for that matter, each of us owes to the non-projective, and continue to owe, as both go alongside each other'. That expression 'save himself' betrays the tendency, doesn't it? Only the other day, in a similar vein, I see that Mr Alan Loney, writing in *Islands*, warns C. K. Stead that he will not achieve 'truly open form' if he doesn't mend his ways. Loney proceeds to advise Stead what he must do to become 'projective'; the way of salvation has been pointed out to him. At least, that seems to be the drift; for my own part, I have to confess that the ghostly counsel offered would give me small comfort, because I find it unintelligible.

Still, as I keep on reminding myself, 'projectivism' is with us. So are Olson and his school. So are a host of younger poets, good and bad, one way or another affected by the movement, whether or not they happen to have studied its definitive writings. Having done a little study myself, I have to ask again, as I did a moment ago: *what* was added to Pound, or Williams for that matter, in the late fifties and the sixties, by Olson, Creeley and the movement we associate with Black Mountain College. Was anything of major worth or meaning added, for instance, to the 'three principles' which Pound and Richard Aldington and 'H.D.' agreed upon 70 years ago? Those three principles have been familiar ground for some of us for a very long time. They will bear repeating here:

1. Direct treatment of the 'thing' whether subjective or objective.
2. To use absolutely no word that does not contribute to the presentation.
3. As regarding rhythm: to compose in the sequence of the musical phrase, not in sequence of a metronome.