Mathieu J. P. Aubin

Reintroducing *Tish*'s Shitty Issues

Social Deviations, Radical Feminisms, and Queer Failures in *Tish 20–E*

Between 1961 and 1969, editors of Vancouver's poetry newsletter *Tish* published forty-five issues that included poems, editorials, reviews, prose, and readers' letters. In 1961, the first editorial board, composed of a group of working-class and lower-middle-class men studying at UBC and writing on Canada's West Coast (Butling and Rudy 50; Niechoda and Hunter 92-93), developed a poetics that began with and responded to its members' peripheral position in North America (*Tish 3* 11). As it is well documented, the board's "theoretically infused confrontation with the contemporary Canadian locus" (Betts, *Avant-Garde* 67) during *Tish*'s first nineteen issues (1961-1963) continues to give the newsletter an important place in the legacy of Vancouver's and Canada's avant-garde history (67-68). However, Pauline Butling troubles the legacy of these issues by arguing that, in spite of claiming to be marginalized, *Tish*'s male editors held a dominant social position in the editorial collective during its first phase (55-56). This article builds on Butling's work by considering how the newsletter's later editorial boards produced more socially equitable texts that reflected non-heteronormative concerns. During the second phase (*Tish 20* to *Tish 24*), the editors, including Daphne Buckle (now Marlatt) and Gladys (now Maria) Hindmarch, produced a more polyvocal space, acknowledged women's contributions, and deployed radical aesthetic strategies (e.g., collage). In the third phase (*Tish 25* to *Tish 40*), when the newsletter continued to be co-edited in part by Hindmarch, the textual space incorporated a more overtly feminist perspective by publishing content that critiqued patriarchal social values. During the fourth phase (*Tish 41* to *Tish E*), the editorial board, which

included gay poet Stan Persky, published queer content (i.e., poetry by gay men and a queer poetics that explored gay sexuality). While the first editorial collective addressed its marginalized position as a group of working-class and lower-middle-class men writing in Vancouver, later editorial collectives transformed *Tish*'s collective and text, published works that represented non-heteronormative perspectives, and challenged the oppression of women and queer people. Although in some ways they reproduced the initial heteromasculinity of the first nineteen issues, later editorial boards ultimately contested the initial phase's androcentricism by deviating from its social relations and aesthetic values.

Scholarship on *Tish* tends to overlook the contributions of heterosexual and lesbian women as well as gay men.[1] As Marlatt indicates in an interview with Brenda Carr, women are "omitted" (102) from histories of *Tish* that focus on the first editorial phase. The recent publications of Frank Davey's *When Tish Happens* (2011) and first-phase editor Fred Wah's *Permissions: TISH Poetics 1963 Thereafter*—(2014), which align with the fiftieth anniversaries of *Tish*'s first publication and the 1963 Vancouver Poetry Conference, respectively, commemorate the first board's literary accomplishments. However, they reproduce narratives that focus on these male editors' experiences and perspectives. Hindmarch, Butling, Buckle, Ginny Smith, and Carol Johnson were "involved in *Tish* and the Writer's Workshop" (Carr 102) from the beginning, but women's labour became more visible during the second editorial phase when Buckle and Hindmarch became members of the editorial board. Marlatt states,

> in the second phase of *Tish, which nobody remembers*, when a group of us who were younger took over the magazine after others had left, there was more of a cross-over with the *Blew Ointment* group and we were publishing Maxine [Gadd]'s poetry and Judy [Copithorne]'s. So I didn't feel, at the time, like I was the only one, though I did feel a certain resistance to the dominance of the men. It was the men who really defined the terms of the prevailing aesthetic at the writing workshops, which was really the collective activity behind *Tish*. (Carr 102, emphasis mine)

As Marlatt notes, men continued to control the newsletter, and did so during the third and fourth editorial phases. Yet, third-phase editors produced newsletters that included feminist poems and prose pieces by writers such as Buckle, Copithorne, Gadd, and Hindmarch,[2] and fourth-phase editors published issues that contained queer content, including works by bill bissett, Robin Blaser, Persky, Jack Spicer, and George Stanley.[3] A literary history of *Tish* that valorizes the contributions of some heterosexual men overlooks

work completed by heterosexual and lesbian women as well as gay men, and continues a tradition of a limited and heteronormative perspective on the newsletter.

Similarly, there is limited scholarship on *Tish* that explicitly examines the last twenty-six issues. The studies that do so mark them as a failure and inadequately address their content that represents non-heteronormative concerns. In *The Little Magazine in Canada 1925-1980*, Ken Norris argues that "the important work done by *Tish* is contained in the first nineteen numbers, when a new poetics and a new orientation were first being worked out" (122). Similarly, Keith Richardson's *Poetry and the Colonized Mind: Tish* emphasizes that later issues show a "lack of innovation" (51) and "lac[k] the argumentative energy of the first nineteen" issues (55). Conversely, derek beaulieu's *TISH: Another "Sense of Things"* offers a more generous reading. beaulieu states: "*TISH* 20 through E [45] did lack the 'argumentative energy' of the original issues, but it was perhaps a creative space that no longer needed to be a literary proving ground" (6). He adds: "As *TISH* re-emerged under a new editorial collective [after issue 19], its role as a *site* for new writing and community shifted to one that both created and reflected a new poetic and political engagement with community" (17, emphasis original). beaulieu's study establishes the necessary groundwork for me to further complicate the notion of "lack" attached to *Tish*'s later issues, especially as later editorial boards shifted their poetic concerns to reflect a new community engagement. However, beaulieu does not explicitly mention that this engagement includes non-heteronormative concerns. *Tish* scholarship ignores later editors' and poets' concerns by marking their issues as failures for not fulfilling the newsletter's founding aesthetics.

In this article, I work against the grain of scholarship that ignores *Tish*'s later issues. Specifically, I offer a socio-cultural analysis of the newsletter's "failed" publications as a means of analyzing the correlation between shifts in *Tish*'s social (i.e., the collective's extratextual social relations) and textual spaces on the page. My analysis is informed by queer theories that examine social spaces and art, including Sara Ahmed's concept of "failed orientation[s]" (92) as well as Jack Halberstam's concept of a "queer art of failure" (88). While Ahmed's and Halberstam's works both engage with the notion of failure, the former focuses on society and the latter focuses on art. Ahmed argues that, in a heteronormative society, "[s]pace acquires 'direction' through how bodies inhabit it" (12), and women and non-heterosexual people are marked as "lost" (7). However, when these marginalized people

shift social structures, they generate "failed orientation[s]" that lead to new ways of occupying a social space (19). Similarly, Halberstam argues that a "queer art of failure" does not reproduce aesthetic conventions, but it "quietly loses . . . and imagines other goals for life, for love, for art, and for being," and in doing so "recognizes that alternatives are embedded already in . . . dominant" practices (88). In short, the theories of Ahmed and Halberstam posit that failure in society and art, respectively, may foster new forms of engagement that eschew heteronormative conventions. To be clear, queer theory offers a theorization of failure that provides a useful framework that I deploy to better understand how the purportedly failed orientations of *Tish*'s editorial board in the last twenty-six issues challenge the heteronormative standards of the first nineteen issues. By joining Ahmed's and Halberstam's theories, I claim that *Tish*'s inclusion of non-heteronormative perspectives in later phases queers the newsletter: they mark a failure to reproduce the patriarchal heteronormativity of the first editorial phase.

In the newsletter's initial phase, managed by Frank Davey and co-edited by George Bowering, David Dawson, Jamie Reid, and Fred Wah, the collective sought to begin a literary movement to address their marginalized position contra established socio-cultural conditions, yet excluded people who were closer to the periphery of power. In the second phase, overseen by Dawson and co-edited by Buckle, Hindmarch, McLeod, Peter Auxier, and David Cull, the magazine's board produced a more polyvocal textual space, acknowledged women's contributions, and published a feminist aesthetics. However, it did not entirely challenge the first collective's masculinist ideology and social relations. In the third phase, overseen by McLeod, and whose co-editors included Auxier, Dawson, and Hindmarch, the magazine's board failed to fulfill the first board's publishing expectations. It published the newsletter intermittently and it produced works that embodied a feminist queer art of failure. Finally, in the fourth phase, led by Persky and co-edited by McLeod, Brad Robinson, Colin Stewart, and Karen Tallman, the magazine's collective focused on men's writing, but published texts by numerous gay poets that formed a queer art of failure. Ultimately, I show that *Tish*'s "failures" mark a departure from the first phase's androcentrism.

During *Tish*'s first phase, the editors embraced their peripheral social and geographical position and conveyed their alternate aesthetics on the page. Like many little magazines at the time across Canada, *Tish* sought to demarcate itself by presenting a unique aesthetic perspective in relation to its own location in Vancouver (Norris 107-108). Specifically, *Tish*'s first board

marked its new poetics and perceived abject social position by calling their publication a "fine kettle of fecis [*sic*]" (*Tish 1* 12), and discussing their peripheral social and literary concerns in relation to what they felt was "GOING ON IN VANCOUVER" (*Tish 5* 1). Gregory Betts indicates that the editors created what he calls a "geopoetics" that "demanded that they respond to their locality and to question in verse the relationship between place and language" as they were "shaped by the contingencies of a particular place at a particular historical moment—Vancouver, 1961" ("Geopoetics" 43). This "geopoetics" started from a self-identified socio-cultural position at the margin and enabled the editorial board to galvanize a textual movement that did not require its members to continue lines of publication begun by dominant Canadian centres of cultural production (i.e., Montreal and Toronto). *Tish* was "designed primarily as a poetry newsletter [with] the intention of keeping poets & other interested people informed on what [was] happening in Vancouver—its writing, its tastes" (*Tish 4* 13). The newsletter worked against the grain of contemporary cultural production in Canada because it failed to promote mainstream Canada's aesthetic values and successfully promoted its editorial board's new version of Vancouver's writing. Thus, by promoting what they understood to be an abject and local aesthetic, *Tish*'s collective engendered alternate socio-cultural conditions that enabled its constituents to advance a new literary project from a peripheral position in Vancouver.

While the first nineteen issues reflected the first board's marginalized identity, their texts reaffirmed heteronormative values. As Lara Halina Tomaszewska demonstrates in her work on masculinity and *Tish*, "[m]aleness and masculinity are preconditions for spiritual and personal freedom" (72). That is, to speak from one's marginalized position entails performing masculinity. To complicate Tomaszewska's point, it is necessary to acknowledge that the page was reserved for men to develop their poetics, and it failed to be more inclusive for women. Although "Buckle . . . and Hindmarch participated in discussions around the magazine and its submissions" (beaulieu, "*TISH* Magazine 1961-1969" 29-30), eighty-four percent of the newsletter's contributors in the first nineteen issues were men, and female contributors were invisible until *Tish 12*. As Marlatt states retrospectively, "I felt fairly ambivalent when Frank [Davey] was talking about marginalization: I felt even more marginalized," and "I remember submitting to *Tish*, and being told that I was writing out of my imagination too much" (Niechoda and Hunter 96).[4] This further marginalization resulted from symbolic violence inflicted upon Buckle by a masculinist

editorial board. As Pierre Bourdieu argues, "symbolic domination" (37) is not immediately recognizable to a marginalized person, but is instituted and reinforced through normalized bodily performances that empower men (37). This symbolic violence is visible in a letter by Davey that rejects Buckle's poem "Uh huh, Mama." In the letter, Davey argues that Buckle's poetics are at odds with the newsletter's aesthetic and states: "I believe in writing only about experience, and, of course, about those thoughts which most dominate my mind" ("Letter to Daphne Buckle"). Although Davey's claim suggests that the newsletter's poetry fits the collective's concept of "experience," Buckle's response to his rejection letter critiques his failure to recognize other forms of imagination and how they connect to experience. She states,

> [your] criticism of 'Uh huh, Mama' may be well-founded, in spite of the fact that I was not even attempting to write this as projective verse. Your criticism of its subject matter, however, is self contradictory . . . The very act of imagining a person or condition is in itself an experience, neither is its product completely removed from reality since all things imagined can not exist unless they be connected to some sensation or perception originally experienced. ("Letter to Frank Davey")

Since masculinity is a "preconditio[n] for spiritual and personal freedom" (Tomaszewska 72) during *Tish*'s first phase, and women's contributions are predominantly left off the page, Buckle's letter is arguably a response to the newsletter's masculinist aesthetic that leads to the exclusion of women. Specifically, the letter is a critique of Davey's limited aesthetic lens that disqualifies Buckle's work because it does not adhere to *his* understanding of "experience." An unsent early version of the letter also crosses out Buckle's phrase "[h]ere it is, a defence and a denunciation" ("Letter to Frank Davey"). This crossing out is a form of self-censorship that shows the symbolic effects of masculine power within *Tish*'s collective. Buckle's struggle to publish her work in a textual space that claimed to be for Vancouver's marginalized poets, but was dominated by men, is an example of how the first phase's social and textual spaces failed to incorporate more marginalized voices.

Tish's second editorial phase, however, marked a continuation of and deviation from the first editorial board's social relations. Although only Dawson continued his role as editor, the collective sought to maintain the momentum of the first nineteen issues. Yet, it redressed the exclusion of women's contributions. To analyze how the second phase challenged the first board's patriarchal values, it is fruitful to consider Ahmed's analysis of patrilineal movements. She argues, "[t]o commit may . . . be a way of describing how it is that we become directed toward specific goals, aims,

and aspirations through what we 'do' with our bodies" (17). However, loss in a social space can generate new directions (19). That is, to commit to a specific movement entails following and repeating the same social relations, yet a loss offers the opportunity to reimagine a social space's structure. As it transitioned to a new editorial board, *Tish* sought to continue the earlier newsletter's momentum, while it adjusted to a new board. Dawson's editorial in *Tish 20* states, "TISH has come to an actual and physical change . . . yet TISH will continue" (5). The new editorial board's members "have worked closely with TISH editors, most of them have published in TISH—all of them have a strong sense of TISH, of what it means & of what it can do" (5). This statement suggests that *Tish 20*'s editorial board was committed to participating in *Tish*'s androcentric telos because the collective's members were carefully chosen based on their previous training and ability to reproduce *Tish*'s aesthetic. However, the departure of editorial board members correlated with a shift in how the newsletter gave representation to the collective within its textual space. As of *Tish 20,* the header listing editors' names changes how it symbolically represents the collective's power structures. In the first nineteen issues' header, the title "editor" (*Tish 1* 1) or "managing editor" (*Tish 13* 1) (i.e., "Frank Davey") was placed above contributing editors' names, which are not listed alphabetically. The placement of all names on the masthead forms a visual hierarchy between the editors. Conversely, the second phase's header includes Buckle's and Hindmarch's names and all editors' names are listed alphabetically (*Tish 20* 1; *Tish 21* 1; *Tish 22* 1; *Tish 23* 1).[5] While the first phase's header marks a symbolic hierarchy of the collective that erases the contributions of women, the second phase's text redresses their invisibility and acknowledges their contributions, suggesting what Dawson described as "an actual and physical change" on the page. Thus, this textual shift indicates a change in the collective's power structures.

The second phase's editors disrupted the boundaries of the text and created space for previously under-represented voices. *Tish 21* deviates from the first phase's format by "more or less 'cut[ing]-up,' in some mad order" (*Tish 21* 1) submitted material (i.e., poems and journal entries) in response to the Vancouver Poetry Conference. Collage, as Halberstam argues, can be a feminist and queer aesthetic practice that negates prescriptive aesthetic boundaries because it "references the spaces in between and refuses to respect the boundaries that usually delineate . . . the copy from the original" (136). That is, collage disrupts rigid conventions that privilege

heteronormative and aesthetic boundaries by exposing and undermining them and reimagining the original material into a remixed feminist copy (136).[6] *Tish 21* is a disruptive text that joins multiple voices and perspectives, including those of women. For instance, in Buckle's poem "The Going Out," the speaker reflects upon the Conference and presents her impressions. The speaker states, "me me me at all reflections in / convolutions of my mind turn upon itself / the mindhand folded prey in-shell" (2). Buckle's poem emphasizes a woman's presence at the event that reflects the larger "convolutions" of the text, a point accentuated by a note following the poem from a journal entry that states, "Poem is presence, not accountable discharge" (2). The issue creates radical junctions between notes from the poetry conference and contributions by the editorial board. In this case, the note emphasizes the presence of Buckle in *Tish*. Although *Tish*'s first nineteen issues highlight the experiences of its male editors, the poem's repetition of the word "me" stresses the importance of the female lyrical voice that places the woman at the event, shows her experience actively reflecting about the event, and voices her thoughts to the reader. In addition, the words "convolutions" and "folded" represent the shape of the poem, which disrupts a linear format, because the lines present convoluted images that fold onto each other. More broadly, this poem represents the larger aesthetic practice of the issue because of its multiple junctions between submitted cut-up materials. Although women had previously been inequitably represented in *Tish*, this issue's feminist collage made the labour of women visible and disrupted the first phase's power structures.

In spite of the issues' disruption of androcentric structures, the second phase's newsletters were entrenched in the first editorial board's social relations and masculinist ideologies. In her analysis of continuity in a patriarchal society, albeit in a different context, Ahmed argues, "the line begins with the father and is followed by those who 'can' take his place" (22). That is, in a heteronormative society, males are privileged and are expected to continue the lines begun by other men. Similarly in *Tish*, Dawson continues the lines begun by editors in the first phase, including himself. As he states in *Tish 20*, "almost as a point of continuity, I am taking over as editor. the other past editors will, of course, be sending poems from wherever they may be. so the change is more a blending in of new poets, rather than an exclusion of anyone" (5). In spite of redressing the exclusion of previously marginalized people, *Tish*'s collective continued the first board's legacy by publishing poems written by Bowering, Davey, and Wah

throughout its five issues. Also, the newsletter published works objectifying women, including poems by previous male contributors.[7] For example, in Auxier's poem "Robson Street 2 a.m.," the speaker objectifies a woman he sees walking on Vancouver's Robson Street. In his description of a "Blonde-haired girl either too young or barely / old enough," the speaker sexualizes "her bum" and "her thighs" (14). This description causes symbolic violence against the object of the speaker's gaze because it reproduces patriarchal representations of the female body that make it visible as a sexual object. Referring to *Tish*'s first-phase poems, Lance La Rocque argues that the male poet "[t]ransform[s] women into commodity, tool, substance, sight," which enables him "to condense the larger other . . . and imagin[e] it as something that is at his disposal, that he can buy, grasp, mould, and gaze at" (165). Like the first-phase poems that La Rocque critiques, "Robson Street 2 a.m." contains a masculinist ideology that strips agency from women and reduces them to a sexual commodity. Although the board redressed the exclusion of some women, these efforts were at odds with the publication of masculinist poems that further served to oppress them. Thus, second-phase issues challenged the first phase's androcentrism, but they paradoxically reinscribed these values by continuing a patriarchal legacy.

The intermittent publication of *Tish* during its third phase disrupted the newsletter's identity as a monthly newsletter and marked a failure to acquiesce to the publishing standards established by the first editorial board. Although the first board established *Tish* as a monthly newsletter, second- and third-phase editors failed to maintain this production schedule. *Tish 22* appeared three months after *Tish 21,* while *Tish 24* was published four months after *Tish 23*. During the third phase, *Tish 31* and *Tish 38* were published five months apart from *Tish 30* and *Tish 37*, respectively. Because the second phase was short, the third phase's twenty-six issues marked a disruption to the newsletter's identity as a consistent publication. This failure is the focus of a letter by Bowering in *Tish 27* critical of such inconsistency. Bowering states: "[l]et me first say Tish shd be coming out more often, once a month, unless it does it loses NEWSletter basis, becomes groupy, magazine" ("Dear Tishers" 2). Bowering's letter suggests his investment in *Tish*'s legacy, his frustration that the newsletter fails to observe his standards as a member of the first editorial board, and his desire to correct it. In her discussion of the reproduction of heterosexual lines in a heteronormative society, Ahmed insists that the following of pre-established lines facilitates continuity (17), yet "straightening" (23) tools can be deployed to correct

failed orientations (72). Bowering's letter functions as a "straightening device" (23) and is intended to reorient the newsletter's collective away from its failed orientation. However, Bowering's effort ultimately failed to change anything and he distanced himself from this later phase because it did not appease his concerns. As an interview two decades later shows, Bowering "didnt [*sic*] like the idea of the magazine's continuing with a new set of editors after its run, [but] wouldn't have minded seeing them do a magazine with a slightly different direction" (Bowering, "Interview" 16). That is, Bowering felt that later editorial collectives should have started another magazine apart from the *Tish* project. This critique suggests that, according to Bowering, the creative efforts of later editorial collectives did not accurately continue the project. Thus, the third phase did not acquiesce to at least one member of the first editorial board's publication standards. It could even be marked as a failed orientation for the newsletter.

During the third phase, the newsletter increased its publication of feminist content by women that challenged the newsletter's original masculinist aesthetics.[8] Gadd's poetry, for instance, seems not to have met Bowering's standards, as he indicates in a letter published in *Tish 27*: "she seems to be thinking abt the things she says now, tho some of them are awry thots still" ("Dear Tishers" 2). Because Bowering calls Gadd's poetry "awry," it is worth further exploring her poetry's "misdirection." As Gadd's letter following her poetry in *Tish 26* indicates, "I insist on pain in art, I insist on it. Because pain . . . leads us, if it is taken fully, to ex stasis, ecstasy, standing outside of oneself, of everything" ("Dear Peter" 5). Her statement connects to what Halberstam calls radically passive feminism. This type of feminist "refuses to cohere, refuses to fortify herself against the knowledge of death and dying, and seeks instead to be out of time altogether, a body suspended in time, space, and desire" (125-26). In Gadd's "2nd Well Poem," the speaker, like a radically passive feminist, negates her creative process. In the first half of the poem, the speaker describes how she hauls "buckets of stars" (2) to the surface. Yet, as she states, because a woman warned her that she may fall into it and never return, she "had a pump / put over the damn thing" (2). The poem is an allegory for the negation of the female speaker's creative experience. The speaker hauling buckets of stars represents an act of descending into a space of imagination to bring images back to the surface. However, out of fear that she may fall into a well of imagination, she refuses to continue the act and negates her agency by replacing her movement with a tool to reproduce her process. That is, the speaker refuses

to continue returning images of stars to the surface, and stops her creative process altogether. Unlike Bowering's theoretical statement in *Tish 1,* which emphasizes that a poet's "job is to *participate*" ("Untitled" 4, emphasis mine), radically passive feminism contradicts agency. This form of feminism enables the speaker to acknowledge her pain and to exist outside of the space of production that places her in a subordinate position. Gadd's "2nd Well Poem" fails to acquiesce in the experience of writing *Tish*'s textual space with a radical passive feminist intervention in which a woman refuses to reproduce a heteronormative aesthetic. Thus, this poem provides an example of third-phase feminist content that challenged the newsletter's earlier masculinist values.

During its fourth phase, *Tish*'s collective and textual spaces were queered by the magazine's inclusion of a gay editor and its publication of several works by gay poets. While Karen Tallman was the newsletter's general editor (Persky, "Bibliographic Soap Opera" 21), Persky "change[d] its format completely . . . , r[an] an increasing amount of prose and other non-poetry forms, develop[ed] a relationship with the burgeoning underground newspaper *The Georgia Straight*, and eventually end[ed] *TISH*'s production completely" (beaulieu, *TISH* 20). Persky also published an increased number of poems by writers such as bissett, Spicer, and Stanley, who together contributed twelve percent of this phase's content. In a recent interview, Persky states that he does not believe he consciously intended to challenge the earlier phases' predominantly heteronormative patterns. However, he does admit that he "was just on the verge . . . of inventing public homosexuality" (Personal interview). Moreover, *Tish 42*, which he published alone, contains the most contributions by gay poets. It is useful once again to turn to the work of Ahmed who argues that "[t]he field of heterosexual objects is produced as an effect of the repetition of a certain [heterosexual] direction" (88). However, a non-heteronormative person orients themself towards queer objects, which queers the object through their phenomenological relationship (94). *Tish 42* is marked by Persky's non-heteronormative social relationships with poets such as Blaser and Spicer, whom he had met in San Francisco. Also, Persky had been romantically involved with Blaser shortly before editing *Tish* (Persky, *Oral History of Vancouver* 7). *Tish 42* arguably reflects this relationship because it includes seven poems by Blaser—and *Tish 43* contains four of his poems. Although the fourth editorial phase marked a queer departure from earlier phases, it remained controlled by Persky and predominantly published poetry by men.

Tish's fourth phase remained a male-centric textual space, while deviating from the original board's direction.

During the last phase, the editors published poems that formed a queer art of failure. These poems fail to reproduce heteronormative perspectives of sexuality because they contain unregulated sexual discourses. They evoke what Halberstam lists as part of the queer art of failure: "rage, rudeness, anger, spite, impatience, intensity, mania, sincerity, earnestness, overinvestment, incivility, brutal honesty, and disappointment" (110). For Halberstam, the queer art of failure challenges the social and aesthetic boundaries of a heteronormative society by evoking excessive affective responses to queer oppression (110). Persky's queer poem "The Long Goodbye" in *Tish 43* participates in this aesthetic practice by mixing brutal honesty, anger, and spite to discuss his response to the death of his lover, who was killed in a gay-bashing. The speaker's brutal honesty is seen in the explicit details of his lover's death as he states that someone "using a rod and an oily cloth until the dark grooves glow" (Persky, "The Long Goodbye" 17) killed his lover. Instead of complying with dominant social practices of mourning, the speaker evokes his anger by stating to himself:

> what you've had of love has not left you on the streets mourning its anniversary, or your hands only remembering places where you put your lips, but a toughness, puckish eyes, if your memory crowds you, you can undercut it with a sharp tongue. (17)

By describing himself as having "a toughness" and "puckish / eyes," he evokes an affective response of anger that refuses to passively accept the violence imposed on his lover. In addition, he chooses to fail to remember when his "memory crowds" him by spitefully using his "sharp tongue" to "undercut" an act of memorialization. Gay-bashings are a violent way of reminding queer people that being gay is a deviation from dominant social practices. However, the speaker in this poem refuses to adhere to this practice by choosing to actively forget these heteronormative relations. This queer art of failure does not comply with heteronormative social and aesthetic standards, but deploys queer affect to challenge these practices. Thus, this poem is one instance of radical queer poetry published during this final editorial phase that queered the newsletter's aesthetic and deviated from the original board's heteronormativity.

While *Tish*'s first nineteen issues produced a literary movement that began with its collective's marginalized position, *Tish*'s later editorial phases

deviated from that first board's heteronormative values. The inclusion of heterosexual and lesbian women as well as gay men in later editorial boards correlated with the reimagination of the newsletter's textual space that included radically passive feminist works and a queer art of failure. However, the newsletter remained dominated by men, which is clearly present on the page. In their failure to adhere to the original editorial board's standards, the second, third, and fourth editorial boards queered the newsletter and challenged the original board's heteronormative values. Although studies of *Tish* have predominantly valorized the experiences of the first male editors and continue to commemorate their efforts, this article challenges the critical trend that dismisses later *Tish* issues. The shifts in later editorial boards cannot continue to be overlooked, but must be recognized for their contemporary value, as they speak to issues that remain important to current feminist and queer activism. Thus, this article's alternate socio-cultural history of *Tish*'s later issues challenges a limited and heteronormative perspective of Vancouver's first poetry newsletter to valorize the efforts of artists that have previously been ignored.

NOTES

1 Although Daphne Marlatt currently identifies as a lesbian woman, she came out in the 1980s.
2 See Buckle's "woman in the week" (*Tish 27* 5), Copithorne's "Prologue" (*Tish 37* 6), Gadd's "i'll write the history of america" (*Tish 31* 9-10), and Hindmarch's "Vancouver Chinatown" (*Tish 26* 12).
3 See Dan McLeod's "The Underground Newspaper" (*Tish D* 8-9) and Robin Blaser's "4" (*Tish 42* 6).
4 Buckle's "Figs in Vancouver" in *Tish 12* is her first poem published with *Tish.*
5 These changes suggest a deviation from the first board's self-representation and represent a textual attempt to redress the exclusion of marginalized people (e.g., women). However, this phase's last two issues return to previous editorial practices. In *Tish 24,* Dawson is identified as the "Editor" and the other editors are listed as "Contributing Editors." In *Tish 23*, Hindmarch's name is placed last, and in *Tish 24* Buckle's and Hindmarch's names are listed last.
6 Interestingly, collage later became part of Fred Wah's aesthetic strategy. See Cabri 9-13.
7 See Bowering's "Leg" (*Tish 22* 9), Mike Matthews' "Where Did You Come From" (*Tish 23* 6), John Keys' "The Use" (*Tish 23* 10), and Lionel Kearns' "The Sensationalist" (*Tish 24* 11).
8 In *Tish 39*, half of the content is written by women.

WORKS CITED

Ahmed, Sara. *Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others.* Duke UP, 2006.
Auxier, Peter. "Robson Street 2 a.m." *Tish 23*, Jan. 1964, p. 14.
beaulieu, derek. *TISH: Another "Sense of Things."* U of Buffalo P, 2017.

—. "*TISH* Magazine 1961-1969: another 'sense of things.'" MA thesis, University of Calgary, 2004.
Betts, Gregory. *Avant-Garde Canadian Literature: The Early Manifestations*. U of Toronto P, 2013.
—. "The Geopoetics of *Tish* (in the Canadian Context)." *Rampike*, vol. 15, no. 1, 2007, pp. 42-54.
Blaser, Robin. "4." *Tish 42*, n.d., p. 6.
Bourdieu, Pierre. *Masculine Domination*. Translated by Richard Nice, Stanford UP, 2001.
Bowering, George. "Dear Tishers." *Tish 27*, 1 Nov. 1964, pp. 2-3.
—. "Interview." *Poets and Print: Barry McKinnon Talks with 10 British Columbia Poet/Publishers*, special issue of *Open Letter*, vol. 7, no. 2-3, 1988, pp. 9-28.
—. "Leg." *Tish 22*, 1 Dec. 1963, p. 9.
—. "Untitled." *Tish 1*, 1961, p. 4.
Buckle, Daphne. "Figs in Vancouver." *Tish 12*, 14 Aug. 1962, p. 3.
—. Letter to Frank Davey. n. d., Box 3, Folder 37. MsC 142a Daphne Marlatt Fonds. Contemporary Poetry Collection, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC. Accessed 15 July 2017.
—. "The Going Out." *Tish 21*, Sept. 1963, p. 2.
—. "woman in the week." *Tish 27*, 1 Nov. 1964, p. 5.
Butling, Pauline, and Susan Rudy. *Writing in Our Time: Canada's Radical Poetries in English (1957-2003)*. Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2005.
Cabri, Louis, editor. *The False Laws of Narrative: The Poetry of Fred Wah.* Wilfrid Laurier UP, 2009.
Carr, Brenda. "Between Continuity and Difference: An Interview with Daphne Marlatt." *Beyond Tish*, edited by Douglas Barbour, NeWest, 1991, pp. 99-107.
Copithorne, Judith. "Prologue." *Tish 37*, 18 June 1966, p. 6.
Davey, Frank. Letter to Daphne Buckle. 31 Oct. 1961. Box 3, Folder 37, MsC 142a Daphne Marlatt Fonds. Contemporary Poetry Collection, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC. Accessed 15 July 2017.
—. *When Tish Happens: The Unlikely Story of Canada's "Most Influential Literary Magazine*." ECW, 2011.
Davey, Frank, et al., editors. *Tish,* 1961.
—. *Tish 3*, 14 Nov. 1961.
—. *Tish 4*, 14 Dec. 1961.
—. *Tish 5*, 13 Jan. 1962.
—. *Tish 13,* 14 Sept. 1962.
Dawson, David, et al., editors. *Tish 20*, 1 Aug. 1963.
—. *Tish 21*, Sept. 1963.
—. *Tish 22*, 1 Dec. 1963.
—. *Tish 23*, 1 Jan. 1964.
—. *Tish 24*, 1 May 1964.
Gadd, Maxine. "Dear Peter." *Tish 26*, Oct. 1964, pp. 3-5.
—. "i'll write the history of america." *Tish 31*, 4 Nov. 1965, pp. 9-10.
—. "2nd Well Poem." *Tish 26*, 1 Oct. 1964, p. 2.
Halberstam, Jack. *The Queer Art of Failure*. Duke UP, 2011.
Hindmarch, Gladys. "Vancouver Chinatown." *Tish 26*, 1 Oct. 1964, p. 12.
Kearns, Lionel. "The Sensationalist." *Tish 24*, 1 May 1964, p. 12.
Keys, John. "The Use." *Tish 23*, 1 Jan. 1964, p. 10.

La Rocque, Lance. "Revolution and Retreat: The Success and Failure of *Tish* Subjectivities." Dissertation, York University, 1999.
Matthews, Mike. "Where Did You Come From." *Tish 23*, 1 Jan. 1964, p. 6.
McLeod, Dan. "The Underground Newspaper." *Tish D*, Feb. 1969, pp. 8-9.
McLeod, Dan, and Peter Auxier, editors. *Tish 31*, 4 Nov. 1965.
McLeod, Dan, et al., editors. *Tish 30*, 1 Aug. 1965.
Niechoda, Irene, and Tim Hunter. "A Tishstory." *Beyond Tish*, edited by Douglas Barbour, NeWest, 1991, pp. 83-98.
Norris, Ken. *The Little Magazine in Canada 1925-1980*. ECW, 1984.
Persky, Stan. "Bibliographic Soap Opera." *Tish D*, Feb. 1969, p. 21.
—. *An Oral Literary History of Vancouver: Stan Persky's Section*. Beaver Kosmos Folios, 1972.
—. "The Long Goodbye." *Tish 43*, 1 Apr. 1969, pp. 18-19.
—. Personal interview. 24 Aug. 2017.
Richardson, Keith. *Poetry and the Colonized Mind: Tish*. Mosaic, 1976.
Tallman, Karen, et al., editors. *Tish 42*, n. d.
—. *Tish 43*, n. d.
Tomaszewska, Lara Halina. "Borderlines of Poetry and Art: Vancouver, American Modernism, and the Formation of the West Coast Avant-Garde, 1961-69." Dissertation, The University of British Columbia, 2007.
Wah, Fred. *Permissions: TISH Poetics 1963 Thereafter—*. Ronsdale, 2014.