
A world carefully reared and fed on reason, its ills treated with reasonable remedies, had by 1918 revealed itself to be deeply rotten and utterly miserable. Following upon Dada, the Surrealists sought a richer, truer reality in the unconscious, in awarenesses and techniques above and beyond realism and logic. Part of their inspiration had come from the grotesqueries of Alfred Jarry (1873-1907) whose gross and obscure Ubu Roi had, in 1896, excited the avant-garde and shocked the bourgeoisie; part of it came from the brilliant artificialities of Cubism and Futurism; and Dada itself of course cannot be ignored as an important influence, though the nihilism of Dada becomes in Surrealist hands a hopeful though destructive approach.

But the Surrealist movement as such was founded by a very few young men, quite unknown at the end of the war: Andre Breton, Jean Cocteau, Philippe Soupault, Louis Aragon, and Paul Eluard.

In the essay that follows, Breton, who has always remained the symbol of this violent and multifarious school, explains both the beginnings and the aims of his invention. Very simply, it tried to apply the lessons of Freudian psychoanalysis in art, either by the use of automatic writing or drawing (doodling from the hand of a sensitive artiste being more authentic and significant than an orderly scheme of things), or by the jolt that things seen or done in this manner might administer.

The constructive, optimistic side of Surrealism led a number of its adherents, concerned with the creation of a new world based on a fresh view of things and eager to smash the old stifling bourgeois values, toward Communism. Soon both Aragon and Paul Eluard joined the Communist Party while Breton drifted very close to it. There was no obvious connection between Surrealism and Communism besides a common agreement that the old order must be destroyed before a better world could be built. Only the passing identification between Russian Communism and humanistic ideals, made possible in the 1930’s by the democratic pusillanimity of the Western powers, could bring some Surrealists closer to the Party, and that not for long. Others, however, fascinated by activity for activity’s sake, eagerly abandoned ends for means just as the Futurists had done in Italy. Meanwhile, the nonpolitically minded, like Salvador Dalí, Cocteau, and Joan Miro, continued their experiments chiefly in the cinema and in the other visual arts, more plastic media than either political society or unwieldy words.
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SURREALISM

International intellectual movement, which was centred mainly in Paris and occupied with the problems of thought and expression in all their forms. The Surrealists perceived a deep crisis in Western culture and responded with a revision of values at every level, inspired by the psychoanalytical discoveries of Freud and the political ideology of Marxism. In both poetry and the visual arts this revision was undertaken through the development of unconventional techniques, of which Automatism was paramount. The Parisian poets who formulated Surrealist theory and orientation were officially identified by André Breton’s Manifeste du surréalisme (1924), the essay ‘Une Vague de rêves’ (October 1924) by louis Aragon and the periodical La Révolution surréaliste, published two months later. Under Breton’s guidance, the movement remained potent up to World War II, surviving until his death in 1966 (see Breton, andré). Of the original members, the core had participated in Parisian Dada and contributed to the periodical Littérature (1919–24), edited by Breton, Aragon and Philippe Soupault. They included the poets paul Eluard, Benjamin Péret, René Crevel, Robert Desnos, Jacques Baron, Max Morise, Marcel Noll, Pierre Naville, Roger Vitrac, Simone Breton and Gala Eluard, and the artists max Ernst, Man ray, hans Arp and Georges Malkine (1901–69). They were joined by the writers Michel Leiris, Georges Limbour, antonin Artaud and Raymond Queneau, and the artists andré Masson and joan Miró, all of whom had gathered at 45 Rue
Blomet during 1922–4. A third group, centred on 54 Rue du Château, included the writers Marcel Duhamel and Jacques Prévert and the painter yves Tanguy.

II. 1930–40.
III. 1940–46.
IV. 1946–66.

1. France.
   (i) Origins, theory and politics.
   (ii) Visual arts.

i) Origins, theory and politics.

The term ‘surréalisme’ was coined in 1917 by the poet Guillaume Apollinaire in relation to the ballet Parade (by Erik Satie, Jean Cocteau and Picasso) and his own play Les Mamelles de Tirésias. It was variously interpreted by those abandoning Dada in the early 1920s, such as Ivan Goll and Paul Dermée, who published the single-issue Surréalisme in October 1924. As the successful claimant of the term, Breton chronicled the experiments that marked the Littérature group’s transition from an attack on prevalent values, in Dada, to their proposition of an alternative, in Surrealism.

Although Apollinaire had left the term’s meaning quite vague, he seems to have understood not only a form of expression exceeding realist effects (sur-réel) but also one that involved a strong element of surprise. This was to be achieved through unexpected juxtapositions, of which the most fertile were not the result of conscious deliberation. In an attempt to suspend conscious control, Breton turned to ‘automatic writing’, which precluded any preconceived subject or style (syntax, grammar, correction etc), to facilitate the flow of images from the subconscious. The first experiments took place in 1919, with his and Soupault’s joint text ‘Les Champs magnétiques’. This established automatism as a central principle for the Littérature group during the two years of uncertainty (known as the époque floue), which followed the collapse of Dada in 1922. Their experiments were reinforced by two antecedents.

One was the kind of automatic writing practised by spiritualist mediums. In ‘Entrée des médiums’, Breton described the experiments initiated by Crevel. Participants fell, at will, into a self-induced hypnotic ‘sleep’, in which they could speak, draw and answer questions, ‘communications’ that lay outside the normal constraints of logic and reason. Language and images seemed to be suspended from their utilitarian functions and to allow glimpses of deeper levels of meaning. After the experiments were terminated in 1923, this interest persisted, although with one crucial distinction: while the mediums claimed that their ‘automatic messages’ came from elsewhere, the Surrealists, eschewing mysticism, recognized only an internal psychic origin.

The second source was the example of Freudian techniques. In the manifesto of 1924 Breton explained that the experiment that resulted in ‘Les Champs magnétiques’ had been inspired by his wartime experience as a medical auxiliary specializing in psychiatry, when he had tried out psychoanalytical techniques on victims of shell-shock. His interest was prompted by the reserves of imagination revealed in the apparently irrational monologues. When he and Soupault turned the technique on themselves, they produced poetic images of a quality surpassing those produced consciously. A measure of the importance of automatism was its place in the manifesto, in which Breton defined Surrealism as ‘psychic automatism in its pure state, by which it is intended to express, either verbally, or in writing, or in any other way, the true functioning of thought. Thought expressed in the absence of any control exerted by reason, and outside all moral and aesthetic considerations’.

Sigmund Freud’s influence dominated the manifesto. His importance lay in the overwhelming power he accorded the unconscious, which could have as great an influence on waking life as the conscious. It is perhaps unsurprising that Freud himself had little sympathy with the Surrealists’ work, as their interest was not in the psychoanalytical means to cure neurosis, but in finding routes to the psyche as the seedbed of the imagination, and in the poetic value of dreams in their own right. The manifesto focused therefore upon dreams, childhood and madness, as states in which the imagination was accepted and free of utilitarian considerations.
The Surrealists contrasted their experimental work with 19th-century philosophical rationalism and literary realism. Significantly, the definition in the manifesto occurred within an alternative literary genealogy including the Marquis de Sade, Jonathan Swift, romantic and ‘diabolist’ writers, such as Gothic novelists and poets as ‘Monk’ Lewis, Baudelaire, Joris-Karl Huysmans, de Nerval, Alfred Jarry and Isidore Ducasse, the Comte de Lautréamont (author of Les Chants de Maldoror). In no sense a fixed list (Rimbaud and Apollinaire passed out of favour), it nonetheless emphasized Surrealism’s adherence to a literature of the imagination. Where the Surrealists differed from these ‘ancestors’ was in their acceptance that the marvellous might be encountered as easily in the street as in fantasy or dreams. As a result, they put considerable faith in the poetry of chance encounters, the trigger for books such as Aragon’s Le Paysan de Paris (1926) and Breton’s Nadja (1928). In this spirit, the Bureau de Recherches Surréalistes was opened daily in late 1924 in Paris as a point of contact with the public at large; wanderings, collecting of inexplicable objects, or suicide reports all provided evidence of the tensions underlying ‘rational’ existence.

Such evidence was disseminated through the generously illustrated periodical La Révolution surréaliste (1924–9). Its appearance, modelled on scientific magazines, lent credence to the seriousness of its contents: Surrealist texts and dream accounts; theoretical and political articles; poems (particularly by Eluard and Desnos); and linguistic experiments (by Leiris). Its manifestos ranged from Artaud’s exhortation to unlock the asylums (no. 3, April 1925), to the group’s defence of Charlie Chaplin (‘Hands off Love’, no. 9/10, Oct 1927). These texts were forged in the daily meetings in cafés or Breton’s studio and cemented the shared nature of their experience. They demanded total commitment, and infringement of their principles brought denunciation.

This dedication complicated the movement’s political position. After rather romantic beginnings, they condemned France’s colonial war in Morocco in late 1925; in so doing they established a dialogue with the Marxist periodical Clarté, edited by Jean Bernier, Marcel Fourrier and others. Together they issued La Révolution d’abord et toujours!, recognizing the need for social revolution. However, the Surrealists insisted on retaining their autonomy, and this continually raised the question of their wholehearted commitment to political action. In La Révolution et les intellectuels (1926), Pierre Naville declared Surrealism incompatible with Marxism and abandoned the movement to join Clarté. Breton’s response, ‘Légitime défense’ (1926), argued that while unreservedly on the side of the revolution, they could not see why they should not continue their experiments until it happened. To underline this commitment, he, Aragon, Eluard, Péret and Pierre Unik joined the French Communist Party in 1927.

ii) Visual arts.

There was always a certain ambivalence within Surrealism regarding the visual arts. Breton simultaneously defended painting as a Surrealist activity and yet called it a ‘lamentable expedient’. However, a footnote to the literary genealogy in the manifesto suggested a comparable genealogy in painting, traced to Paolo Uccello and Gustave Moreau and, among the living, Pablo Picasso, Paul Klee, marcel Duchamp, francis Picabia and giorgio De chirico, whose works were extensively collected by Eluard, Breton and others. Each was admired for his ability to expose a further facet of reality; in particular, Duchamp’s disruption of the distinction between ‘art’ and ‘non-art’, and de Chirico’s dream-like imagery. They did not join the movement; instead, it was the three younger artists listed, Ernst, Man Ray and Masson, who (together with Arp, Miró and Tanguy) established the major areas of dream imagery and automatism explored in visual Surrealism (although Miró never ‘officially’ joined the group).

Ernst produced the most compelling dream-related images. The juxtapositions of unrelated objects in his early collages and photomontages disrupted stable relations of time and space. Breton’s preface to the catalogue of his exhibition of 1921 (Paris, Au Sans Pareil) remarked on the spark generated by the contact of the objects’ separate realities; this offered a visual parallel to Lautréamont’s influential metaphor, ‘as beautiful as the chance encounter of a sewing-machine and an umbrella on a dissecting table’. Ernst invested his ‘proto-Surrealist’ canvases (1922–4) with this disorientation to reflect his immersion in the experiments with hypnotic trances; the iconoclastic Pietà or Revolution by Night (1923; London, Tate) in particular, combined a kind of visual manifesto of the dream with a homage to Freud’s Oedipus theory.
Unexpected juxtapositions had featured in the Dada objects and rayographs by Man Ray. The unforeseeable results of the rayographs brought this close to qualifying as an automatic process (for illustration see Man Ray). His more orthodox photographs undermined the objectivity of their medium (often through their sexual charge), securing their importance in La Révolution surréaliste. The periodical also carried Masson’s drawings, which established a direct visual equivalent to automatic writing. They consisted of hasty webs of fine lines, out of which enlaced and truncated bodies (animal and human) emerged, implying themes of desire and death. His fellow Surrealists immediately acclaimed the power of these drawings, whose lines hover between pre-linguistic chaos and order, for example Furious Suns (1925; for illustration see Automatism). Together with popular art and film stills, these works contributed to a mixture of images in La Révolution surréaliste that lacked any conventional governing aesthetic and reflected the debate over the whole visual condition of Surrealism. Morisse addressed these problems in ‘Les Yeux enchantés’ (Révol. Surréaliste, no. 1), questioning the type of dream painting represented by de Chirico and Ernst. He argued that memory, inherent in such works, acted as the agent of conscious control, so that ‘the images are Surrealist, their expression is not’. He believed that such expressions had to be free of conscious intention, illustrating the article with one of Masson’s drawings, and citing those by mediums or the mentally ill and Man Ray’s rayographs.

These difficulties were confronted more aggressively by Naville, in a short text, ironically entitled ‘Beaux Arts’, in La Révolution surréaliste. He denied the possibility of any Surrealist painting, accepting ‘only the street, the cinema, newspaper photographs’. Breton could not accept this denial of the value of individual expression. He took over editorial control of the periodical from Naville and Péret (from no. 4, July 1925), and published the series ‘Le Surréalisme et la peinture’. Although rejecting the pursuit of art for its own sake, he justified his support for artists for their direct experience of alternative realities. Before Masson, Ernst and Man Ray, he placed Picasso, whose Cubism he considered the most daring break with external visual appearances. Breton’s argument with de Chirico’s new style was also exposed, as he claimed the early work for Surrealism. The crucial thing in each case was the search for an internal model, although the way in which this might be pursued was left open.

As part of his response Breton presented the wealth of visual Surrealism. First, important works by Ernst and Miró (e.g. Catalan Landscape (The Hunter), 1923–4; New York MOMA), as well as Picasso’s Demoiselles d’Avignon (1907; New York, MOMA) and The Dance (1925; London, Tate), dominated the issue’s illustrations. Second, with Desnos, he organized the first group exhibition (La Peinture surréaliste, Paris, Gal. Pierre, Nov 1925), which included work by de Chirico, Klee and Picasso alongside Arp, Ernst, Masson, Miró, Man Ray, Malkine and Pierre Roy. Third, the Galerie Surréaliste was founded under Noll’s direction (March 1926), to show members’ work, often drawn from the poets’ collections. The opening show of paintings by Man Ray and sculptures from the Pacific Islands established a juxtaposition (reflecting the Surrealists’ interest in and collection of indigenous art from Melanesia, Mexico and Eskimo lands) repeated for Tanguy’s show with sculptures from North and South America the following year. Although Malkine and Arp exhibited in 1927, and early de Chiricos were shown in 1928, the gallery closed that year.

These developments heralded a growing diversity of automatic techniques. Ernst developed frottage and collaged the results into images that transformed the original substance; Masson combined free line with texture, by pouring sand on to his canvases of 1926–7, for example Battle of the Fishes (1926; New York, MOMA); and Miró located biomorphic forms in fields of saturated colour in such works as Person Throwing a Stone at a Bird (1926; New York, MOMA). With Man Ray, Lee Miller developed solarization, giving portrait photographs unexpected auras (see Photography, fig. 5). At the same time, however, the disjunctive illusionism of work by such artists as Malkine and Roy was reinforced by Tanguy’s poetically titled and spatially subaquatic images, for example Mama, Papa Is Wounded! (1927; New York, MOMA; see fig. 1).

2. Belgium.

An autonomous group formed in Brussels in 1925 and became official in 1926, bringing together two groups of friends. On one side were the editors of the Dada-orientated periodicals œsophage (1925) and Marie (1926), the musician, poet and artist e. l. t. Mesens and the painter rené Magritte; on the
other, were the contributors to Correspondance Paul Nougé (1895–1967), Marcel Lecomte (1900–66) and Camille Goemans (1900–60), as well as the musician André Souris. In 1927 they were joined by the writer Louis Scutenaire. Correspondance consisted of single tracts on individual writers published every ten days (Nov 1924–5). In 1925 the contributors began to collaborate with Paris, and Nougé and Goemans signed La Révolution d’abord et toujours! Despite being a founder of the Belgian Communist Party, Nougé was dubious about the Party’s attitude towards writers, and the Belgians maintained their distance from the French group’s difficulties. Nevertheless, in 1927, both Goemans and Magritte moved to Paris and frequented Breton’s circle. The former established the Galerie Goemans, which took the place of the Galerie Surréaliste in 1929–30. Magritte, inspired by the example of de Chirico in such works as the Threatened Assassin (1926; see Magritte, rené, fig. 1), also absorbed the lessons of Ernst’s collages; he stayed until 1930, contributing to La Révolution surréaliste, but his work was not immediately appreciated.

Surrealism, §II: 1930–40

1. Theory and politics.

In 1929 the satellite group around the periodical Le Grand Jeu, including Roger Gilbert-Lecomte, Maurice Henry (b 1907) and the Czech painter Josef Šíma, was ostracized, while Breton’s ‘Second manifeste du surréalisme’ excluded those reluctant to commit to collective action: Leiris, Limbour, Morise, Baron, Queneau, Prévert, Desnos, Masson and the photographer Jacques-André Boiffard (1902–61). They gravitated towards the periodical Documents (1929–30), edited by Georges Bataille, whose anti-idealist materialism had produced a hybrid Surrealism that exposed the baseness of man’s instincts (e.g. ‘Abattoirs’, Documents, no. 6, 1929, photographs by Eli Lothar). Documents discussed popular arts, used Boiffard’s disconcerting photographs (e.g. Untitled/Hand and Foot, 1929; Paris, Pompidou) and included articles on ethnography and art by Leiris, Limbour, Carl Einstein and others.

New members invigorated Surrealism in 1929–30, contributing to the new periodical, Surréalisme au service de la révolution (SASDLR; 1930–33). These included the former Dada leader, Tristan Tzara, as well as the writers René Char, Georges Sadoul, André Thirion and Maurice Heine, the artists Salvador Dalí, Luis Buñuel, Alberto Giacometti (see Giacometti, (3)) and Valentine Hugo (1887–1968). Alongside Breton and Eluard’s essays simulating neurotic and psychotic states (‘L’Immaculée Conception’, SASDLR, no. 2, 1930), contributions included Heine’s consideration of Sade (no. 2, 1930) and Tzara’s ‘Essai sur la situation de la poésie’ (no. 4, 1932). Their concerns remained deeply political. The second manifesto had detailed their attempts to undermine definitively the dominating ideas of patriotism, family and religion. Their commitment to the Third International tried to pacify the Party in the face of the group’s growing admiration for Leon Trotsky (newly exiled from Moscow). This overshadowed Surrealism’s political position throughout the 1930s, as they steered an independent course through a series of ill-fated anti-Fascist alliances, which precipitated internal schisms. In 1932 Aragon left to join the Party as a result of his enforced rejection of Freudianism and Trotskyism while representing Surrealism at the International Congress of Revolutionary Writers in Khar’kov in 1930; Sadoul, Unik, Maxime Alexandre and Buñuel followed him. In 1933 the Surrealists’ assertion of the impossibility of a ‘proletarian literature’ within a capitalist society led to their break with the Association des Écrivains et Artistes Révolutionnaires (AEAR) and the expulsion of Breton, Eluard and Crevel from the Communist Party; Crevel’s suicide in 1935 was partially associated with an inability to reconcile the two doctrines.

The group’s politics were largely divorced from their art by their contribution to the beautifully illustrated review Minotaure (1933–9), which lay outside their control. This confirmed their public image as an artistic movement, ignoring such alliances as the Contre-Attaque movement (1935–6; with Bataille and the Front Populaire). On his trip to Mexico in 1938 (reported in Minotaure no. 12–13), Breton discovered affinities with Surrealism in the work of Frida Kahlo (e.g. The Two Fridas, 1939; Mexico City, Mus. A. Mod.) and the photographer Manuel Alvarez Bravo (e.g. Daydreaming, 1931; see Photography, fig. 24); he also met Trotsky, with whom he and Diego Rivera founded the short-lived Fédération Internationale de l’Art Révolutionnaire Indépendant (FIARI). However, Eluard broke personally with Breton that year, precipitating the departure of Ernst and Man Ray.

Surrealism, §II: 1930–40

2. Visual arts.
In March 1930 Aragon’s ‘La Peinture au défi’ was the preface for the catalogue of the important Collages exhibition at the Galerie Goemans, proposing juxtaposition as the central tenet underlying automatism and dream imagery. The latter gained ground through the work of Magritte (e.g. the Daring Sleeper, 1928; London, Tate), Tanguy and Dalí, who arrived in a welter of controversies. His début exhibition (Paris, Gal. Goemans, Nov 1929) followed the première of Un chien andalou, made with Buñuel, which demonstrated film’s compelling potential to simulate dreams. Although he contributed little to Buñuel’s L’Age d’or (1930), its combination of irresistible love (l’amour fou) and anticlericalism ensured that it was banned.

Dali’s obsessional paintings drew on the Freudian notion that the ‘manifest’ façade of the dream concealed the latent content of the dreamer’s, often sexual, desires. In such works as Illuminated Pleasures (1929; New York, MOMA) he expressed these anxieties in a minutely detailed, visual language that paralleled the space and juxtaposition of objects in dreams. He then developed the ‘paranoiac-critical’ method (‘L’Ane pourri’, SASDLR, no. 1, 1930); linked to paranoia (in which the world is interpreted according to an obsessional idea), it capitalized upon the capacity to read a single configuration of forms in several different ways (e.g. Metamorphosis of Narcissus (1937; see Dalí, salvador, fig. 1). Dali’s fertile contribution disguised the danger that his fantasies, which replaced the ‘real’ world, had also obscured Surrealism’s concern with the interpenetration of unconscious and conscious realities. His concern with highly saleable commodities and his political unreliability led to a split in the 1930s.

One of Dalí’s most important initiatives was to recognize the disturbing potential of objects, having seen Giacometti’s suggestive sculptures, especially Suspended Ball (1930–31; Basle, Kstmus.; see fig. 2). Several members produced ‘symbolically functioning objects’ (repr. in SASDLR, no. 3, 1931), and production reached its height around the Objets exhibition (Paris, Gal. Charles Ratton, 1936). There Giacometti’s work appeared alongside Duchamp’s ready-mades and the ultimate Surrealist object, Meret Oppenheim’s Object (1936; New York, MOMA), a fur-covered cup and saucer. Women, widely idealized but marginalized creatively within the movement until the 1930s, found object-making open to them, perhaps because of its ambiguous artistic status. Gala, Valentine Hugo and Jacqueline Breton seized upon this.

The independent positions of senior artists (Ernst, Miró, Man Ray) encouraged new recruits in 1932–5. The writers included Maurice Henry, Marcel Jean, Georges Hugnet, Pierre Mabile, the Peruvian César Moro and the 14-year old Gisèle Prassinos. As well as Oppenheim, the artists included raoul Ubac, Clovis Trouille (1889–1975), oscar Domínguez, victor Brauner, and the Germans wolfgang Paalen, richard Oelze and hans Bellmer; paul Delvaux frequented the Belgian group. Most employed illusionism (e.g. Pink Bows, 1937; for illustration see Delvaux, paul), although Paalen and Domínguez invented the new automatic techniques of fumage (drawing with smoke) and decalcomania (pressing paint between sheets of paper) respectively (for illustration of decalcomania see Domínguez, oscar). In addition, Picasso, with his automatic writing (1933–4), and Duchamp (from 1935) came into the Surrealist orbit; in 1936 Masson was readmitted.

The influx of foreign artists coincided with the internationalization of the movement. The activities in Belgrade of Marco Ristitch (b 1902) culminated in a declaration (SASDLR, no. 3, 1932) that brought government suppression. In 1933 the Prague Devětist group, comprising the writers karel Teige, Viteslav Nezval (1900–58) and Jindrich Heisler (1914–53), and the painters jindřich Styrský and Toyen, declared their adherence (SASDLR, no. 5, 1933). In the mid-1930s a Surrealist group was formed in Cairo by the poet Georges Henein, while the Japanese poets shūzō Takiguchi and Chiruo Yamanaka, and such painters as harue Koga also established contact with Paris.

The process was accelerated by a series of exhibitions beginning with Minotaure at the Musée d’Art Moderne in Brussels (1934) mounted by Nougé and Mesens, and Kubisme-Surrealisme in Copenhagen (1935) organized by the painters vilhelm Bjerke-petersen and wilhelm Freddie. In March 1935 Breton, Eluard and Šíma travelled to Prague for the first Exposition Internationale du Surréalisme, establishing the special link that sustained Surrealist activity in Prague beyond World War II. The conjunction of a bilingual Bulletin and exhibition was repeated in May in Santa Cruz de Tenerife, where (at Domínguez’s invitation) Breton and Péret met the Gaceta del árte group including the critic Eduardo Westerdahl, Domingo Pérez Mink and Augustin Espinosa. Although suppressed
under Franco, the group helped to disseminate Surrealism in Latin America. In 1936, after a further Belgian exhibition (Brussels, La Louvière, Aug 1935), a fourth exhibition (complete with Bulletin) was held in London (New Burlington Gals). The English group, formed by the poet David Gascoyne and the painter roland Penrose, temporarily attracted herbert Read, Humphrey Jennings, henry Moore and Paul Nash; more permanent were eileen Agar, John Banting (1902–71), Grace Pailthorpe, Ithel Colquhoun and Conroy Maddox. In 1938 Mesens arrived to direct the London Gallery and to edit the London Gallery Bulletin (1938–40; with Penrose), supported by the French writer and film maker Jacques Brunius (1906–67).

In Paris Breton re-emphasized automatism and, in L’Amour fou (Paris, 1937), reaffirmed the potential of chance encounters. During 1937–8 further adherents included Patrick Waldberg (b 1913) and Julien Graq (b 1910), and the painters kurt Seligmann, roberto Matta, Gordon Onslow-Ford, Jacques Hérod, leonora Carrington and léonor Fini, although Fini did not join the movement officially. With the exception of the last two, all the painters explored automatism, expanding in scale and adopting Tanguy’s deep space (e.g. Onslow-Ford’s Without Bounds, 1939; San Francisco, CA, MOMA). The short-lived Galerie Gradiva (1937–8) confirmed the movement’s commercial difficulties, but the exhibitions culminated in the Exposition Internationale du Surréalisme at the Galerie des Beaux-Arts, Paris, 1938. This pioneered a disconcerting environment for the works, including eerie laughter, coal sacks attached to the ceiling by Duchamp and a pond by Paalen; the group’s unified activity was underscored by each artist adorning a shop mannequin.

Surrealism

III. 1940–46.

Coherent Surrealist activity ceased in Europe during World War II, apart from the London group (irredeemably split between Mesens and Toni del Renzio in 1942), and Noël Arnaud and Jean-François Chabrun’s La Main à Plume group in occupied Paris. The German members (Ernst, Brauner, Wols) had been interned in 1940, and many prepared for exile to the USA through the influence of Peggy Guggenheim (see Guggenheim, (2)), leaving former colleagues (Aragon, Eluard, Tzara and Desnos) to work in the Resistance. A number of Surrealists, including Wilfredo Lam, sought shelter in Marseille in 1940. Paalen, his wife, the painter Alice Rahon, and Moro were already in Mexico City, where they organized the Exposición Internacional del Surrealismo (Galeria de Arte Mexicano, 1940), which included artists with whom Surrealism found common ground: Rivera, Kahlo, Alvarez Bravo, Roberto Montenegro, Guillermo Meza (b 1919) and others. This encouraged the southward spread of the movement, notably to Peru and the Mandragora group in Chile. In Mexico Paalen drew away from the movement’s political intrigues to establish the periodical DYN (1940–45), and, after visiting British Columbia, he became interested in indigenous American cultures. Other Surrealists arrived in Mexico: Onslow-Ford, Péret, his wife, the painter Remedios Varo and Carrington, who together developed a mystical pictorial imagery, seen in such works as Carrington’s Pomp of the Subsoil (1947; Norwich, U. E. Anglia, Sainsbury Cent.).

In 1941 Breton sailed with Lam for Martinique, meeting the poet Aimé Césaire, and then to Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, meeting the painter E. F. Granell; all three disseminated Surrealist ideas in the Caribbean. Continuing to New York with Masson, he rejoined Ernst, whose new decaleonias included Europe after the Rain (1940–42; see Ernst, max, fig. 4), as well as Matta, Seligmann, Tanguy and Kay Sage in a larger group of refugees. The first Surrealist group show in the USA had taken place in 1931–2 at the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, CT, travelling to the Julien Levy Gallery, New York. A historical survey in 1936 (Fantastic Art, Dada, Surrealism, MOMA, New York), though outside Surrealist control, had introduced their work to a wider audience, but in 1942 the movement’s arrival was marked by the First Papers of Surrealism exhibition (451 Madison Avenue). With an installation by Duchamp (a mile of string wrapped round the exhibits), it included such local artists as Robert Motherwell, William Baziotes and David Hare, the editor of the Surrealist periodical VVV (1942–4). The galleries of Peggy Guggenheim, Julien Levy and Pierre Matisse favoured Surrealism and encouraged new recruits, notably dorothea Tanning, Enrico Donati (who had already assisted in organizing the show in Paris in 1937), Jérome Kamrowski, Frederick Kiesler and Joseph Cornell. Breton’s emphasis on automatism in ‘Genèse et perspective artistique du surréalisme’ (written 1941) was taken up by Jackson Pollock and Arshile Gorky (e.g. Garden at Sochi, 1941; New York, MOMA), who responded to the techniques of Masson and Matta. During this exile,
Breton also became interested in establishing parallels between Surrealist thought and the magic and mysticism of Native American and Eskimo peoples. Ethnographic work by Claude Levi-Strauss appeared in VVV, and Breton’s Prolegomena to a Third Manifesto of Surrealism or Not (1942) called for the formation of a new myth. Prior to his return to Europe these interests were reinforced by the experience of Voudou in Haiti, where he met Mabille, Lam and the painter Hector Hyppolite.
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Andre Breton, What Is Surrealism?

At the beginning of the war of 1870 (he was to die four months later, aged twenty-four), the author of the *Chants de Maldoror* and of *Poesies*, Isidore Ducasse, better known by the name of Comte de Lautreamont, whose thought has been of the very greatest help and encouragement to my friends and myself through the fifteen years during which we have succeeded in carrying on a common activity, made the following remark, among many others which were to electrify us fifty years later: "At the hour in which I write, new tremors are running through the intellectual atmosphere; it is only a matter of having the courage to face them." 1868-75: it is impossible, looking back upon the past, to perceive an epoch so poetically rich, so victorious, so revolutionary and so charged with distant meaning as that which stretches from the separate publication of the *Premier Chant de Maldoror* to the insertion in a letter to Ernest Delahaye of Rimbaud's last poem, *Rov*, which has not so far been included in his Complete Works. It is not an idle hope to wish to see the works of Lautreamont and Rimbaud restored to their correct historical background: the coming and the immediate results of the war of 1870 Other and analogous cataclysms could not have failed to rise out of that military and social cataclysm whose final episode was to be the atrocious crushing of the Paris Commune; the last in date caught many of us at the very age when Lautreamont and Rimbaud found themselves thrown into the preceding one, and by way of revenge has had as its consequence-and this is the new and important fact-the triumph of the Bolshevik Revolution.

I should say that to people socially and politically uneducated as we then were – we who, on the one hand, came for the most part from the petite-bourgeoisie, and on the other, were all by vocation possessed with the desire to intervene upon the artistic plane-the days of October, which only the passing of the years and the subsequent appearance of a large number of works within the reach of all were fully to illumine, could not there and then have appeared to turn so decisive a page in history. We were, I repeat, ill-prepared and ill-informed. Above all, we were exclusively preoccupied with the campaign of systematic refusal, exasperated by the conditions under which, in such an age, we were forced to live. But our refusal did not stop there; it was insatiable and knew no bounds. Apart from the incredible stupidity of the arguments which attempted to legitimize our participation in an enterprise such as the war, whose issue left us completely indifferent, this refusal was directed-and having been brought up in such a school, we are not capable of changing so much that it is no longer so directed-against the whole series of intellectual, moral and social obligations that continually and from all sides weigh down upon man and crush him. Intellectually, it was vulgar rationalism and chop logic that more than anything else formed the causes of our horror and our destructive impulse; morally, it was all duties: religious, civic and of the family; socially, it was work (did not Rimbaud say: "Jamais je ne travaillerai, o flots de feu!" and also: "La main a plume vaut la main a charrue. Quel siecle a mains! Je n'aurai jamais ma main!"). The more I think about it, the more certain I become that nothing was to our minds worth saving, unless it was . . . unless it was, at last, "l'amour la poesie," considered as inseparable in their essence and as the sole good. Between the negation of this good, a negation brought to its climax by the war, and its full and total affirmation ("Poetry should be made by all, not one"), the field was not, to our minds, open to anything but a Revolution truly extended into all domains, improbably radical, to the highest degree impractical and tragically destroying within itself the whole time the feeling that it brought with it both of desirability and of absurdity. Many of you, no doubt, would put this down to a certain youthful exaltation and to the general savagery of the time; I must, however, insist on this attitude, common to particular men and manifesting itself at periods nearly half a century distant from one another. I should affirm that in ignorance of this attitude one could form no idea of what surrealism really stands for. This attitude alone can account, and very sufficiently at that, for all the excesses that may be attributed to us but which cannot be deplored unless one gratuitously supposes that we could have started from any other point. The ill-sounding remarks that are imputed to us, the so-called inconsiderate attacks, the insults, the quarrels, the scandals—all the things that we are so much reproached with -turned up on the same road as the surrealist poems. From the very beginning, the surrealist attitude has had that in common with Lautreamont and Rimbaud which once and for all binds our lot to theirs, and that is wartime defeatism.
I am not afraid to say that this defeatism seems to me more relevant ever. "New tremors are running through the intellectual atmosphere: it is only a matter of having the courage to face them." They are, in fact, always running through the intellectual atmosphere: the problem of their propagation and interpretation remains the same and, as far as we are concerned, remains to be solved. But, paraphrasing Lautreamont, I cannot refrain from adding that at the hour in which I speak, old and mortal shivers are trying to substitute themselves for those which are the very shivers of knowledge and of life. They come to announce a frightful disease, a disease inevitably followed by the deprivation of all rights; it is only a matter of having the courage to face them also. This disease is called fascism.

Let us be careful today not to underestimate the peril: the shadow has greatly advanced over Europe recently. Hitler, Dollfuss and Mussolini have either drowned in blood or subjected to corporal humiliation everything that formed the effort of generations straining towards a more tolerable and more worthy form of existence. In capitalist society, hypocrisy and cynicism have: ‘now lost all sense of proportion and are becoming more outrageous every daft.’ Without making exaggerated sacrifices to humanitarianism, which always involves impossible reconciliations and truces to the advantage of the stronger, ‘I should say that in this atmosphere, thought cannot consider the exterior: world without an immediate shudder. Everything we know about fascism shows that it is precisely the homologation of this state of affairs, aggravate to its furthest point by the lasting resignation that it seeks to obtain from: ‘those who suffer. Is not the evident role of fascism to re-establish for the time being the tottering supremacy of finance-capital? Such a role is of itself sufficient to make it worthy of all our hatred; we continue to consider this feigned resignation as one of the greatest evils that can possibly be inflicted upon beings of our kind, and those who would inflict it deserve, in our: opinion, to be beaten like dogs. Yet it is impossible to conceal the fact that this immense danger is there, lurking at our doors, that it has made its appearance within our walls, and that it would be pure byzantinism to dispute too long, as in Germany, over the choice of the barrier to be set up against it, when all the while, under several aspects, it is creeping nearer and nearer to us. During the course of taking various steps with a view to contributing, in so far as I am capable, to the organization in Paris of the anti-fascist struggle, I have noticed that already a certain doubt has crept into the intellectual: circles of the left as to the possibility of successfully combating fascism, a doubt which has unfortunately infected even those elements whom one might, have thought it possible to rely on and who had come to the fore in this struggle. Some of them have even begun to make excuses for the deprivation of all rights; it is only a matter of having the courage to face them also. This disease is called fascism.

Let us be careful today not to underestimate the peril: the shadow has greatly advanced over Europe recently. Hitler, Dollfuss and Mussolini have either drowned in blood or subjected to corporal humiliation everything that formed the effort of generations straining towards a more tolerable and more worthy form of existence. In capitalist society, hypocrisy and cynicism have: ‘now lost all sense of proportion and are becoming more outrageous every daft.’ Without making exaggerated sacrifices to humanitarianism, which always involves impossible reconciliations and truces to the advantage of the stronger, ‘I should say that in this atmosphere, thought cannot consider the exterior: world without an immediate shudder. Everything we know about fascism shows that it is precisely the homologation of this state of affairs, aggravate to its furthest point by the lasting resignation that it seeks to obtain from: ‘those who suffer. Is not the evident role of fascism to re-establish for the time being the tottering supremacy of finance-capital? Such a role is of itself sufficient to make it worthy of all our hatred; we continue to consider this feigned resignation as one of the greatest evils that can possibly be inflicted upon beings of our kind, and those who would inflict it deserve, in our: opinion, to be beaten like dogs. Yet it is impossible to conceal the fact that this immense danger is there, lurking at our doors, that it has made its appearance within our walls, and that it would be pure byzantinism to dispute too long, as in Germany, over the choice of the barrier to be set up against it, when all the while, under several aspects, it is creeping nearer and nearer to us. During the course of taking various steps with a view to contributing, in so far as I am capable, to the organization in Paris of the anti-fascist struggle, I have noticed that already a certain doubt has crept into the intellectual: circles of the left as to the possibility of successfully combating fascism, a doubt which has unfortunately infected even those elements whom one might, have thought it possible to rely on and who had come to the fore in this struggle. Some of them have even begun to make excuses for the loss of the battle already. Such dispositions seem to me to be so dismaying that I should not care to be speaking here without first having made clear my position in relation to them, or without anticipating a whole series of remarks that are, ‘to follow, affirming that today, more than ever before, the liberation of the mind, the express aim of surrealism, demands as primary condition, in the opinion of the surrealists, the liberation of man, which implies that we must struggle with our fetters with all the energy of despair; that today more than ever before the surrealists entirely rely for the bringing about of the liberation of man upon the proletarian Revolution.

I now feel free to turn to the object of this pamphlet, which is to attempt to explain what surrealism is. A certain immediate ambiguity contained in the word surrealism, is, in fact, capable of leading one to suppose that it designates I know not what transcendental attitude, while, on the contrary it expresses-and always has expressed for us-a desire to deepen the foundations of the real, to bring about an ever clearer and at the same time ever more passionate consciousness of the world perceived by the senses. The whole evolution of surrealism, from its origins to the present day, which I am about to attempt to retrace, shows that our unceasing wish, growing more and more urgent from day to day, has been at all costs to avoid considering a system of thought as a refuge, to pursue our investigations with eyes wide open to their outside consequences, and to assure ourselves that the results of these investigations would be capable of facing the breath of the street. At the limits, for many past years-or more exactly, since the conclusion of what one may term the purely intuitive epoch of surrealism (1919-25) - at the limits, I say, we have attempted to present interior reality and exterior reality as two elements in process of unification, of finally becoming one. This final unification is the supreme aim of surrealism: interior reality and exterior reality being, in the present form of society, in contradiction (and in this contradiction we see the very cause of man’s unhappiness, but also the source of his movement), we have assigned to ourselves the task of confronting these two realities with one another on every possible occasion, of refusing to allow the preeminence of the one over the other, yet not of acting on the one and on the other both at once, for that would be to suppose that they are less apart from one another than they are (and I believe
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that those who pretend they are acting on both simultaneously are either deceiving us or are a prey to a disquieting illusion; of acting on these two realities not both at once, but one after the other, in a systematic manner, allowing us to observe their reciprocal attraction and interpenetration and to give to this interplay of forces all the extension necessary for the trend of these two adjoining realities to become one and the same thing.

Although there can be no question here of going through the history of the surrealist movement—its history has been told many a time and sometimes told fairly well; moreover, I prefer to pass on as quickly as possible to the exposition of its present attitude—I think I ought briefly to recall, for the benefit of those of you who were unaware of the fact, that there is no doubt that before the surrealist movement properly so called, there existed among the promoters of the movement and others who later rallied round it, very active, not merely dissenting but also antagonistic dispositions which, between 1915 and 1920, were willing to align themselves under the signboard of Dada. Post-war disorder, a state of mind essentially anarchic that guided that cycles many manifestations, a deliberate refusal to judge—for lack, it was said, of criteria—the actual qualifications of individuals, and, perhaps, in the last analysis, a certain spirit of negation which was making itself conspicuous, had brought about a dissolution of the group as yet inchoate, one might say, by reason of its dispersed and heterogeneous character, a group whose germinating force has nevertheless been decisive and, by the general consent of present-day critics, has greatly influenced the course of ideas. It may be proper before passing rapidly—as I must—over this period, to ascribe by far the handsomest share to Marcel Duchamp (canvases and glass objects still to be seen in New York), to Francis Pachy (reviews "291" and "391"), Jacques Cache’ (Lettres de Guerre) and Tristan Tzara (Twenty-five Poems, Dada Manifesto, 1918).

Strangely enough, it was a discovery of language that there was seeking to organize itself in 1920 what-as yet on a basis of confidential exchange-assumed the name of surrealism, a word fallen from the lips of Apollinaire, which we had diverted from the rather general and very confusing connotation he had given it. What was at first no more than a new method of poetic writing broke away after several years from the much too general theses which had come to be expounded in the Surrealist Manifesto - Soluble Fish, 1924, the Second Manifesto adding others to them, whereby the whole was raised to a vaster ideological plane; and so there had to be revision.

In an article, "Enter the Mediums," published in Literature, 1922, reprinted in Les Pas Perdus, 1924, and subsequently in the Surrealist Manifesto, I explained the circumstance that had originally put us, my friends and myself, on the track of the surrealist activity we still follow and for which we are hopeful of gaining ever more numerous new adherents in order to extend it further than we have so far succeeded in doing. It reads:

"It was in 1919, in complete solitude and at the approach of sleep, that my attention was arrested by sentences more or less complete, which became perceptible to my mind without my being able to discover (even by very meticulous analysis) any possible previous volitional effort. One evening in particular, as I was about to fall asleep, I became aware of a sentence articulated clearly to a point excluding all possibility of alteration and stripped of all quality of vocal sound; a curious sort of sentence which came to me bearing -in sober truth-not a trace of any relation whatever to any incidents I may at that time have been involved in; an insistent sentence, it seemed to me, a sentence I remembered the exact sentence at this distance, but it ran approximately like this: 'A man is cut in half by the window’; What made it plainer was the fact that it was accompanied by a feeble visual representation of a man in the process of walking, but cloven, at half his height, by a window perpendicular to the axis of his body. Definitely, there was the form, re-erected against space, of a man leaning out of a window. But the window following the man's locomotion, I understood that I was dealing with an image of great rarity. Instantly the idea came to me to use it as material for poetic construction. I had no sooner invested it with that quality, than it had given place to a succession of experiences which left me no less astonished, but in a state, I would say, of extreme detachment.

"Preoccupied as I still was at that time with Freud, and familiar with his methods of investigation, which I had practised occasionally upon the sick during the War, I resolved to obtain from myself what one seeks to obtain from patients, namely a monologue poured out as rapidly as possible, over which the subject's critical faculty has no control—the subject himself throwing reticence to the winds—and which as much as possible represents spoken thought. It seemed and still seems to
me that the speed of thought is no greater than that of words, and hence does not exceed the flow of either tongue or pen. It was in such circumstances that, together with Philippe Soupault, whom I had told about my first ideas on the subject, I began to cover sheets of paper with writing, feeling a praiseworthy contempt for whatever the literary result might be. Ease of achievement brought about the rest. By the end of the first day of the experiment we were able to read to one another about fifty pages obtained in this manner and to compare the results we had achieved. The likeness was on the whole striking. There were similar faults of construction, the same hesitant manner, and also, in both cases, an illusion of extraordinary verve, much emotion, a considerable assortment of images of a quality such as we should never have been able to obtain in the normal way of writing, a very special sense of the picturesque, and, here and there, a few pieces of out and out buffoonery. The only differences which our two texts presented appeared to me to be due essentially to our respective temperaments, Soupault's being less static than mine, and, if he will allow me to make this slight criticism, to his having scattered about at the top of certain pages—doubtlessly in a spirit of mystification—various words under the guise of titles. I must give him credit, on the other hand, for having always forcibly opposed the least correction of any passage that did not seem to me to be quite the thing. In that he was most certainly right.

"It is of course difficult in these cases to appreciate at their just value the various elements in the result obtained; one may even say that it is entirely impossible to appreciate them at a first reading. To you who may be writing them, these elements are, in appearance, as strange as to anyone else, and you are yourself naturally distrustful of them. Poetically speaking, they are distinguished chiefly by a very high degree of immediate absurdity, the peculiar quality of that absurdity being, on close examination, their yielding to whatever is most admissible and legitimate in the world: divulgence of a given number of facts and properties on the whole not less objectionable than the others."

The word "surrealism" having thereupon become descriptive of the generalizable undertaking to which we had devoted ourselves, I thought it indispensable, in 1924, to define this word once and for all:

"SURREALISM, n. Pure psychic automatism, by which it is intended to express, verbally, in writing, or by other means, the real process of thought. Thought's dictation, in the absence of all control exercised by the reason and outside all aesthetic or moral preoccupations.

"ENCYCL. Philos. Surrealism rests in the belief in the superior reality certain forms of association neglected heretofore; in the omnipotence of the dream and in the disinterested play of thought. It tends definitely to away with all other psychic mechanisms and to substitute itself for them the solution of the principal problems of life. Have professed absolute sur realism: Messrs. Aragon, Baron, Boiffard, Breton, Carrive, Crevel, Delte Desnos, Eluard, Gerard, Limbour, Malkine, Morise, Naville, Noll, Peret, Pica Soupault, Vitrac.

"These till now appear to be the only ones, and there would not have been any doubt on that score were it not for the strange case of Isidore Ducas: of whose extra-literary career I lack all data. Were one to consider their output only superficially, a goodly number of poets might well have passed for surrealists, beginning with Dante and Shakespeare at his best. In the course many attempts I have made towards an analysis of what, under false pretences is called genius, I have found nothing that could in the end be attributed to any other process than this:"

There followed an enumeration that will gain, I think, by being clearly set out thus:

"Young's Night Thoughts are surrealist from cover to cover. It was w: fortunately a priest who spoke; a bad priest, to be sure, yet a priest.

"Heraclitus is surrealist in dialectic.

"Lulle is surrealist in definition.

"Flamel is surrealist in the night of gold.

"Swift is surrealist in malice.

"Sade is surrealist in sadism.

"Carriere is surrealist in drowning.

"Monk Lewis is surrealist in the beauty of evil.

"Achim d'Arnim is surrealist absolutely, in space and time.

"Rabbe is surrealist in death.

"Baudelaire is surrealist in morals.

"Rimbaud is surrealist in life and elsewhere.

"Hervey Saint-Denys is surrealist in the directed dream.

"Carroll is surrealist in nonsense."
"Huysmans is surrealist in pessimism.
"Seurat is surrealist in design.
"Picasso is surrealist in cubism.
"Vache is surrealist in myself.
"Roussel is surrealist in anecdote. Etc.

"They were not always surrealists-on this I insist-in the sense that one can disentangle in each of them a number of preconceived notions to which, very naively, they clung. And they clung to them so because they had not heard the surrealist voice, the voice that exhorts on the eve of death and the roaring storm, and because they were unwilling to dedicate themselves to the task of no more than orchestrating the score replete with marvelous things. They were proud instruments; hence the sounds they produced were not always harmonious sounds.

"We, on the contrary, who have not given ourselves to processes of filtering, who through the medium of our work have been content to be silent receptacles of so many echoes, modest registering machines that are not hypnotized by the pattern that they trace, we are perhaps serving a yet more nobler cause. So we honestly give back the talent lent to us. You may talk of the 'talent' of this yard of platinum, of this mirror, of this door and of this sky, if you wish.

"We have no talent..."

The Manifesto also contained a certain number of practical recipes, entitled: "Secrets of the Magic Surrealist Art," such as the following:

"Written Surrealist Composition or First and Last Draft.

"Having settled down in some spot most conducive to the mind's concentration upon itself, order writing material to be brought to you. Let your state of mind be as passive and receptive as possible. Forget your genius, talents, as well as the genius and talents of others. Repeat to yourself that literature is pretty well the sorriest road that leads to everywhere. Write quickly without any previously chosen subject, quickly enough not to dwell on, and not to be tempted to read over, what you have written. The first sentence will come of itself; and this is self-evidently true, because there is never a moment but some sentence alien to our conscious thought clamours for outward expression. It is rather difficult to speak of the sentence to follow, since it doubtless comes in for a share of our conscious activity and so do the other sentences, if it is conceded that the writing of the first sentence must have involved even a minimum of consciousness. But that should in the long run matter little, because therein precisely lies the greatest interest in the surrealist exercise. Punctuation of course necessarily hinders the stream of absolute continuity which preoccupies us. But you should particularly distrust the prompting whisper. If through a fault ever so trifling there is a forewarning of silence to come, a fault, let us say, of inattention, break off unhesitatingly the line that has become too lucid. After the word—whose origin seems suspect you should place a letter, any letter, I for example, always the letter 1, and restore the arbitrary flux by making that letter the initial of the word to follow."

"I shall pass over the more or less correlated considerations which the Manifesto discussed in their bearing on the possibilities of plastic expression in surrealism. These considerations did not assume with me a relatively dogmatic turn until later (Surrealism and Painting, 1928).

I believe that the real interest of that book—there was no lack of people who were good enough to concede interest, for which no particular credit is due to me because I have no more than given expression to sentiments shared with friends, present and former—rests only subordinately on the formula above given. It is rather confirmatory of a turn of thought which, for good or ill, is peculiarly distinctive of our time. The defence originally attempted of that turn of thought still seems valid to me in what follows:

"We still live under the reign of logic, but the methods of logic are applied nowadays only to the resolution of problems of secondary interest. The absolute-rationalism which is still the fashion does not permit consideration of any facts but those strictly relevant to our experience. Logical ends, on the other hand, escape us. Needless to say that even experience has had limits assigned to it. It revolves in a cage from which it becomes more and more difficult to release it. Even experience is dependent on immediate utility, and common sense is its keeper. Under pretext of progress, all that rightly or wrongly may be regarded as fantasy or superstition has been banished from the mind, all uncustomary searching after truth has been proscribed. It is only by what must seem sheer luck that there has recently been brought to light an aspect of mental life to my belief by far the most important—of which it was supposed that we no longer had any concern. All credit for these discoveries must go to Freud. Based on these discoveries, a current of opinion is
forming that will enable the explorer of the human mind to continue his investigations, justified as he will be in taking into account more than mere summary realities. The imagination is perhaps on the point of reclaiming its rights. If the depths of our minds harbour strange forces capable of increasing those on the surface, or of successfully contending with them, then it is all in our interest to canalize them, to canalize them first in order to submit them later, if necessary, to the control of the reason. The analysts themselves have nothing to lose by such a proceeding. But it should be observed that there are no means designed a priori for the bringing about of such an enterprise, that until the coming of the new order it might just as well be considered the affair of poets and scientists, and that its success will not depend on the more or less capricious means that will be employed . . . .

"I am resolved to render powerless that hatred of the marvellous which is so rampant among certain people, that ridicule to which they are so eager to expose it. Briefly: The marvellous is always beautiful, anything that is marvellous is beautiful; indeed, nothing but the marvellous is beautiful . . . .

"The admirable thing about the fantastic is that it is no longer fantastic: there is only the real

. . . .

"Interesting in a different way from the future of surrealist technics (theatrical, philosophical, scientific, critical) appears to me the application of surrealism to action. Whatever reservations I might be inclined to make with regard to responsibility in general, I should quite particularly like to know how the first misdemeanours whose surrealist character is indubitable will be judged. When surrealist methods extend from writing to action, there will certainly arise the need of a new morality to take the place of the current one, the cause of all our woes."