

The Post-Structuralist Repositioning of Allen Ginsberg's Controversial Poem "Howl": A Deconstructive Approach



Amir Baradaran M. A.¹, Omid Ghahreman Ph.D.²

¹Khayyam University of Mashhad, Iran

Postal Address: Apt no. 3, No. 20, Piroozi 28th, Piroozi Blvd, Mashhad, Razavi Khorasan Province, Iran

²Khayyam University of Mashhad, Iran

ABSTRACT: Allen Ginsberg's poems with their paradoxical language and syntax are a literary commentary on anger, hopelessness and frustration of the American society in the 1950s. His poems work on the binary concept of this culture versus counter-culture and try to portray a suitable diatribe on the cultural issues which were disgusting in Ginsberg's mind. The present study looks for potentially malfunctioning sections of the language of his masterpiece "Howl" in order to argue that although attempted by the poet, there might be no organic unified without showing susceptibility to breakage and rupture. The study concludes that Ginsberg's poetry strives hard to express a vehement lamentation in breath-length stanzas which often times decenters its own text and might raise multiple interpretations and provoke multiple lingual disorganizations.

KEYWORDS: Allen Ginsberg, Deconstruction, Jacques Derrida, poem, binary opposition, rupture, analysis

I. INTRODUCTION

During the post-war years American society underwent a huge metamorphosis which resulted in a new direction in life, a life pursuing a lost world of meaning, of distorted human identity and of burdening heavy loads of political criticism. During World War II and following the Cold War, the harshness and cruelty of human nature led to a representation of the dark side of humanity. Aside from the widespread degeneracy, the atmosphere of American society was poisoned by the dark anti-communist policies.

The situation created menacing atmosphere of war in America casting a shadow of fear of another time of disaster but this time with the apprehension of nuclear apocalypse. The rage and indignation resulted by the extreme social dissatisfaction with the corrupted nature of the modern human led to new definitions of humanity, society and the individual. Speaking of this drastic social change, this had a huge impact on the art and literature of the time that is to say 1950s, the representative of which is the literary angry Beat generation. This generation of writers, poets and musicians produced a great body of artistic works which depicted the corrupted society of the time with all its struggles. Of the widely praised figures were Jack Kerouac, William S. Burroughs, Neal Cassady and Allen Ginsberg.

Irwin Allen Ginsberg was born in 1926 to an average Jewish family in Newark. Both parents were educated, and his father used to write poetry drenched in "apocalyptic" notions which later appeared in his own poetry while his mother was a strong follower of Marxist ideology (Raskin, 2004, p. 26). As a Marxist, she was an incendiary critic of capitalism which was being more and more strengthened in America. According to Jonah Raskin, "If ever there was a poet in rebellion against his own parents it was Allen Ginsberg. And yet if ever there was a dutiful poet it was also Allen Ginsberg. The son carried on the family heritage even as he railed against it" (2004, p. 26). Although he was a critic of his parents' ideas, like his mother Ginsberg also harbored strong anti-conformist, anti-capitalist, and political criticism in his poetry, best exemplified in his poem "Howl". According to the Beat literature scholar, Reisman (2012):

The voice Ginsberg employed in "Howl" not only has influenced the style of several generations of poets, but also has combined the rhythms and language of common speech with some of the deepest, most enduring traditions in American literature. In both his life and his work, Ginsberg set an example of moral seriousness, artistic commitment, and humane decency that made him one of the most popular figures in American culture. The best of his visionary and innovative creations earned for him recognition as one of the major figures of the twentieth century. (p. 107)

The Post-Structuralist Repositioning of Allen Ginsberg's Controversial Poem "Howl": A Deconstructive Approach

Therefore, Allen Ginsberg who was known as the prophet of the Beat generation expressed the atmosphere of the time in his controversial poems, the poems of madness, of indignation and of the filth hidden in the nature of the modern man. Ginsberg's poetry calls for a recognition of the self alongside with the social identification and reveals the politicized manipulation of logic under which, the modernist society had lost its way to peace. The first time that Ginsberg's poetry was presented to the public was at the important event, "The Six Gallery Reading". In 1955 the young poet let his words portray his genius and perspicacious insight by reading "Howl" in the mentioned poetry event which was held in San Francisco accompanying his four other fellow poets, Philip Whalen, Gary Snyder, Phillip Lamantia and Michael McClure. This poetic performance led to the explosion of political and socially critical themes of the poem "Howl", while being read like in a public political ceremony in which an electorate is giving a public speech in front of a city's residents. Later published in his book *Howl and Other Poems* (1956), "Howl" and the rest won him great recognition and popularity among American people and specifically literary figures and critics.

Popularized by Jacques Derrida, deconstruction basically argues that the systematic structure of language might stand as an unreliable connectivity among its users acting as a lingual swindle which could produce a range of meaning. In order to grasp a more-than-before sophisticated take of Ginsberg's poems, deconstruction helps finding in his poetic language what "escapes structurality" and needs to be pondered upon outside of its believed-to-be fixed systematization (Derrida, 1978, p. 352). The present study applies deconstruction to Ginsberg's poetry and is going to put its lingual coherence into question all in order to appreciatively expand its complexity and explore its poetic depth and many-sidedness.

II. METHODOLOGY

The present study avails itself of deconstruction introduced by Derrida. Derrida was an eminent French philosopher whose somehow ideologically radical ideas argue about the disassembling of language parts e.g. sentences, words, concepts etc. and their detailed analysis in relation to each other. As a post-structuralist theoretician, he puts into question the structurality of a structure. In lieu of the structuralist viewpoint of rationalizing every potential meaning of texts according to its structurally organized roadmap, Derrida disassembles, dissipates, and disorganizes texts in order to cast a shadow of doubt on the mind of readers to show them the unreliability, untrustworthiness and the swinging nature of language. He argues that:

Operating necessarily from the inside, borrowing all the strategic and economic resources of subversion from the old structure, borrowing them structurally, that is to say without being able to isolate their elements and atoms, the enterprise of deconstruction always in a certain way falls prey to its own work. (Derrida, 1976, p. 24)

It would be self-defeatist to consider deconstruction as a wholly systematic method because in this way it would contradict its proclaimed instability of meaning. Starting with the breakage of the Saussurean sign system, Derrida argues that in the process of signification, the relationship between the signifier and the signified, two building parts of a sign, is blurred. A signifier which is the verbal mark of a sign is supposed to address the signified which is the background concept, but what exactly is this signified: Derrida believes is another signifier addressing another signified in an unstoppable process.

This vicious circle of signification eradicates the Saussurean sign system which is the pivot of structuralist methodology whose suppositions Derrida refuses. Furthermore, Derrida undermines Western philosophy by questioning its predisposition to conceptualize the world and human experience dichotomously. Western philosophy tends to privilege one part of the dichotomy as the most important side of the pair.

In his widely known essay "Structure, Sign and Play in the Discourse of the Human Sciences" (1966), Derrida talks about a precarious binary pair which was implicitly questioned by Claude Levi-Strauss. Levi-Strauss calls the nature/culture a "scandal" in which both nature and culture share the same characteristics to some extent. Levi-Strauss argues that the very concept of "incest prohibition" is governed by both sides of this nature/culture pair. Although "incest prohibition" is based on a universal notion which makes it natural and maybe to a large extent instinctual, it is present in laws and regulations, which is the result of culturally definitive notions (Derrida, 1978, pp. 357-358). Thus far, it has become clear that the supposed "center" in a binary opposition may not stand fixed and there is a "play" of two sides of these binary pairs in which one acts as a "supplement" for the other. This erases the barrier of opposition between them and lets them share their believed-to-be oxymoronic relationship:

This field [that is, language and a finite language] is in effect that of *play*, that is to say, a field of infinite substitutions only because it is finite, that is to say, because instead of being an inexhaustible field, as in the classical hypothesis, instead of being too large, there is something missing from it: a center which arrests and grounds the play of substitutions. One could say... that this movement of play, permitted by the lack or absence of a center or origin, is the movement of *supplementarity*. (Derrida, 1978, p. 365)

Thus the purpose of his work is to- all introduced within the delimitations of the text- show the oscillations between the meaning the text proclaims and presents explicitly and what the text may not have the power to establish firmly fully without any potential violation of meaning. Having expanded Derrida's ideas, it is apparently important to mention that deconstruction only serves as a literary microscope in order to expand the world of a text to reveal the disorderly side of its existence, that is, its arbitrarily maintained compliance.

The Post-Structuralist Repositioning of Allen Ginsberg's Controversial Poem "Howl": A Deconstructive Approach

Although modern literature tends to display the instability of language, it still enjoys consistency and reliability which enables the readers to achieve a sense of understanding. The postmodern language of poetry, however, is fluid and inconsistent demanding the participation of the reader in the creation of meaning. According to Maestas (2012) "a turn towards the premodern is a distinguishing factor in postmodern American poetry and that the intention was to move forward by way of immersion in the premodern" (p. 3). He believes that the American postmodern poetry is marked by a tradition which passes through the history of modernism and then erupts into the realm of postmodernism. He also believes that the building blocks of tradition have been looked upon skeptically through the lens of modernism, and when arriving at the postmodern world, they are broken wildly and reshaped by the postmodern current and critical notions. According to some critics like Jonathan R. Wynn (1998) "postmodern theories develop a deconstructive discourse" and this analytical view has the power to put the political and sociological situation of a society into question (p. 6).

Speaking of the postmodern poetic language, from the academic point of view it could be stated that this kind of language has broken the formerly established rules and regulations so as to stand in front of its audience as simplistic, rooted in commonality and erasing the traditional definitive barriers. The immanency of the postmodern poetic language takes the place of the formerly valued "transcendence", and poetry finds its place more comfortable inside the common everyday life and language (Wagner, 1985, p. 486). It is stated by Derrida (1976) that:

As man's first motives for speaking were of the passions, his first expressions were tropes. Figurative language was the first to be born. Proper meaning was discovered last. One calls things by their true name only when one sees them in their true form. At first only poetry was spoken; there was no hint of reasoning until much later. (p. 271)

Derrida points to the purity and at the same time "figurative" character of the human language at its earliest stages which is comparable to the language of poetry, of the felt and not of the faked. He has artistically considered even the unstained and innocent language of man, a piece of poetry which is although basic, yet still literary.

As a poststructuralist approach to Ginsberg's poetry in this study, deconstruction might be considered a violent task to magnify the precarious centers of language by putting emphasis on the cloudy and unclear parts. Furthermore, deconstruction does not lead Ginsberg's text towards stability which saves it from its flustered nature, rather it would add more to the possibilities of interpretations which at the end of the day problematizes the process of understanding the poem. Accordingly, "deconstructive work never ends, as it builds new technologies, new forms of writing" (Plotnitsky, 2004, p. 3).

Having talked about the vulnerability of language, it should be noticed that Derrida's pondering on "play" and "supplementarity" which has been elaborated in the previous chapter, starts explaining the whole project of deconstruction here. Derrida's pivotal thought is characterized in the concept of "differance" which "would be another name in the open-ended chain of 'non-synonymous substitutions'" (Royle, 2003, p. 71). By "differance," Derrida means both "differing" and "deferring" which are both written as "differance" in French. The unheard juxtaposition of these two meanings in French language is what is used smartly by Derrida to point to the concept of supplement in language which is the chain of substitution. As Royle (2003) states, "differance 'is' the difference of the present from itself", that is to say, the present bits of language which are no doubt visible, bear loads of difference and dissimilarity in themselves (p. 74). Subsequently, in order to unkink the many-centered language of Ginsberg and its tangled meanings, deconstruction serves this purpose best because it points directly to the confusing parts of language, that is to say, the poetic language of Ginsberg.

III. DISCUSSION

According to Albert Gelpi (2015), "*Howl* (1956) is probably the most widely read poem of the second half of the twentieth century" (p. 102). The poem contains long lines and has been written in free verse with musical characteristics all recalling Whitman's verse. Its lines are employed as stanzas, uttering separately different but nearly similar thoughts and ideas. The poem is comprised of three parts and the first, being the longest, is the free poetic stream of narrating a description of a destroyed nation, a theatre of people who are defeated by the hardships of vagabondage, drugs, alcohol etc. and dragging their bodies in the cold of the night. In "*Howl*", "Ginsberg bombards the reader with a series of images, that is to say, plentiful signifiers, meant to convey the drug-like emotional state of the "best minds of my [Ginsberg's] generation" to the readers" (Mortenson, 2017, p. 80).

Soon after the first three lines, the poem brings a continuation of the word "who" which repeats sixty times to the end of part I as to describe the wandering people at night with sixty adjective clauses. This long trail of descriptions might have been applied to stay away from the writer's existential attitude toward the American society which is the subject of this poem.

However, to reveal his relativist point of view in that his society is not there to exist, those neglected citizens are present because they are needed as members of a huge factory that is capitalism which needs a lot of workers. The meaninglessness of their hollow-centeredness becomes evident when there are a lot of nouns and adjectives and adverbs but all in a long unending sentence flowing to the end of the first part.

The Post-Structuralist Repositioning of Allen Ginsberg's Controversial Poem "Howl": A Deconstructive Approach

The second part of the poem repetitively portrays the presence of "moloch", the mythical deity who burned children in his chest. "Moloch" serves as a symbol of the underlying cruelty of the industrial America. It is the collective damaging modern industry that devours the hope, life and future of earth.

Finally, the third part is the poet's depiction of hope, bright future and support in which he addresses Carl Solomon, his important friend and inspiration, and keeps his company by repeating "I'm with you in Rockland".

Derrida (1976) stated that "from the moment that there is meaning there are nothing but signs. We think only in signs" (p. 50). Accordingly, Ginsberg's mentioned remark could be the representation of his mutinous thoughts, that is to say, the signs which are arbitrarily designed as a "patchwork" and shaped his poems.

In a 1976 conversation with Paul Geneson, Ginsberg talks about the "spontaneity" which turns into "gibberish", the undecipherable conundrum of perplexity which he calls "chicken-track" and "patchwork" does approve of the many-sidedness of his language:

PG: In "Howl" you wrote about one writing off the top of one's head, going on and on, which in the morning was "gibberish."

AG: I was thinking of amphetamine head-babbling-"in the yellow morning were stanzas of gibberish." I was thinking about poems that I'd written on benzedrine back in 1948. The specific problem I had was, my mind would get tangled at the end and I'd begin revising, and by the time I was done, the last few climactic pages of any long poem written on amphetamines would be this chicken-track, this patchwork that I couldn't decipher any more. So, in other words, I was talking very specifically about *that*, but I didn't mean "spontaneity doesn't make it". (Geneson & Ginsberg, 1976, pp. 27-28)

A. The "Angel": Spirituality vs. Materiality

Derrida (1976) believed that "reading must always aim at in a certain relationship, unperceived by the author, between what he commands and what he does not command of the schemata of the language that he uses" (p. 158). In spite of using distinctly ambiguously related words, Ginsberg shows the values of his text structurally, which starts a cerebral pursuit toward the abovementioned deconstructive reading. His strategy in overturning the conventional literature of his time becomes evident in "Howl" where he uses words with unmatched inside meanings and strives to make a unifying ballast. For example, he portrays artists likened to howling animals, and mentions their "manuscripts" and "genitals": "[the best minds of my generation] who howled on their knees in the subway and were dragged off the roof waving genitals and manuscripts" (Ginsberg, 1976, p. 12).

The relative pronoun "who," in the flow of lines refers to the "angelheaded hipsters" that struggle with poverty, drugs, political problems etc.

angelheaded hipsters burning for the ancient heavenly connection
to the starry dynamo in the machinery of night (Ginsberg, 1976, p. 9)

The adjective "angelheaded" refers to the young and innocent American youth who confronted miseries. However, in the process of "supplementation," it might also signify the popular narcotic of Ginsberg's time, angel. Apparently, what is witnessed on the surface is the decentering of the word "angel" plus a bewildering confusion. Plotnitsky (2004) maintains that:

"Decentering" is one of Derrida's earliest terms... It is worth noting at the outset that Derridean decentering is not defined by the absence of all centrality (a common misconception). Instead it is defined by multicentering, a potential emergence of many centers and claims upon one or another centrality in the absence of a single, absolute center that would define its alternatives as unconditionally marginal. (p. 7)

From Derrida's perspective, in the case of the latter, the "angelheaded" people have found shelter in the hallucinatory effect of drugs. There is an urge for "hipsters" to establish a "heavenly connection" between themselves and the dark sky above their heads. Likewise, not far from this line, Ginsberg (1956) mentions the word "angel" again:

who bared their brains to Heaven under the El and saw
Mohammedan angels staggering on tenement roofs
Illuminated (p. 9)

The "angel" here strongly suggests the celestial beings who are at the service of God and subsequently appear after a hint of the use of drugs that "bared their brains" and let them overcome the barriers of human logic. In opposition to the spiritual reference of the word "angel", Ginsberg is actually referring to the material routine world of American youth who are suffering because of being economically marginalized and socially neglected so they are not living a fancy life but a suburban low-standard survival which becomes magnified under the lens of Beat project.

Moreover, on the discussion of spirituality, Ariel (2013) argues that:

Ginsberg grew up in a secular Jewish home, not committed to observance of the commandments or the studying of Jewish texts. But even this seeming spiritual void left a deep mark on Allen. The family did celebrate Passover seders, often with relatives. Some of the language and rhythm of epic passages of the Passover Hagaddah are

The Post-Structuralist Repositioning of Allen Ginsberg's Controversial Poem "Howl": A Deconstructive Approach

echoed in Howl, except that the "He" of whom Ginsberg speaks in "Howl" refers to vulnerable humans instead of to God. (p. 60)

Therefore, in "Howl", the notion of God is exchanged with human spirituality thus the notions of deity and humanity are merged within one concept. As the abovementioned quotation suggests, the use of "angel" may refer to the poet's religious background and at the same time secularity, which causes "angel" to stand as a drug; and which sets it far away from notions of heavenly meaning. The "angel" here excites a commotion between spirituality and materiality, and opposing to what is grasped by the readers at first; the "angel" does not go further than mere materiality.

B. Homosexuality vs. Heterosexuality

The "waving genitals and manuscripts" may refer to the artists who produced and introduced their new art which was not cherished by the mainstream society of the time. Indeed, adding the word "genital" may refer to the artists' dissatisfaction with mob mentality and their act of insult. While artists are leaving and flying away from their society, they wave by their genitals and their art. The other possible meaning for this would be Ginsberg's expression of homosexual desires as he mentioned in 1974 in his talk with Allen Young that "Howl" was a "coming out of the closet" and "acknowledgement of the basic reality of homosexual joy" (Raskin, 2004, p. xx). Homosexual artists like himself, freely show their desires and orientations while waving their arts and flying away from the crowd at a time when homosexuality was criminalized.

In a part in the text following that, the poet seems to be talking about a couple's bed, but not an ordinary heterosexual romantic bed, but a homosexual one with "beer" and "cigarettes" on it. In spite of the presence of some words like "sweetheart" and also a vernacular word for a female genital, a careless walking which leads to falling and the use of obscene words like "gyzym" might testify the absence of a lady

who copulated ecstatic and insatiate with a bottle of beer a sweetheart a package of cigarettes a candle and fell off the bed, and continued along the floor and down the hall and ended fainting on the wall with a vision of ultimate cunt and come eluding the last gyzym of consciousness (Ginsberg, 1956, p. 12)

Having in mind the repulsion of heterosexuality by both Christianity and also the government of the time, it is safe to say that if Ginsberg had mentioned and defended homosexuality any brighter than this, he could have been rejected to the point of oppression and criminalization. As a result, he chose to hide it under notions of heterosexuality which stands in front of it as the right stands in front of the wrong.

C. Moral Health vs. Moral Anemia

The celebration of dissatisfaction continues and the next example holds an allusion to Ginsberg's own time in a psychiatric hospital where he met Carl Solomon to whom he dedicated the poem.

... who threw potato salad at CCNY lecturers on Dadaism and subsequently presented themselves on the granite steps of the madhouse with shaven heads and harlequin speech of suicide, demanding instantaneous lobotomy, and who were given instead the concrete void of insulin metrasol electricity hydrotherapy psychotherapy occupational therapy pingpong & amnesia (Ginsberg, 1956, p. 15)

In this example, it can be witnessed that the speaker of the poem is addressing the underprivileged, spiritually homeless people of the 1950s as becoming so much obsessed with the meaninglessness of their world that they cannot bear hearing a university lecture on dadaism. They throw their food, so they prefer to be hungry but at peace and not being disturbed by the discomfort of the America of the time. The concept of "difference" is elucidated here as the government's definition of mental illness might be synonymous with Ginsberg's definition of a sane citizen whose faculty of thought is healthy and therefore is not satisfied with whatever he/she is exposed to, like policies and lectures and codes of American mainstream life. The healthy people, according to Ginsberg's terms end up being in mental hospitals, the speaker claims, because of their silent suicidal tendencies and are treated and lobotomized because society wants to change their thoughts, control them and keep them alive and working to achieve the American industry masters' social and economical goals.

Whoever the thinkers are, they will surely be labeled as insane if they do not normally accept what they are being fed. The poet's reference to lobotomy which is the damaging of some brain parts, also signifies castration, a process which would stop him and the people alike, from being homosexual citizens.

The so called moral anemia of the American people which has gone to the point that they could not even tolerate a lecture, is privileged smartly by Ginsberg over the kind of mental health which is caused by lobotomy. The readers of this poem might probably be surprised when they become aware that Ginsberg chooses madness over sanity, but taking cognizance of his aim to uproot the values of imposed definitions of health, solves their confusions and resurrects Derrida who believes that "the task [of deconstruction] is . . . to dismantle the metaphysical and rhetorical structures which are at work (in the text), not in order to reject or discard them, but to inscribe them in another way" (qtd. in Derrida, 1976, p. lxxv).

The Post-Structuralist Repositioning of Allen Ginsberg's Controversial Poem "Howl": A Deconstructive Approach

D. Unholy vs. Holy Consumerism

There could be seen a number of political hints introduced and described in the poem. Supporting that, Mortenson (2017) states:

In "Howl"'s celebrated phrase "hydrogen jukebox," for instance, Ginsberg is able to create a dense web of allusion that reverberates in the reader's own mind. "Hydrogen" recalls the atomic bomb, which was an omnipresent feature of Cold War life, while "jukebox" evokes the ecstatic celebration of jazz, which was a major influence on Beat poetry and an impetus for the term "Beat" itself. (pp. 80-81)

This mocking approach to the politics of the day is evident especially in the second part of the poem, the "moloch" part:

Moloch the incomprehensible prison! Moloch the crossbone soulless jailhouse and Congress of sorrows! Moloch whose buildings are judgement! [sic] Moloch the vast stone of war! Moloch the stunned governments! Moloch whose mind is pure machinery! Moloch whose blood is running money! Moloch whose fingers are ten armies!... Moloch whose skyscrapers stand in the long streets like endless Jehovahs! Moloch whose factories dream and croak in the fog!...Moloch whose love is endless oil and stone ! Moloch whose soul is electricity and banks! Moloch whose poverty is the specter of genius! (Ginsberg, 1956, p. 17)

The cruelty of the mechanized American "moloch" on which there is a huge load of emphasis, here accompanies words which may represent political attitude of the time. Words like "government", "armies", and "judgment" carry the political stand of Ginsberg toward his society. According to Jonah Raskin, Ginsberg and his fellow poets like Michael McClure, Philip Whalen, Philip Lamantia and Gary Snyder, all showed a great discomfort for the materialism and militarism of the American society of the time. In this part Ginsberg, tries to show an impasse of the spirituality of his society, a deadlock caused by the change brought by consumerism and its outcomes. He believed that all politics are hollow and ludicrous, both the left and the right wings and he chose art over all those years' '-ism's such as Marxism, Socialism and Fascism, but contradictorily it can be mentioned that he wrote on his journal (1943): "Whee! Out of the cracked and bleeding heart, I fashion—Art" (qtd. in Raskin, 2004, p. 56).

Furthermore, that means that alongside those struggles caused by the hungry, cruel and consumer "moloch", Ginsberg could find his art which without all that "bleeding" was not possible at all. By deconstructing the quality of unholy, Ginsberg has distorted his own definition of consumerism and has stated that it is not at all empty of holiness which has been the moving energy of his art, that is to say the energy of holiness and the spirituality. He disables the holy/unholy binary pair by asserting that the unholy might regulate the necessary energy of creating holiness; that is to say, the unholy "moloch" caused the commencement of the complaint narrative "Howl", not being able to smother its emergence.

The poet's heartfelt discontent with this machine-work meaninglessness and also mental uneasiness as the central theme of this poem is brightly evident when he mentions the word "moloch" in the second part of the poem. Namely, "moloch" appears as a deity in biblical literature and holds the wish for child sacrifice and, therefore, is sketched unholy. Thus Ginsberg (1956) here puts:

Moloch! Moloch! Robot apartments! invisible suburbs! skeleton treasuries! blind capitals! demonic industries! spectral nations! invincible madhouses! granite cocks! monstrous bombs! (p. 18)

The poem strives to portray the identical face of the child-killing "moloch" and conventions of modernization expressed in every stanza by the damage which Ginsberg's generation had tolerated before they were eaten by "moloch" and completely destroyed. Nevertheless, there can also be seen evidences of Ginsberg's preference of the privileges of industry and his preference of mechanization. For example:

Moloch whose love is endless oil and stone! Moloch whose soul is electricity and banks! Moloch whose poverty is the specter of genius! Moloch whose fate is a cloud of sexless hydrogen! Moloch whose name is the Mind! (Ginsberg, 1956, p. 9)

Ginsberg calls the cruel, pococurante master "moloch", the human mind. Accordingly, in his footnote to "Howl" he claims that the modern mind could also be "holy" in spite of all its heartless interventions in human life: "...holy the fourth dimension holy the fifth International holy the Angel in Moloch !" (Ginsberg, 1956, p. 21). Also in the opening of the poem: "I saw the best minds of my generation destroyed by madness, starving hysterical naked..." (Ginsberg, 1956, p. 9), he calls for "madness" as an answer to the question of social destruction although in the second part of the poem as mentioned above, "moloch" is called "the Mind" with a capital "M" to bring about more emphasis. Lyon (1969) argues that:

[Ginsberg] sees as the root of America's troubles that Americans are afraid of accepting the joy that is inside them, as their birthright as a part of God, and in their fear they allow themselves to be taken up into the impersonal Moloch. (p. 398)

The Post-Structuralist Repositioning of Allen Ginsberg's Controversial Poem "Howl": A Deconstructive Approach

As a matter of fact, as Jonathan Culler (1982) argues, "deconstructive criticism attends to structures that resist a text's unifying narrative scheme" (p. 251). Employing a deconstructive approach becomes necessary because the noose tightens here and finding a center between sanity and insanity, leads to nowhere but the poet's alternative state of mind which tries to unconsciously break the defined notions of madness and saneness and redefine them in relation to drugs which are supposed to cause sagacity while destroying logic. So it could be true to claim that before this study, Ginsberg might have deconstructed himself as regards "difference".

CONCLUSION

"Howl" is the three stages of creation, mostly part one, decreation, part two, and liberation which is manifested in the figure of Carl Solomon in part three. Although at first glance, "Howl" stands as an angry war of words, it defines itself as the non-remediable suffering caused by repression (Breslin, 1977, p. 88).

The overall pressure on the poet's mind, caused by familial, social and psychological issues, seems to have squeezed the prolix generalisability of human ideas, into a desacralized sub-reading of the zeitgeist of the time. The locus of his passion and pain is the lacuna to which has been paid attention on the register of deconstruction. It has been demonstrated through the pages of this chapter that Ginsberg have tried hard to find a solution for the American problematic life, but by being a part of the problem, his poem could shape a sheltering for both hope and its opposite, a quiescent despair.

After all, through the pages of this study, it has been shown that, using Derridean deconstruction, Ginsberg's "Howl" undermines some of its own centering themes. Beyond the common reading, the poem could be rendered as chaotic having done a deconstructive analysis on its interlinear implicatures.

REFERENCES

- 1) Ariel, Y. 2013. Charisma and Counterculture: Allen Ginsberg as a Prophet for a New Generation. *Religions*, 4(1), 55-66. doi:10.3390/rel4010051
- 2) Breslin, J. 1977. Allen Ginsberg: The Origins of "Howl" and "Kaddish". *The Iowa Review*, 8(2), 82-108. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.17077/0021-065X.2207>
- 3) Culler, J. 1982. *On Deconstruction: Theory and Criticism after Structuralism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- 4) Derrida, J. 1976. *Of Grammatology* (A. Bass, Trans.). London, England: University of Chicago Press.
- 5) Derrida, J. 1978. *Writing and difference* (G. C. Spivak, Trans.). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- 6) Gelpi, A. 2015. *American Poetry After Modernism: The Power of the Word*. Retrieved from <https://www.megapaper.ir>
- 7) Geneson, P., & Ginsberg, A. 1975. A Conversation with Allen Ginsberg. *Chicago Review*, 27(1), 27-35. doi:10.2307/25303265
- 8) Ginsberg, A. 1956. *Howl and Other Poems*. Retrieved from https://edisciplinas.usp.br/pluginfile.php/3986496/mod_resource/content/1/HOWL%20AND%20OTHER%20POEMS.pdf
- 9) Hutcheon, L. 2004. *A poetics of postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. Retrieved from <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/9780203358856>
- 10) Lyon, Jr., G. W. 1969. Allen Ginsberg: Angel Headed Hipster. *The Journal of Popular Culture*, 3(3), 391-403. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.0022-3840.1969.0303_391.x
- 11) Maestas, N. A. 2012. *Calling Out the State: Postmodern American Anthropolitics* (3552822) [Doctoral dissertation, University of Washington]. Mega Paper.
- 12) Mortenson, E. 2017. Allen Ginsberg and Beat Poetry. In Steven Belletto (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Beats*. Retrieved from <https://www.megapaper.ir>
- 13) Plotnitsky, A. 2004. The Differance of the World: Homage to Jacques Derrida. *Postmodern Culture*, 15(1), 1-15. doi:10.1353/pmc.2004.0046
- 14) Raskin, J. 2004. *American Scream: Allen Ginsberg's Howl and the Making of the Beat Generation*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press. Retrieved from <https://srv2.ketab.io/booksource/C18903E755B167003FCE6CB187C9BD02.pdf?16974>
- 15) Raskin, J. 2011. Allen Ginsberg, "Howl," and the 6 Gallery Poetry Performance. In C. Gräbner & A. Casas. (Ed.), *Performing poetry: Body, place and rhythm in the poetry performance*. Retrieved from <https://www.megapaper.ir>
- 16) Royle, N. 2003. *Jacques Derrida*. Taylor & Francis e-Library. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203380376>
- 17) Wagner, L. 1985. On Modern and Postmodern Poetry. *Contemporary Literature*, 26(4), 482-486. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/1208118
- 18) Wynn, J. R. 1998. *Beat Sociology: Ethnographic Journeys in Event Spaces* (1392168) [Master's thesis, University of Nevada]. Mega Paper.