

Jews in Dada: Marcel Janco, Tristan Tzara, and Hans Richter

This lecture deals with three Jews who got together in Zurich in 1916. Two of them, Janco and Tzara, were high school friends in Romania; the third, Hans Richter, was German, and, probably unbeknown to them, also a Jew.

I start with Janco and I wish to open on a personal note. The 'case' of Marcel Janco would best be epitomized by the somewhat fragmented and limited perspective from which, for a while, I was obliged to view his art. This experience has been shared, fully or in part, by my generation as well as by those closer to Janco's generation, Romanians, Europeans and Americans alike.

Growing up in Israel in the 1950s and 60s, I knew Janco for what he was then – an Israeli artist. The founder of the artists' colony of Ein Hod, the teacher of an entire generation of young Israeli painters, he was so deeply rooted in the Israeli experience, so much part of our landscape, that it was inconceivable to see him as anything else but that. When I first started to read the literature of Dada and Surrealism, I was surprised to find a Marcel Janco portrayed as one of the originators of Dada. Was it the same Marcel Janco? Somehow I couldn't associate an art scene so removed from the mainstream of modern art – as I then unflatteringly perceived

the Israeli art scene – with the formidable Dada credentials ascribed to Janco. Later, in New York – this was in the early 1970s – I discovered that many of those well-versed in the history of Dada were aware of Marcel Janco the Dadaist but were rather ignorant about his later career. Even more surprisingly, they would generally know of Janco as the spirited contributor to soirées at the Cabaret Voltaire, but their information about his actual artistic achievements was scanty. Michel Seuphor introduced a Janco exhibition in 1961, at a time when his Dada work became a little better known, saying that, "Janco's work of the Dada period has remained one of the most solid plastic expressions of this movement. That today he should still be so little known is incomprehensible." Not so incomprehensible, though, when we recall Janco's "migrations and peregrinations," as he himself refers to the meandering course his life has taken – with the foremost dislocation caused by World War II. There is a touching little story about two good friends, Marcel Janco and Hans Richter. In 1948, Richter contributed an essay to Robert Motherwell's anthology *The Dada Painters and Poets*, and writing about Janco he concluded: "Many years later he [Janco] wrote me from Bucharest that he had become an architect and that he has such a great desire to go west again (France). But then came the Iron Guard to kill thousands of Romanians and then the

Nazis again killed thousands. I didn't hear from him again." This was, to use Richter's words, his *adieu de louange* – praise and farewell – for Janco. It was only in 1950, after twenty years of silence – so Richter tells in a letter printed in a later edition of Motherwell's anthology – that Richter learned to his surprise and delight that Janco was alive and well in Israel. Was Janco in artistic exile in Romania in the years preceding World War II? To Richter it doubtlessly appeared so. But we do learn of the role Janco played in the forefront of Romanian artistic and cultural life in those years. And how had his Israeli career appeared to his former friends? Had they considered it another exile?

It is ironic that this fragmented perspective – deriving from national, geographic, and, ultimately, religious boundaries – would be the lot of a Dadaist who tirelessly advocated universalism, denying national, ethnic or religious particularism. But then so did most of the Jews associated with the Zurich Dada, some of them even concealing their Jewish ancestry by changing their names and thus choosing alternative identities as artists (as did, for that matter, Man Ray, the New York and Paris Dadaist whose original name was Emmanuel Radnitsky). As I've said, I will focus on Janco himself, Tristan Tzara and Hans Richter. I will present some details of their career, both in regard to their successful – or at times not so

successful – attempt to leave behind them, to eradicate, their origin, as well as in relation to the existence of Judaism as a kind of sub current, mostly unconscious, in their thought – as a mode of thought, so to speak. Janco, in this respect, doesn't have much to show us. He is the universalist par excellence. There is no allusion or reference at all to anything ethnic, national or religious in his early art works, or in his texts, those of the early Dada period as well as those written later on, when he was already well entrenched in the Israeli experience. It is interesting, for instance, to note that in Willy Verkauf's 1957 anthology, *Dada: Monograph of a Movement*, for which he was one of the co-editors and to which he contributed a long essay on the Zurich Dada, there is no mention at all of anything Jewish. It is also interesting to note that, of all the entries in the Dada Dictionary included in this volume, only the one on Tzara refers to his original name. It says: "Pseudonym of Sami Rosenstock – wrote in Roumania also as 'Samiro.'" Indeed, Tzara, as I shall show later, could not metaphorically fully escape the Sami Rosenstock label. Nor could Janco, for that matter, in view of the way Hugo Ball, the founder of the Cabaret Voltaire, in his book *Flight from Time*, describes how Janco and Tzara showed up for the first time at the Cabaret. **[[[2. Cabaret Voltaire; Poster for the opening 1916]]]]** This was in 1916. Ball remembers an "oriental-looking deputation of

four little men with portfolios and pictures under their arms, bowing politely many times," who introduced themselves as Marcel Janco, Georges Janco and Tristan Tzara. No doubt, "oriental" in this respect was more of a euphemism for Jew than a reference to the East-European origin.

A short while after the Romanians appeared on the scene, Tzara assumed artistic control, Janco and Arp took charge of the costumes and sets, and Ball supervised the group's theatrical experiments. They were then joined by Richard Huelsenbeck, who arrived from Berlin, and later by Marcel Slodki and Hans Richter (and others, I won't name all of them). Much has been written about the spirit animating the scandalous manifestations and the theatrical experiments taking place in the Dada soirées. My concern now is with Janco, who created the decorations, painted posters, recited and danced. **[[[3. Masks]]]** His most striking contribution to the theatrical events were his masks, which were "terrifying," as Arp recalled. Hugo Ball described them as being reminiscent of the Japanese and Classical Greek theater, yet entirely modern. "Not only did each mask seem to demand the appropriate costume, it also dictated a specific set of gestures, melodramatic and bordering, almost on madness . . ." **[[[4. Poster and cover]]]]** Janco was also active in the publication of the revue Dada, **[[[5. Portraits Tzara Huelse]]]** and illustrated

its pages with numerous woodcuts and portraits of his friends. **[[[6. cover inside pages Antipyrine]]]** He executed colored woodcuts for Tzara's *La Première aventure céleste de M. Antipyrine* (1916), which was possibly the first Dada imprint.

He also painted. In reaction to the parochial outlook offered by the Romanian art then, once in Zurich he was ready to embrace the modern art trends. **[[[7. Cabaret in Zurich; Cabaret Voltaire]]]** Arp humorously recalls how "secretly, in his quiet little room, Janco devoted himself to a 'naturalism in zigzag.' I forgive him this secret vice," adds Arp, "because in one of his paintings he evoked and commemorated the 'Cabaret Voltaire.'" **[[[8. Janco and Severini]]]** Visually rendering the musical rhythms of dance, those paintings reveal a marked affinity with Futurist canvases such as Severini's *Bal Tabarin*. We may understand Arp, though, for treating the "zigzag" paintings somewhat condescendingly and for suggesting that their value is anecdotal. **[[[9. Construction 3]]]** More original indeed are his sculptures (most of which are lost now), fantastic creatures, as Arp wrote in 1957, "all made of spiral springs and swans' feathers, beings in magical kimonos . . ." You, he addresses Janco, "prophesized the era of pure fabulation." **[[[10. Lock and White]]]** Janco's reliefs, considered by many to be his greatest achievement during his Zurich days, were meant to be incorporated without frame into

interiors, as architectonic components. [[[**11. Flower Geometry**]]] In a manifesto dated 1919, Janco formulated a "theory of abstract art," demanding the integration of the plastic arts with architecture. Yet, Janco also regarded them as a manifestation of Dada. Hans Arp recognized this combination of attitudes when he said, with regard to the reliefs, that "This art remains oriental and tempered constructivism. The very opposite of the intellectual and mechanized art of the robots." Tempered constructivism refers to Janco's ambivalence with regard to severe mechanical abstraction; the term "oriental" implies that Janco's work was associated, even by his colleagues, with his being Romanian; not necessarily Jewish, I should add. [[[12. Staccato]]] This "tempered abstraction" to which Arp refers also characterizes the oil paintings done between 1918 and 1921.

I won't go in detail into Janco's story in the coming years. Enough to say that the Dada group had begun dispersing in 1919. In 1920 Janco came to Paris, but he couldn't find his place there with the Paris Dadaists. He opposed the budding Surrealist Movement because of what he considered to be its tendency toward literary romanticism and mystification. [[[**13. Still life, Luxembourg**]]] In 1922 he returned to Romania, exhibited in the Maison d'Art in Bucharest, founded the modernist movement "Contimporanul" and published with Ion

Vinea an avant-garde review bearing that name. He continued painting and exhibiting and worked as an architect. His paintings of the 1920s reveal an increasing preoccupation with space and depth; representational elements begin to occupy these newly formed spaces. It was only in Romania in the interwar years that the issue of his Jewishness came up and brought about increasingly some tension and unease between him and his colleagues. [[[**14. Arab Café**]]] Following the rise of Nazi-aligned forces in Romania, and, later, the outbreak of the war, early in 1941 he immigrated to Israel (then Palestine). He worked there as an architect, taught art and painted. [[[**15. Air raid, wounded soldier**]]] His paintings of the 1940s and 1950s, far more representational, are suffused with the horrors of the Shoah; the war of independence introduced new subjects. In the late 1950s his paintings became more abstract in character. [[**16. Blue Tension**]]

His works after the World War were quite removed from his early Dada ideals. Janco was fully cognizant of the problem. In a letter to Richter in 1950 he admitted that he had not always painted abstractly, because he believed one must also "say something." "I'm still very close to 'dada,' to the true dada which at bottom always defended the forces of creation, instinctive and fresh, colored by the popular art that one finds in all people." There remained, however, a certain split in him.

Writing retrospectively about Dada in 1966, Janco paid lip service to prevailing notions on Dada: "We had lost confidence in our 'culture.' Everything had to be demolished." But he hastens to add that, while for writers - posing as nihilists and declaring art dead and Dada a joke – this was an easy matter, for those in the visual arts it was less simple. And Janco was not alone in distinguishing thus between the Dada writers and artists. One can detect a hint of complaint in Richter's assertion that even when they were practicing art as art, "our friends the poets, philosophers, writers, and psychologists left us not so much as a mouse hole through which to smuggle a single conventional idea." It is obvious that the Zurich Dada artists were quite tame in comparison with more demonstrative anti-artists such as Duchamp or Picabia. Writing in 1966 about Dada, Janco discerned in it two "speeds." The "negative speed" of scandal and "ineffectual babbling," followed by a "positive speed" stressing creativity, freedom and direct expression. He admits to having been for a while on the first "speed." But then, he and his artist friends were always there, beyond negation. I should point out that, while in letters to his former Dada friends he may refer to the horror and the suffering of the war years or to his new life in Israel, in his Dada texts of the 1950s and 1960s, as I have noted earlier, he remains

completely aloof from his origins, completely within the confines of the universalist ideals of his version of Dada.

[[**17. Man Ray, Tzara 1921**]] Let's move then to Tristan Tzara. Tristan Tzara was born in 1896 in Moinesti (Romania) to a well to do Jewish family. His name then, as is well known, was Shmuel Rosenstock. In 1912 he published four symbolist poems in *Simbolul*, a literary review he had founded with Ion Vinea and Marcel Janco, both of whom shared his interest in French poetry. In the years that followed, he published a number of other poems in Romanian periodicals, characterized at times by black humor and unexpected poetic dislocations foreshadowing in part what lay ahead. In 1915 he came to Zurich, where he enrolled at a university to study philosophy. [[[**18. Janco Mask Tzara, Richter Tzara**]] Shortly after his arrival in Zurich, Tzara reunited with Janco and Janco's brother Georges, and the three of them, as recounted before, showed up at the Cabaret Voltaire. This was the beginning of his Dada activities. It was a short while earlier that the new persona, Tristan Tzara, came into being (tzara is the Romanian for land, "sad in the land"; it might also refer to "trouble" in Hebrew and Yiddish). The new name was a mark of his denial of his Jewish origin. Under the umbrella of this avant-garde persona, Tzara broke the rules of language, grammar, syntax, as part of a nihilistic world view,

calling for a fresh start, a tabula rasa, and opting for the universal as opposed to the national, ethnic or religious.

There are two important publications, Tom Sandquist's book, *Dada East: The Romanians of Cabaret Voltaire* and Steven Mansbach's article, "The 'Foreignness' of Classical Modern Art in Romania," which examine in detail the Romanian avant-garde background of Janco, Tzara, M. H. Maxy, Arthur Segal and others. Both publications also provide a close view of the Jewish background of this group. [[[19. **Photo avant-garde artists in Romania**]]] I should also draw your attention to an exhibition that was exhibited a few years ago at Amsterdam's Jewish Historical Museum, "From Dada to Surrealism: Jewish Avant-garde Artists From Romania, 1910–1938," and then was shown at the Israel Museum.

As has been pointed out, Tzara's cultural and spiritual background was steeped in Jewish culture. It has also been argued that his Jewish identity had a direct bearing on his revolt against European social constraints. As my colleague, Prof. Milly Heyd, argues, in spite of Tzara's denial of Judaism, it is possible to detect Judaic modes of thoughts behind the universal Dadaist manifestos. She discerns this in a quotation from his 1918 manifesto from which she has garnered three phrases. [[[20. **Tzara text**]]] These are: "DADA the abolition of memory," "DADA the abolition of prophets," "Dada the

abolition of the future,” “DADA can enable you to escape from destiny.” The notions of “memory,” “prophets,” and “destiny” have a particular meaning within Judaism. Judaism is the religion of memory, as has been discussed by Yosef Hayim Yerushalmi, in his book *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory*. The Hebrew word “Zakhor,” --“remember,” is a command central in the Hebrew Bible where it appears one hundred and sixty-nine times complemented by the command to refrain from forgetting. In injunctions such as: “Remember that you were a slave in Egypt,” the command is uttered in an unequivocal way.

Tzara uses terminology that is part and parcel of Judaic thinking, but does so as part of an aggressive nihilistic attack. “Memory”, “prophets” and “destiny” are, according to Tzara’s manifesto, to be abolished. As Milly Heyd notes, herein lies the paradox: not wanting to share Jewish memory, rejecting the legacy of the prophets, and most importantly, as is relevant to his actual life, putting a special emphasis on escaping destiny, Tzara cannot avoid using terminology with strong Jewish resonance. Part of the terminology used in his manifesto indicates that he had interiorized some basic concepts within Judaism that are highly representative of the fate of the people from which he wished to disassociate. This is a typical Dadaist paradoxical position: by attacking these concepts he also

inescapably discloses the deep meaning they had for him and which he tried to overcome. Furthermore, ironically, in the totality of his ideological position and in the angry fervor animating his 1918 manifesto, he sounds like a secular prophet: “every man must shout: there is great destruction, negative work to be done. To sweep, to clean.” In his "Dada can enable you to escape from destiny" Tzara divulges his need to recreate his life by escaping from his own destiny.

He didn't quite manage to do that. His life circumstances dictated otherwise. His Jewish origin was often on the mind of friends and foes alike, even when not specifically noted as such. **[[[21. Man Ray, Tzara 1920s]]** In France in the post-war years, or even before that, Dada was seen at times as synonymous with Judaism as well as with foreign interests, and Tzara, as the foremost proponent of Dada, often had to defend himself against the accusations of being a supporter of foreign interests. In his biography of André Breton, Mark Polizzotti marks many instances relating to such occurrences. At the end of the war, even before Tzara arrived in Paris, an anonymous column in *La Nouvelle Revue Française* noted disapprovingly that some French writers were boosting Dada (meaning Breton and the Parisian Dadaists); the war was scarcely over, the column continues, and already "Paris seemed to be extending a welcome to such drivel, which [came] straight from Berlin."

Breton asked Tzara to write a rebuttal, and Tzara complied and wrote a few paragraphs in which he denied having any pro-German sympathies during the war, adding that "People these days no longer write with their race but with their blood (what a platitude!). One's temperament, he said, is more relevant to art than one's race, or, by implication, one's Jewishness.

[[[22. Man Ray, Tzara 1928]] Tzara's name was generally not mentioned in these attacks against his foreignness or Jewishness. Thus, for instance, among the many answers to a questionnaire published in *Littérature* asking "Why do you write?" the playwright Jean Giraudoux, in direct reference to Tzara, responded: "I write in French, being neither Swiss nor Jewish, and because I have earned all my diplomas." No less venomous was an article by André Gide which appeared in *La Nouvelle Revue Française* in which he noted: "The great misfortune for the inventor of Dada is that the movement he set in motion is knocking him aside, and that he himself is being crushed by his machine." And then, "They tell me he's a foreigner. – I can easily believe it. A Jew. – You took the words out of my mouth. I am told he doesn't use his real name; and I can well believe that Dada itself is nothing but a pseudonym." Noting that "foreigners aren't much interested in our French culture," he concludes, "I hope that in this cask the best wine of youth will soon begin feeling a bit confined," Thus

distinguishing the best wine – the French Dadaists, Breton and Aragon – from the foreigners, foremost among them Tzara. Gide obviously felt the threat of Tzara's universalism, ironically using as a weapon the ethnic and religious background which Tzara's universalism rejected.

The occurrence which was the most offensive in this respect took place at the time of a falling out between Tzara and Breton during the "Congress of Paris." **[[23. Tzara, Simone, Breton]]** Tzara the Dadaist objected to Breton's initiative – which was almost anti-Dada in spirit – of founding a "congress for the determination and defense of the modern spirit." Breton responded, fulminating "against the maneuverings of a publicity-mongering impostor known as the 'promoter' of the movement from Zurich whom it is not useful to name in any other way and who has nothing to do with the current reality." Breton didn't say explicitly that Tzara was a Jew, but the subtext was quite clear. Tzara replied: "An 'international' congress which reproaches someone for being a foreigner no longer has a reason to exist."

[[24. Tzara Calligram]] Tzara may have given a visual representation to his sense of tottering identity in a self image composed of words, i.e. a caligram, which he drew in the shape of an acrobat whose body is in a challenging pose, unstable, about to fall. Was this an acknowledgment of the verbal

acrobatics needed to maintain his universalist identity in the face of anti-Semitic opposition? [[**25. Finkelstein**]] I bring in a caligram I have created in 1976 (without having any knowledge at the time of Tzara's Calligram). It was done for a journal devoted to Romanian art and literature. It represents Tzara as the author of the great French poem "The Approximate Man," a poem that has been described as a study in social alienation and the search for an escape; a rebellion against the "excess baggage of [man's] past and the notions [...] with which he has hitherto tried to control his life." This seems quite appropriate in the present context as well.

[[**26. Richter in front of Eyes**]] And I move on to Hans Richter, who joined the Dadaists in Zurich, advocated universalism akin to Tristan Tzara. It was only after the unification of Berlin in 1989, thirteen years after Richter's death that his birth certificate was found, stating that he was born (1888) to Jewish parents, Moritz Richter and Ida Gabriele, née Rothschild. He appears to have been the most thorough of the three artists discussed today in putting his Jewish parentage under a deep cover. Richter, who in 1941 immigrated to New York, wished in his writings to create the impression that he had to flee away from Europe because he was seen by the Nazis as a "degenerate artist," and not because he was a Jew. Even in America he remained truthful to the identity of the

German-artist émigré. He succeeded in his attempt to play the role of a German modern artist so well that his obituary in *Time Magazine* (1976) states that he “was forced to flee Germany [and] immigrate to the United States.” because he was “An outspoken opponent of Nazism.”

[[[**27. Family pictures**]] In his autobiography *Hans Richter by Hans Richter*, written in 1971 in New York, the artist includes a photograph of his mother with himself as a child and his two siblings. Also included are drawings of the father and mother but their names are conspicuously absent.

There is a strange dualism in his attitude to anything that has to do with Jews or Judaism. On the one hand, he seems to be averse to designating people as Jews. In his contribution to Motherwell's anthology, which I've cited before, He doesn't use at all the word Jews when he refers to the thousands of "Romanians" killed by the Iron Guard and the Nazis. But, on the other hand, when we read his book *Dada: Art and Anti-Art*, we get the impression that he's quite engrossed by the Jews who were around him in the Zurich Dada group, whether they were openly Jewish or had kept their identity hidden. He never designates them specifically as Jews but he's quite the expert in innuendos and allusions. The fact that he chose to cite Hugo Ball's description of the oriental-looking deputation, to which I've referred earlier, is telling enough. He introduces Tzara as

"the Rumanian poet Tristan Tzara" and goes on to describe him as "a David who knew how to hit every Goliath in exactly the right spot." And a few lines further, Tzara in his evocation, is "always on the move, chattering away in German, French or Rumanian," and thus Richter insinuates that Tzara is yet another cosmopolitan Jew.

[[**28. Richter, port Serner**]] Richter's account of the author Walter Serner is also quite telling. Born in 1886 as Walter Seligman to prosperous assimilated Jewish parents from Karlsbad, his name-change, as in many other cases, was a means of hiding his Jewish identity. Richter describes him as "a rootless figure who took root in anything that was extraordinary... a tall, elegant Austrian who wore a monocle." Richter sees him as "a moralist and a cynic, a nihilist who loved mankind . . . he was the cynic of the movement, the declared anarchist . . ." And a few lines later, "his bearing, the impeccable precision of his language, his remarkable intelligence ... made him a sort of aristocrat of Dada."

Thus Richter insinuates that Serner was Jewish by referring to him as a "rootless figure" and by emphasizing his intelligence. This intelligence also comes through in a portrait in oil that Richter painted in 1917. His ambivalence with regard to Serner might be discerned in a caricature of Serner in profile

which appears to suggest a stereotypical conception of Jewish physique.

[[**29. Richter, BlueMan**]] In a paper addressing the question of Richter's Jewish identity, Prof. Milly Heyd argues that Richter's 1917 painting *The Blue Man* represents his ideal self as a universal man. I'll present here her argument, which I find to be quite persuasive. She sees it as an image denoting an odd man out. The ecstatic yet cold quality of the blue color, the intensive expression of the eyes and the man's position being cut by the frame, all suggest a movement from place to place – a man in flight, a hidden wandering Jew. [[**30. Dreams**]] The blue man re-appears in Richter's film, *Dreams that Money Can Buy* (1947) which includes episodes done by Man Ray, Marcel Duchamp, Alexander Calder, Fernand Léger and Max Ernst, as well as one by Richter himself. Prof. Heyd's involved analysis of Richter's episode is too long to be presented here. [[**31. Dreams, Eye**]] Briefly, in one scene, the dreamer similarly to Narcissus looks into the water metamorphosed into a turquoise-blue eye and then realizes that he has become blue. [[**32. Dreams, Who would want**]] The blue man sits at a table with men playing card, a look of fear and sorrow on his face, and one of the men says: "but who would want to sit at a table with a blue man. Sorry you'll have to leave" The blue man raises the question "Blue, why is blue worse than green, violet

or white? Or white better than violet, green or blue?" Heyd argues that through the symbolic language of colors, Richter seems to tell us that he's different from the others. Writing about the film, Richter confesses that at some point in his life he realized he wasn't the man he thought he was and decided to make a film about a man who realizes suddenly that "he isn't the man he thought he was . . . he is blue."

In a conversation in 1957 with the filmmaker and critic Jonas Mekas about the nature of film poetry, Richter tells a story that explains what the blue man means to him. As Richter describes it: "We were ...a Negro writer, my Jewish distributor, and a non-Jewish Critic." For the "Negro writer" the blue Man is a symbolic representation of "the Negro question." In his view, "the blue man feels self-conscious; he is isolated among his friends: even the objects and surroundings are unfriendly." In a parallel manner, the Jewish distributor says: "When I was in Nazi Germany in 1934, as a Jew I felt exactly that way—isolated and looked at by all these people in the street, self-conscious, and embarrassed and alone." Whereas the two minority representatives interpret the image as "others", "the non-Jewish critic" opts for a universalist social interpretation. For him what Richter wants to show is "the relative isolation of the individual in our highly collectivized society." Richter himself identifies with the latter definition, but he adds that "all

three...are right.. I have touched with this blue man upon something which we all have in common, although it is differentiated by our individual experience.”

Does this imply a measure of repentance in Richter with regard to his hidden identity? I don't think so. He remained quite unrepentant to his dying day, the universal man par excellence, but this probing into his work evinces a deep underlying current that wouldn't be stifled.

I wish to bring up at this point, if time permits, one question that seems to me quite crucial with regard to what I have been doing in this lecture and what others have been doing quite extensively in recent decades, that is, the attempt to flush out the hidden Jew, to identify a distinct Jewish sensibility, to discern hidden allusion to Jewish matters. Of course, this activity is quite legitimate and often admirable. However, it is not without dangers. Recently I have discovered on the internet an extensive article in four parts entitled "Tristan Tzara and the Jewish Roots of Dada." Written by someone called Brenton Sanderson, it is well written and excellently researched. From the strict academic research viewpoint it is without reproach. But it so happens that it is included in an online periodical called *Occidental Observer: White Identity, Interests and Culture*. The author's argument is

that the "Jewish intellectual substructure of many of these twentieth century art movements was manifest in their unflinching hostility toward the political, cultural and religious traditions of Europe and European-derived societies." Dada is, of course, the main culprit in this article. As the author argues, "Dada was a movement that was destructive and nihilistic, irrational and absurdist, and which preached the overturning of every cultural tradition of the European past, including of rationality itself. . . While there were many non-Jews involved in Dada, the Jewish contribution was fundamental in shaping its intellectual tenor as a movement, for Dada was as much an attitude and way of thinking as a mode of artistic output." And then, over four long parts, the author goes on to prove his thesis, using the same tools, the same approach even, as the one adopted by so many Jewish-oriented publications in recent years – indeed he makes use of many of the sources used by Prof. Heyd or myself or many others in the field – but with conclusions that smack of virulent anti-Semitism. I wish to bring up this issue, not in order to deny legitimacy of Jewish-oriented efforts, but to simply to create an awareness of the pernicious use to which they might be put.