On Wednesday evening, October 14th, 1942, notable New York art world enthusiasts congregated at the former residence of millionaire industrialist Whitelaw Reid, an imposing late-nineteenth-century Italianate mansion along Madison Avenue. Provisionally housing the Coordinating Council of French Relief Societies, this unlikely venue was host to “First Papers of Surrealism,” the first “official” international exhibition of Surrealism to be held in the United States. The opening night gala guests were unexpectedly caught up in a gigantic Surrealist object, strung together by an exhibition-hanging team assembled under the direction of Marcel Duchamp. Fabricated from “miles” of basic white string – a material displaced from its ordinary use in hanging pictures and further suggestive of the unraveling of the threads of a blank canvas – the giant entanglement wound around exhibited objects, architectural space and visitors alike.

The visually-stunning photographs of Marcel Duchamp’s string labyrinth in the main room of this show have inspired much art historical scholarship, from passing mention in general histories of Surrealism to pride of place in recent accounts of twentieth-century art and beyond to the contemporary recreation of Duchamp’s “Miles of String” installation by American artist Josh Smith at the Greene Naftali gallery group show “Genesis, I’m Sorry,” in August 2007. Hailed as a “chef-d’oeuvre,” Duchamp’s “crazy” “cat’s cradle” virtually stole the Surrealist show if critical reception to date may be a measure of its success. One critic quite perceptively commented on how the installation “forever gets between you and the assembled art, and in so doing creates the most paradoxically clarifying barrier imaginable.”

This astute observation invites speculation on the nature of what was both exposed and veiled behind what another critic described as a “geometric semi-cocoon (sic).” Another more prosaic interpretation saw the string as performing its literal func-
tion of binding the disparate parts into a unified whole where “even the American Indian finds a place – alongside Picasso, Chagall, Dalí, Calder, Delvaux, Klee, Breton, Duchamp and Max Ernst.” Prefacing this enumeration of Surrealism’s mainstays, the anonymous critic authoritatively asserted that such jarring juxtapositions – that is, hanging “the untutored primitivism of Morris Hirshfield… on equal terms with the suave sophisticated work of Yves Tanguy, the fiery brilliance of Matta or the knowing distortion of Seligmann,” were the exclusive domain of Surrealist display.

Revisiting the reception of “First Papers of Surrealism” in another way, I shall focus on the exhibition as a lens for examining how the non-Western objects exhibited were “entangled” not only physically but conceptually. If fanciful combinations of incongruous objects were de rigueur in a Surrealist environment, the appearance of Native American works side by side with modern art was apparently novel – at least it was in the New York City of the early 1940s. The shifting status of these objects – like the twine that Marcel Duchamp and his cohorts had gleefully strung around the exhibition space – presents one of the myriad threads in the entangled mesh intertwining with broader issues of identity, place and nation. In an effort to unravel this chaotic cultural crisscrossing, the purpose of my paper will thus be to examine the web of ideological, institutional and individual interests in which these Native American objects were caught. “First Papers of Surrealism” is one point of convergence, a knot with strings attached to considerations of both the American context of the exhibition and the history of Surrealist exhibitions.

As the show’s title suggests, “First Papers of Surrealism” promised to be an initiation, a beginning, an introduction to the artistic antics of the Surrealist group in exile. In 1942, however, the Surrealist movement was hardly an unknown entity, having already gained much notoriety from Salvador Dalí’s theatrical, publicity-seeking maneuvers in New York during the 1930s. If Alfred Barr’s “Fantastic Art, Dada and Surrealism” had garnered the movement institutional acclaim by 1936, then Dalí’s _Dream of Venus_ pavilion at the 1939 New York World’s Fair had popularized an erotically-charged funhouse version of Surrealism for a wider American audience. So exactly what was this 1942 international Surrealist exhibition proposing as a first? Quite literally, the title “First Papers of Surrealism” was a reference to the administrative documents issued to U.S. asylum-seekers, an allusion to the émigré status of the European artists in exile, underscoring the dislocation of the formerly Parisian-based Surrealist group during the Second World War. Beyond referring to the European artists’ displacement to New York City as a result of the Nazi threat, the show’s deceptively didactic title also contended that the exhibition marked a starting point for Surrealism on American soil, thereby implying that all previous exposure to
Surrealist production had not painted an entirely accurate picture of the movement.

That the public at large and even art scene initiates would misinterpret the movement's motives was inevitable, especially as it ventured abroad, crossing borders to encounter new cultural landscapes. Recognizing the perpetual challenge that a deterritorialized, drifting Surrealism faced, André Breton expressed this concern during his New York sojourn. In his 1942 *Prolegomena to a Third Surrealist Manifesto or Not*, Breton unselfconsciously lamented that:

> … Every great idea is perhaps subject to being seriously altered the instant it comes into contact with the mass of humanity, where it is made to come to terms with minds of a completely different stature than that of the mind it originally came from. The evils that are always the price of favor, of renown, lie in wait even for Surrealism though it has been in existence for twenty years… Surrealism is already far from being able to cover everything that is undertaken in its name, openly or not, from the most unfathomable ‘teas’ of Tokyo to the rain-streaked windows of Fifth Avenue… What is being done in any given direction bears little resemblance to what was wanted.  

“First Papers of Surrealism” could thus have provided a corrective to the false identity that Surrealism had assumed in the United States – one epitomized by Dalí’s media-savvy posturing as Surrealism’s provocative prophet on the cover of *Time* magazine in 1936. Already in 1935, the 29-year-old Dalí was lecturing on “Surrealist Paintings; Paranoiac Images” at the Museum of Modern Art for an audience in search of the keys to unlocking the enigmas of his and other Surrealist works.

Identity was indeed central to the Surrealist project, as was visually underscored by the Surrealists’ virtual obsession with portraiture—both individual and collective—to which the “compensation portraits” in the “First Papers of Surrealism” catalogue attest (Fig. 1). The outwardly playful device of replacing the portrait photographs of participating artists with apparently anonymous likenesses resonates with the Surrealist fascination with psychoanalytical theories of the self. Purportedly compensating for the unavailability of photographic images for exhibitors residing overseas, these seemingly random replacements play upon notions of subjectivity and artistic authority by subversively mimicking an identity-photo format to undermine photography’s reproductive promise of physical likeness. On one level the “compensation portraits” allude to the loss of identity experienced by the European
exiles, while on another they suggest the shifting identity of Surrealism as it traveled abroad or the Surrealist effort to disrupt the Enlightenment ideal of a fixed identity. ¹⁷

British art historian David Hopkins discusses the use of the passport photo in the context of “First Papers of Surrealism,” linking the “compensation portraits” to the practice of falsifying identity papers that exiles commonly had to resort to in order to gain entrance to the United States. ¹⁸ The notion of false identity, moreover, ties in with Breton’s attempts to correct the misguided perception of Surrealism. Viewed as a group portrait, the choice of surrogate photographs portraying stereotypical American subjects appears to interrogate constructs of national identity and reinforce the idea of a new American identity for Surrealism: one represented by depression-era sharecroppers, gangsters, industrialists, an Eskimo, an African-American and a Wild-West saloon hostess. ¹⁹

The use of “compensation portraits” usurps the photographic claim to representational objectivity corresponding to the purportedly impersonal, mechanical character of the indexical imprint. Identifying the outward appearance of one individual with that of an “other” triggers an associative mechanism whereby the absence of physical likeness elicits alternative identifications. ²⁰ The objective imprint, stripped of its representational reliability, lays bare subjective impression – the question of what one might be like replaces what one looks like. ²¹ The obvious discrepancy between the text and the corresponding image (the artist’s name and the anonymous photograph) thus (doubly) exposes the cracks in conventional notions of portraiture. ²² Disguised, the artist as imposter or masquerader assumes a ques-
tionable identity. This interest in postures and posturing appears to relate in turn to issues of identifying and identification, in particular with respect to Amerindian masks.

Northwest Coast transformation masks held special significance for André Breton, who was drawn to them for their “power of suggestion” rather than aesthetic or ethnographic considerations. Nonetheless, Breton began his essay on these masks with a reference to Georges Buraud’s book *Les Masques* (1948), followed by a lengthy quotation in which Buraud describes his poetic and fanciful vision of how the masks function within a general ritual context. The selected quotation by Buraud no doubt appealed to Breton for its description of how the spectators, identifying with the masked dancer as the embodiment of the being represented by the mask, collectively participate in the transformative action, resulting from the release of unconscious forces.

The essential quality of the masks for Breton is thus functional and transformative. The mask operates as an instrument to “becoming other,” performed by virtue of a mechanism (literally a string) that activates the shift from one form to another – animal to man, dream state to waking state.

While the masks were tied to the Surrealist conception of self, the appropriation of non-Western objects in general, masks and otherwise, contributed as well to the construction of the Surrealist movement’s identity. As collective constructs, the international exhibitions of Surrealism participated publicly in this Surrealist self-fashioning by performing the transhistorical and transnational boundaries of the Surrealist endeavor yet necessarily inscribing the movement within a specific time and place – in the case of “First Papers of Surrealism,” the upheaval of the Second World War, the uprootedness of exile in New York City, and competing nationalisms in the 1940s.

Despite New York’s familiarity with Surrealism by 1942 and its ambivalent attitude toward the movement – one tinged with fascination and fatigue – the premier appearance of Native American objects amongst the astounding array of Surrealist paintings, sculptures and other ephemera, all enshrouded in Duchamp’s gigantic web, clearly captured the critics’ attention. *Time* magazine pointed out that “among the show’s 105 exhibits, including dolls, idols, ceremonial masks by American Indian primitives, was work by painters Masson, Delvaux, Chagall, Tanguy, Magritte, Vail, Hirshfield,” a designation that assigns the Native American objects to the ranks of collectible curiosities.

Edward Alden Jewell of *The New York Times* concurred that:

…a little bit of everything has been brought in to produce Surrealism’s all-out against the Axis. The maze contains not paintings alone,
but quantities, as well, of ‘out-of-this world’ objects, as they are now aptly being called. Whether the famous fur-lined teacup and saucer are there I can’t at the moment say, for installation had not been completed at the time of my visit. But it was evident that the primitive North American Indian is looked upon by modern experts in the field as having been to some extent versed in the mysteries of the subconscious.³⁰

Their commentary suggests that the inclusion of indigenous objects was surprising and original whereas the accompanying Surrealist artwork, perceived as lacking vitality, was labeled tiresome, repetitive and academic. Furthermore, the statements reveal much about prevailing perceptions of Native American objects little more than a year following the Museum of Modern Art’s 1941 watershed exhibition “Indian Art of the United States,” as well as predominant American attitudes toward Surrealism, which was generally conceived of as an exclusively artistic movement.³¹ Whereas Native American objects were enlisted by an American cultural elite in search of authentic artistic origins independent from European tradition, they appealed to Surrealist sensibilities for somewhat different reasons. The latter sought to establish analogies between the Native American objects and their own anti-national politics and poetics of consciousness, while the former (both in New York and in Mexico) embraced them as a means of developing a national American (or Mexican) identity that would compete with European hegemony.³² This common ground of appropriation paradoxically blurred the contrasting values and qualities which either American or European avant-garde modernism attached to the indigenous arts. The Surrealist strategies of display, however, unconsciously exposed these underlying competing interests.

Although the First Papers of Surrealism catalogue prominently mentions indigenous arts, no visual trace of the non-Western objects on display was documented, either in the catalogue or in the two extant photographs of show.³³ On the pale green introductory page of the catalogue, a statement under the rubric “Primitive Art” announces the Surrealist position regarding the Native American objects:

Surrealism is only trying to rejoin the most durable traditions of mankind. Among the primitive peoples art always goes beyond what is conventionally and arbitrarily called the ‘real.’ The native of the Northwest Pacific coast, the Pueblos, New Guinea, New Ireland, the Marquesas, among others, have made objects which Surrealists par-
ticularly appreciate.  

A footnote further specifies the provenance of these objects from the collections of members of the Surrealist movement (Max Ernst, André Breton), New York art dealers (Pierre Matisse, Julius Carlebach and Segredakis) as well as French anthropologist Claude Lévi-Strauss, who had journeyed to New York via Martinique with André Breton the previous year. Centered in the middle of the page, directly above the paragraph on “primitive” art, a phrase describing the opening night features a more elusive reference to the long-standing Surrealist affinity with Northwest Coast cultures “Vernissage consacrée aux enfants jouant, à l’odeur du cèdre” (Cedar-scented opening dedicated to children playing). Although neither critics nor attendee accounts corroborated this claim of odiferous appeal, the boisterous presence of children tossing balls and jumping rope hardly went unnoticed. While the ritual association of cedar burning evoked the exotic other, the youthful exuberance of recreational games referred to the Surrealist privileging of childhood, and lent an ambiance of freedom that was the rallying cry for the latest international exhibition of Surrealism. In effect, the introductory text by Breton, appearing at the top of the page in French and English, underscored the Surrealist mission to liberate mankind:

The Surrealist cause, in art as in life, is the cause of freedom itself. Today more than ever to speak abstractly in the name of freedom or to praise it in empty terms is to serve it ill. To light the world freedom must become flesh and to this end must always be reflected and recreated in the word.

Both the evocation of ritual incense and the chaos of physical activity added a performative aspect to the event—one that upset tradition, disrupted vision, and displaced objects as well as participants.

The format and themes of the 1942 exhibition were not entirely innovative but rather translated earlier experiments with the medium of display in Paris and further afield in Copenhagen, London, Tenerife, Brussels, and Mexico City. Often designed as multi-sensorial environments that showcased an enthralling assortment of objects – ranging from the more traditional genres of painting, sculpture and photography, by artists more or less closely affiliated with the Parisian Surrealist group, to non-Western objects, folk art, art of the insane and children’s art – Surrealist exhibitions functioned as snapshots of the movement fixed in a moment of “dwelling-in-
Surrealist display incorporated appropriation and displacement of myriad objects of diverse origins, reassembling them in complex configurations to construct both individual and group identity – the former in Surrealist collecting practices and the latter in group exhibitions. Perhaps the most emblematic precursor, the 1938 “Exposition International du Surréalisme,” held at the Galerie des Beaux-Arts in Paris, was even reviewed in *The New York Times* under the headline “Paris Joke.” Extensively documented, the 1938 show has since become the subject of much scholarly discussion. In a contemporary Paris review, Maurice Henry, a writer, cartoonist and member of the movement involved in organizing the show, described it as “an honest expression of the current state of the movement” that inspired the viewer to “abandon him/herself to an adventure.” Interestingly, the 1938 show was exceptional in that non-Western objects were not exhibited. Only an olfactory presence hinted at a New World connection – *odeurs du Brésil*, the aroma from a coffee-roasting machine wafting through the galleries.

Clues to the Surrealist slant on indigenous cultures may be gleaned from texts and documentation of other Surrealist displays incorporating “primal” art, both in exhibitions and journals. In fact, non-Western objects had entered into Surrealist practices of display in the 1920s with two exhibitions combining a monographic format of a Surrealist artist with that of a particular culture—“Tableaux de Man Ray et objets des îles” (March 26-April 10, 1926) and “Yves Tanguy et objets d’Amérique” (May 27-June 15, 1927), which presented paintings by Tanguy with pre-Columbian art, Hopi kachinas and Northwest Coast objects, all from the collections of Aragon, Breton, Eluard and Roland Tual. The American objects metonymically represented the imaginary dream-world of the Americas against which Tanguy’s oneiric landscapes were inscribed. In the 1931 anti-colonial exhibition “La Vérité sur les colonies,” the Surrealists again mobilized non-Western objects, instrumentalizing them to denounce the veiled imperialist propaganda of the concurrent Colonial Exhibition. Non-western art also featured prominently in two 1936 Surrealist exhibitions: a Hopi kachina adorned the cover of the catalogue for the *Exposition Surréaliste d’Objets*, held at the Galerie Charles Ratton, which specialized in non-Western art – where kachina dolls, Eskimo masks, and pre-Columbian ceramics as well as masks and sculpture from Oceania alternated with an unusual and intriguing selection of objects, from ready-mades and mathematical models to found and natural objects. At the massive *International Surrealist Exhibition* staged at New Burlington Galleries in London, roughly twenty non-Western objects – most of them from Oceania, with the exception of one African and three American objects – were interspersed with nearly four hundred artworks, found objects, natural objects interpreted, and Surrealist objects as
well as photographs of ethnographic objects from the British Museum.49

Written shortly after the London show, Breton's essay “Non-national Boundaries of Surrealism” outlines some key concepts, which shed light on the dissemination of Surrealism’s broader aims through the staging of exhibitions.50 According to Breton, the popular appeal of Surrealism – quantifiable in the extraordinary turnout for the London show, with roughly 20,000 visitors – provided a misleading measure of the movement’s success. Instead, he located the movement’s true achievement in its reach beyond national borders. The international lineup of the exhibitors including artists from fourteen countries, thus demonstrated the unity of aspiration and innovation in “a new awareness of life that is common to all,” rather than “simply a unification of style.”51 While clearly aligning the Surrealist movement with concurrent political events, Breton reiterated the defining principles of Surrealism as an intellectual movement in order to correct apparent misconceptions of it as another “ism” in the genealogy of modern art.52 In 1936, the paradoxical consequences of widespread success, mainstream recognition and critical acclaim remained a source of concern that Breton would return to in 1942.53 It follows that Surrealist exhibitions operated as foils to conventional exhibitions by subversively employing common conventions of public display to expose their underlying social and political underpinnings – whether the commercial pursuits of gallery exhibitions, the classifying and categorizing efforts of ethnographic and art museum exhibits, or the nationalist discourse of international expositions.54

On another level, the Surrealist exhibitions functioned as dynamic points of convergence and transit, as “contact zones.”55 Their international scope brought together a diversity of objects and individuals, whose centripetal movement resulted in an ephemeral configuration of haphazard juxtapositions, a principal strategy of Surrealist collage and assemblage aimed to disorient and deconstruct. This potential to trigger associations served as a catalyst, sparking unexpected and uncontrollable reactions in random directions. In moving beyond representation, the Surrealist exhibitions created and produced an intensely local in-between space that exceeded the international.56 Stylistic diversity and non-Western objects, both basic elements of Surrealist display, thus visually encoded the movement’s non-aesthetic and antinationalist stance. Amanda Stansell has argued that the apparent contradictions in Surrealist politics and collecting practices, at once opposing and unconsciously perpetuating the colonialist discourse of their day, nonetheless had far-reaching implications for destabilizing and exposing racial constructs.57

The tension between non-Western cultural appropriation and Western cultural critique in Surrealist display was further vexed when transplanted to the Ameri-
can continent. In the context of “First Papers of Surrealism,” the international Surrealist exhibition was a “contact zone” located within the national borders of the United States, where the transhistorical and transnational character of the Surrealist movement collided with the construction of an American cultural identity. The American reception of both Native American art and Surrealism—both having been recently promoted at the Museum of Modern Art under the direction of Alfred H. Barr, Jr.—thus intersected with that of “First Papers of Surrealism.”

While the 1936 “Fantastic Art, Dada and Surrealism” presented an overwhelming “potpourri” of over seven hundred objects, including a category labeled “comparative material” comprising “children’s art, art of the insane, folk art, commercial and journalistic art, miscellaneous objects and pictures with a Surrealist character, scientific objects,” Native American objects were surprisingly absent from the exhibition. In his preface to the catalogue, Alfred Barr stated that “Oriental art and the extremely relevant art of primitive and prehistoric man have not been touched,” but did not account for this conscious omission.

Furthermore, Barr had attended the “International Exhibition of Surrealism” in London earlier that year in preparation for the upcoming Museum of Modern Art show “Fantastic Art, Dada and Surrealism” and would no doubt have been struck by the non-Western pieces interspersed with the modern works in the crowded salon-style hanging. The reasons behind Barr’s exclusion of non-Western works remain open to speculation. His choice of a neutral, orderly display format, however, suggests a deliberate decision to maintain the Museum of Modern Art’s policy of clear, didactic exhibition design, one of the institution’s hallmarks under his direction. Barr opted for a chronological hanging, with proto-Surrealist works displayed in rooms according to century up to the twentieth, which was divided into Dada, organic abstraction (Arp, Picasso, Miro, Masson) and realistic Surrealism (Dali, Magritte, Ernst).

In view of the conspicuous lack of non-Western art in the 1936 show, the American critics’ references to Surrealism with respect to the Native American objects exhibited in the Museum of Modern Art’s 1941 “Indian Art of the United States” elicits conjecture. The critical reception of the latter show drew parallels between the Native American objects and Surrealist imagery, a link forged in the perceived expression of the unconscious common to both. That “Indian Art of the United States” was unanimously heralded as a manifestation of indigenous American ingenuity and held up to comparison with modernist European models might at first glance have seemed antithetical but in fact both reactions were mutually reinforcing. By placing Native American art on a par with the most advanced European modern art, the organizers and critics established an origin and legitimacy for American
artistic production. At a time when the United States was looking to indigenous cultures for an original homegrown cultural tradition independent of its European roots, Native American art had an entirely distinct resonance from the Surrealists’ universalizing vision. Entangled within the web of national interest and international conflict, the Native American objects on display in “First Papers” were thus floating signifiers. The displaced objects, liberated from their original culturally-determined significance, were reduced to signs whose polysemic quality was reinforced in the various resulting chains of association.

If the Surrealists envisioned the exhibition as a deterritorialized domain for collective action, then its New World setting was a mental construct, conceived of as a fertile terrain for artistic exploration and discovery, a terra incognita, an uncharted territory to be exploited by Western artists—both European and American, Surrealist or otherwise. Just as the decontextualized Native American objects alternately stood for American nationalist sentiment or the Surrealist universal quest to liberate mankind, the equivocal potential of the New World trope likewise sparked both the American and the Surrealist imaginations. Reporting on the State Department-sponsored conference on “Inter-American Cultural Relations in the Field of Art” in an editorial entitled “The New World is Still New,” American Federation of Arts member F.A. Whiting, Jr. rallied artists, scholars and museum people to unite in a Pan-American effort to discover new creative horizons in the “vast, uncharted field of activity within the Americas.”

Similarly, André Breton explored the New World imaginary and its regenerative possibilities in his preface to Peggy Guggenheim’s 1942 Art of This Century inaugural catalogue. Paradoxically – given the Surrealists anticolonial stance – Breton applied the colonial metaphor of Christopher Columbus and his discovery of the New World to the modern artist’s exploration of the interior world. The European artist thus becomes an adventurer in search of new models, and the modernist endeavor a story of travel encounters.

Invoking its magical and transformative properties, the Surrealists exhibited non-Western art as an antidote to European rationalism and its visual culmination in modernist aesthetics. Integral to this romanticized vision of non-Western art as a product of a pure, uncorrupt state of consciousness was the belief that Native Americans, in particular, living in harmony with nature, embodied the Surrealist quest for the resolution of opposing principles that located an idealized former state of existence “elsewhere.” Paradoxically, the magical aura or “savage heart” of non-Western objects, which Surrealists so cherished, was entirely disrupted in the process of appropriation and displacement.

Disruption was indeed the pervasive theme of the “First Papers” installation,
with Marcel Duchamp’s *16 Miles of String* literally tying it all together while blurring boundaries and shattering the gallery space. The choreographed chaos of “First Papers” resonated with the current state of the Western world. Critics wittily drew parallels with the war by commenting that Duchamp’s string effectively camouflaged or combated the bourgeois décor. Yet, the Surrealist exhibition space was much more. It was an ideological battlefield that lay siege to the orderly classifications and linear development of conventional modern art genealogies, virtually exploding Alfred Barr’s modern art chart and by extension his historicizing vision of Surrealism, while launching an assault on the status of the traditional art object and the authority of the artist, the critic, and the viewer as well.

This attempt to unravel some of the threads entwined in “First Papers of Surrealism” in order to loosen the concealed contextual knots, inevitably untangles other Surrealist strings, extending and converging across a vast temporal and spatial network in novel configurations. The recurrent themes of identity and community that are intrinsically related to the Surrealist embrace of non-Western and particularly Native American cultures thus reappear along Surrealism’s post-war itineraries, winding through both real and imagined American landscapes. The chance encounters choreographed in “First Papers of Surrealism” enacted the irrational, ineffable nature of Surrealism. Thus introducing an ill-informed American public to Surrealism might be likened to an initiatory ritual, one that the Surrealists would translate, adapt and transport elsewhere. Individual artists closely associated with the Surrealist movement such as Max Ernst relocated to the Southwest during the late 1940s and cultivated an intense identification with Native American culture. Traveling east, along the path taken by many of the exiled artists returning to their homelands and landing in post-war Paris, the non-Western takes over the exhibition space in “Surrealism in 1947” at the Galerie Maeght in 1947. In his preface to the *Surrealism in 1947* catalogue, André Breton, taking stock of Surrealist activity since the previous Paris-based International Exhibition of Surrealism in 1938, stressed the premonitory atmosphere of both that show and “First Papers of Surrealism,” suggesting how both had unconsciously registered the impending socio-political climate. If, in the gloomy darkness of the 1938 show, Surrealism had prefigured the cataclysmic events of the Second World War, and the resulting ruins in the shattered space of “First Papers of Surrealism,” then it would follow that the movement would set the tone for the future with an invitation to undertake an initiatory excursion, envisioned as a new myth in the making.

This cursory description offers a fleeting glimpse of the future potential for examination of Surrealist exhibitions, as in-between sites of dwelling-in-travel that
perform the non-national boundaries of the Surrealist enterprise, contact zones where myriad elements combine to embody the dynamism, diversity, and complexity at the heart of the movement's concerns.
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